Appendix A

Additional Tables

TABLE A1: Descriptive Statistics - Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Wave 1				Wave 2			
	Control		*Treatment*		*Control*		*Treatment*	
	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
Demographic Variables								
Age	38.15	11.66	38.89	12.05	36.78	10.05	36.72	10.60
Female	0.44	0.50	0.45	0.50	0.34	0.47	0.48	0.50
American	0.98	0.14	0.97	0.17	0.91	0.29	0.99	0.09
College degree or more	0.63	0.48	0.59	0.49	0.80	0.40	0.71	0.45
Married	0.60	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.76	0.43	0.50	0.50
Other Variables								
Amount to put in safe option	0.57	0.39	0.56	0.36	0.66	0.56	0.58	0.35
Engaging in extreme sports	0.10	0.15	0.07	0.13	0.23	0.20	0.09	0.13
Amount to keep for yourself (UG)	0.54	0.19	0.55	0.21	0.55	0.22	0.54	0.18
BFI-Extraversion	0.28	0.17	0.28	0.18	0.30	0.14	0.29	0.18
BFI-Conscientiousness	0.48	0.15	0.50	0.15	0.41	0.15	0.49	0.15
BFI-Openness	0.43	0.16	0.46	0.15	0.37	0.13	0.45	0.17
BFI-Agreeableness	0.40	0.16	0.42	0.16	0.39	0.14	0.43	0.16
BFI-Neuroticism	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.19	0.30	0.14	0.27	0.19
People take advantage of others?[1]	0.53	0.24	0.51	0.22	0.63	0.24	0.52	0.22
Integrity score[2]	0.42	0.11	0.44	0.09	0.35	0.13	0.42	0.10
Ethics score[3]	0.67	0.31	0.74	0.28	0.44	0.34	0.71	0.31
Donation to charity (%)	19.32	24.86	13.11	23.02	33.30	21.62	15.36	23.11
Donation to researcher (%)	16.20	23.55	9.30	19.58	31.05	21.16	12.46	20.30
Observations	284		608		101		267	

[1] A higher number means fairer and less advantageous. [2] The integrity score is created using participants' ratings on 15 dishonest actions. [3] The ethics score is created using participants' self-reports on whether they had engaged in various unethical actions. More explanation about how these variables are defined can be found in the main text.

Passive vs Active Control

Here we discuss the choice of passive vs active control. We opted to use a passive control in our experiment: the subjects in our control group skipped the behavioural intervention stage and move from stage 1 to stage 3 of the experiment. Even though there is no significant difference between employing a passive or active control in behavioral intervention studies as shown in this meta-analysis Au et al. (2020), it might be worth discussing why a passive control seems superior when an active control is often a good choice in other areas.

An active control, such as writing about a recent holiday or physical item, no matter how far removed from concerns of honesty still runs the risk of sparking some form of moral/immoral thinking, and, even more worrying, this might be expected to be biased in the direction of the individual's underlying honesty creating a potential confound. Writing might also trigger other emotions which might in turn impact honesty (such as positive mood) which again might vary with underlying honesty creating a further confound. In the case of our own experiment, we might also worry about external validity and comparability: it is not clear how comparisons between writing about honesty and writing generally map onto our proposed real-world applications.

One potential issue is that we might worry that those in the treatment groups would feel annoyed about spending time on the writing task and this might modify their behavior relative to the control group. First, we would point to the brevity of the writing task. Second, the fact that the length of the experiment was stated clearly in advance and was based upon the treatment group (so those in the control group might feel some benefit from finishing slightly earlier but by the time this was apparent it would be too late for this to influence their behavior within the experiment). Finally, even if there were some effects generated by annoyance at having to undertake the writing task this would first be cancelled out when we compare behavior by the same individual across the two dishonesty tasks to follow. Second, we might think that those taking the high dishonesty task or low dishonesty task would feel more strongly than those asked to write about a time when they were honest. However, we find no statistically significant difference in behavior between treatment groups (see Table 2 in the main text).

Relevance Filter

We used a relevance filter based on the text written by our participants in the second stage of the experiment. We carefully examined and categorized the text as either relevant or irrelevant through manual classification. If a participant wrote a story of (dis)honesty depending on their randomly allocated treatment group, it is classified as a relevant text. Conversely, texts that were merely random or unrelated to (dis)honesty were classified as irrelevant. We dropped the irrelevant observations from our sample as dictated by our pre-registration and as described in the main text. Nonetheless, since the classification process was performed manually by our research team, we implemented several validity checks to ensure the accuracy of our classification, aiming to minimize any potential biases.

First, we trained several machine-learning models (including the k-nearest neighbors classifier, multinomial naive bayes classifier, logistic regression classifier and support vector classifier)[29] and evaluated them for a classification task. Accuracy score is a common metric used to evaluate classification models. It represents the percentage of correctly predicted instances out of the total number of instances. In our models, the accuracy score ranges from 88% (k-neighbor classifier) to 91% (support vector classifier). It means that the SVC model accurately predicted the target variable for approximately 91% of the testing data. The target variable in our model is the relevancy of the text data that was classified manually by our research team. High accuracy scores indicate that the models performed well in distinguishing between different categories: irrelevant vs relevant text. It suggests that the

[29]Parameter classifications for the models can be provided upon request.

chosen SVC model and its parameter settings were effective in capturing the underlying patterns in the data and making accurate predictions. Even though our data does not consist of a substantially large number of observations that would normally be preferable for supervised machine-learning models, we provide these analyses as a first step to demonstrate the validity of our manual classification of relevant and irrelevant text writers.[30]

Moreover, our study employed text analysis utilizing the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) Dictionary (Pennebaker & Tausczik 2010) to discern the disparity between irrelevant and relevant texts. Table A2 showcases the outcomes of this analysis. The first column of the table displays a selection of LIWC variables deemed pertinent for composing a narrative concerning honesty or dishonesty. Columns 2 and 3 present the mean values of these variables for relevant and irrelevant texts, respectively. Lastly, the last column exhibits the p-values derived from a two-sided t-test. It is noteworthy that all text variables featured in this table exhibit significant distinctions between relevant and irrelevant texts.[31]

One of the most noteworthy disparities between relevant and irrelevant texts pertains to the use of past tense. Given that participants were instructed to write a story encompassing the past 12 months, it is anticipated that their narratives would entail a greater frequency of past-focused words and a diminished usage of present or future-focused words. In this regard, irrelevant texts manifest a significantly lower use of past-focused words, while exhibiting a considerably higher utilization of present and future-focused words compared to relevant texts. Furthermore, the use of the first-person singular pronoun "I" is significantly lower in irrelevant texts than in relevant texts. This discrepancy arises from the fact that composing a personal story necessitates frequent usage of this pronoun and irrelevant text writers did not seem to read/follow the experimental instructions as in the use of past-focused words. In conclusion, our manual classification of texts as relevant and irrelevant has proven to be a valid approach, as evidenced by the consistent patterns observed in the text analysis. The significant differences in various linguistic variables between the two groups substantiate the validity and reliability of this classification method.

To illustrate the distinction between relevant and irrelevant text in order to highlight the effectiveness of our approach, we present a selection of examples from the participant-written texts. The following excerpts exemplify relevant text. In the honesty treatment, one participant stated, "I decided to tell my husband exactly how I had been feeling. I was upset

[30] In the training data, we have 862 observations and in the test data, we have 602 observations with only one attribute.

[31] Among the 93 variables included in the LIWC, a mere 15 variables, such as the employment of swear words, prepositions, and interrogatives, do not demonstrate statistically significant differences between writers of relevant and irrelevant texts. The remaining variables, however, exhibit significant dissimilarities between these two groups at a 1% level.

TABLE A2: Comparison of Text Variables between Relevant and Irrelevant Texts

	Mean Values		**T-Test**[1]
	Relevant Text	Irrelevant Text	p-values
Word Count	81.43	89.03	0.001
	(26.21)	(54.83)	
Word per Sentence	22.21	25.64	0.000
	(13.04	(20.54)	
Past Focused	10.68	3.62	0.000
	(4.30)	(3.62)	
Present Focused	7.52	10.89	0.000
	(4.09)	(5.06)	
Future Focused	0.76	1.12	0.000
	(1.14)	(1.62)	
Emotional Tone	41.77	64.74	0.000
	(35.56)	(36.27)	
Positive Emotion	3.14	5.64	0.000
	(2.54)	4.41	
Negative Emotion	2.53	2.10	0.001
	(2.20)	(2.73)	
1st Person Singular (I)	10.87	5.29	0.000
	(3.48)	(5.69)	
1st Person (I, we)	11.54	6.16	0.000
	(3.26)	(5.65)	
2nd Person (you)	0.12	2.70	0.000
	(0.64)	(3.70)	
3rd Person (she, he, they)	2.49	0.79	0.000
	(3.22)	(2.05)	
Insight	2.91	3.29	0.002
	(2.06)	(2.73)	
No of observation	875	553	

Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. [1] p-values from a two-tailed t-test are reported. The table includes the sample from both wave 1 and wave 2 before the relevance filter is applied.

about some things and had been for quite some time. I usually bottle things up inside and keep my emotions to myself. We had a fight, but it felt good to get out how I felt and I feel like things got better after being honest. It is now in the open how I feel about some actions and I don't have this burden weighing on me because I am keeping things inside." Similarly, in the high dishonesty treatment, another participant recounted, "A few months ago I was changing the oil in some of the machines that are used at the company I work for. I forgot to add enough oil to one of the machines and when it was used a couple of days later the engine seized up. One of the newer employees at the company got blamed for the screw-up and I didn't say a word to correct this situation. The employee ended up being fired because I didn't speak up and I feel terrible about this." Conversely, we provide examples of irrelevant text. For instance, one participant directly copied the question instead of composing a story, stating, "For your first task we would like to ask you to write about a real-life event. Please think about an event in your own life (preferably in the last 12 months) in which you decided to be completely honest. We would like to ask you to write about this event below. For your first task, we would like to ask you to write about a real-life event. Please think about an event in your own life (preferably in the last 12 months) in which you decided to be completely honest. We would like to ask you to write about this event below." Another one who wrote a random text: "Ah, Latin... you've just gotta love it. As antiquated as they might seem, these two little Latin abbreviations are pretty handy in modern writing, but only if you use them correctly. The Latin phrase id est means "that is," so i.e. is a way of saying "in other words." It's designed to make something clearer by providing a definition or saying it in a more common way."

Text Analysis of Stories Written by the Participants

We conducted a basic text analysis on the text written by the participants in the second stage of the experiment. Our main aim is to check whether participants took the priming tasks seriously which then validates the success of our treatment manipulation. Table A3 represents the result from the text analysis using LIWC (Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count) Dictionary (Pennebaker & Tausczik 2010). In the first column, we present a selection of LIWC variables that seem relevant. In Columns 2,3 and 4, we report the mean values of these variables in the Honesty, Low Dishonesty and High Dishonesty treatments, respectively. Finally, last three columns we report the p-values from a series of two-sided t-tests.

On average, participants used 81 words to describe a real-life event with participants in the Low Dishonesty treatment using around 4 words fewer than participants in other treatments. On the other hand, word per sentence (on average 22) does not differ across the

treatments. The text written is mainly past-focused which is consistent with writing about an event in the last 12 months. Furthermore, the emotional tone used in the text differs across the treatments. To investigate this difference, we compare the scores of positive and negative emotions among treatment groups. As we might expect participants who wrote about an honest self displayed on average higher levels of positive emotion and lower levels of negative emotion in their text, as compared to participants who wrote about a dishonest self. Over and above the main results from the paper, these findings suggest that participants did take the writing task seriously. The usage of "I" is very prevalent in all of the treatment groups though less frequent in the Honesty treatment than in the other treatments. Moreover, participants in the Honesty treatment used more insightful words (such as "think" or "know") than participants in the dishonesty treatments, with the Low Dishonesty treatment scoring highest of all. These linguistic features serve as indicators that our priming task successfully elicited the salience of (dis)honesty among participants. These results provide substantial evidence that participants took the priming tasks seriously and engaged with the writing task in a manner consistent with the treatment manipulations. These findings validate the effectiveness of our treatment manipulation and support the reliability of our experimental design.

TABLE A3: Text Analysis of Stories Written by the Participants

	Mean Values			**T-Test**[1]		
	Honesty Tr.	Low Dishonesty Tr.	High Dishonesty Tr.	Honesty vs Low Dis.	Honesty vs High Dis.	Low vs High Dish
Word Count	82.84	78.86	82.86	0.073	0.933	0.025
	(33.82)	(18.67)	(24.49)			
Word per Sentence	21.20	22.48	22.92	0.221	0.114	0.692
	(11.94)	(13.30)	(13.76)			
Past Focused	10.65	10.39	11.03	0.463	0.275	0.077
	(4.04)	(4.54)	(4.27)			
Present Focused	7.59	7.96	6.98	0.286	0.067	0.003
	(4.14)	(4.23)	(3.81)			
Future Focused	0.69	0.85	0.72	0.092	0.787	0.154
	(1.09)	(1.21)	(1.10)			
Emotional Tone	56.81	37.09	31.97	0.000	0.000	0.059
	(36.11)	(33.70)	(32.07)			
Positive Emotion	4.25	2.62	2.62	0.000	0.000	0.979
	(2.72)	(2.31)	(2.22)			
Negative Emotion	2.11	2.62	3.04	0.053	0.000	0.001
	(1.98)	(2.23)	(2.29)			
1st Person Singular (I)	10.49	11.11	10.98	0.033	0.114	0.629
	(3.56)	(3.16)	(3.41)			
1st Person (I, we)	11.34	11.57	11.72	0.406	0.183	0.551
	(3.56)	3.05	(3.16)			
2nd Person (you)	0.21	0.06	0.09	0.005	0.062	0.440
	(0.83)	(0.40)	(0.64)			
3rd Person (she, he, they)	4.21	2.72	3.69	0.000	0.053	0.000
	(3.51)	(3.02)	(3.08)			
Insight	3.39	2.83	2.5	0.001	0.000	0.049
	(2.12)	(2.09)	(1.87)			
No of observation	281	312	282			

Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. [1] p-values from a two-tailed t-test are reported. The table presented here exclusively comprises our final sample, which consists solely of relevant text writers and participants who passed the attention and comprehension checks as in all analyses provided in the main paper.

Appendix B - Experimental Instructions

Participation Agreement

You have been invited to take part in a research study run by researchers at [details removed to facilitate double-blind review]

Please read the following statements carefully and answer the question below.

Our commitments and privacy policy:

We never deceive participants. For example, if we inform you that another participant is making a choice on which you can then react, this is indeed the case. We keep our promises made to participants. For example, if we promise a certain payment, participants will indeed receive it. In the event that we are responsible for a mistake that is to the disadvantage of participants, we will inform and compensate the respective participants. We design, conduct and report our research in accordance with recognized scientific standards and ethical principles.

We adhere to the terms of our privacy policy as stated below:

The data in the participants' database will only be used for the purpose of the study. There is no link between the personal data in the participants' database and the data collected during a study. The generated anonymous data will be used for analysis. The end product will be publicly available. Your participation in this study is purely voluntary, and you may withdraw your participation or your data at any time without any penalty to you. Please note that the software (Qualtrics) automatically notes the time you spent on each question and this data will be made available to researchers for analysis.

If you would like to make a complaint about the way you have been dealt with during the study or any possible harm you might have suffered please address your complaint to the person below [details witheld to facilitate double-blind review]

If you are happy to proceed please tick the "I agree" button below to continue.

First Stage

Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions.

Age:

Gender:

Marital status:

Highest educational attainment:

Nationality:

English as a native language:
Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair? 1 means that "people would try to take advantage of you," and 10 means that "people would try to be fair" :
Please write "purple" if your favourite colour is asked later on this study.

Ethic Questionnaire

Which of these things, if any, have you done in the past 12 months?
i) Avoided a fare on public transport
ii) Made something up on a job application
iii) Downloaded music or videos without paying for them
iv) Called in sick to work/ to school when not actually unwell

How often do you participate in extreme sports? (Extreme sports include bungee-jumping, para-gliding, parachute jumping, gliding, rafting, diving and other dangerous sports.) :
What is your favourite colour according to the statement written before in this study?

Integrity Questionnaire

	Always justified	Sometimes justified	Rarely justified	Never justified
Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled	○	○	○	○
Buying something which you know it is stolen	○	○	○	○
Taking cannabis	○	○	○	○
Keeping money that you found in the street	○	○	○	○
Lying in your own interest	○	○	○	○
Having an affair when you are married	○	○	○	○
Having sex under the legal age of consent	○	○	○	○
Failing to report accidental damage you have done to a parked vehicle	○	○	○	○
Throwing away litter in a public place	○	○	○	○
In order for us to check you are reading instructions, please select "Always justified" for this statement.	○	○	○	○
Driving under the influence of alcohol	○	○	○	○
Avoiding a fare on public transport	○	○	○	○
Cheating on taxes if you have a chance	○	○	○	○
Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties	○	○	○	○
Driving faster than the speed limit	○	○	○	○
Making up things on a job application	○	○	○	○

Bonus Payments: The next few tasks involve the chance for you to win a bonus payment. One of them will be selected at random and depending upon your choices and which question is selected you stand the chance to win a bonus. The precise nature of the bonus will be made explicit during each task but please remember that only one of these tasks will end up paying out a bonus.

Risk Preference

For your next task please consider the following scenario. You have been endowed with $1. You are asked to allocate this amount among 2 options: Option A and Option B. The amount you put in Option A will stay as it is (the value of the money you placed in this option will not change). The amount you put in Option B will be determined by the following rule:

A random whole number between 1 and 6 will be generated. If the number is less than or equal to 3, the amount you put in Option B will be multiplied by 2. If the number is greater than 3, it will be 0 (zero).

Your potential bonus from this task will be the sum of the amount you put in Option A and the final amount resulted in Option B. Please indicate how you would like to allocate the $1 among Options A and B.

Ultimatum Game

For your next task, imagine that you are randomly matched with another participant in this experiment. You are Player 1. You need to decide how to allocate $2 between yourself and Player 2. You need to offer an allocation. If Player 2 rejects your offer, both players will receive a potential bonus of $0. If Player 2 accepts the offer, both players will receive a potential bonus according to the allocation you offered.
Please select how to allocate $2 between yourself and the other player.

Now, you are assigned to the role of Player 2 and randomly matched with another participant Below, you will see different allocations offered by Player 1. If you reject the offer, both players will receive a potential bonus of $0. If you accept the offer, both players will receive a potential bonus according to the allocation Player 1 offered.

Big Five

Please indicate how well do the following statements describe your personality.

I see myself as someone who...

	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly
is reserved	○	○	○	○	○
is generally trusting	○	○	○	○	○
tends to be lazy	○	○	○	○	○
is relaxed, handles stress well	○	○	○	○	○
has few artistic interests	○	○	○	○	○
is outgoing, sociable	○	○	○	○	○
tends to find fault with others	○	○	○	○	○
does a thorough job	○	○	○	○	○
gets nervous easily	○	○	○	○	○
has an active imagination	○	○	○	○	○
In order for us to check you are reading instructions, please select "Agree a little" for this statement.	○	○	○	○	○

Second Stage

Honesty Treatment

For your first task we would like to ask you to write about a real life event. Please think about an event in your own life (preferably in the last 12 months) in which you decided to be completely honest. We would like to ask you to write about this event below.

Low Dishonesty Treatment

For your first task we would like to ask you to write about a real life event. Please think about an event in your own life (preferably in the last 12 months) in which you decided not to be completely honest in order to benefit yourself, but where you felt that this dishonesty did not harm anyone else. We would like to ask you to write about this event below.

High Dishonesty Treatment

For your first task we would like to ask you to write about a real life event. Please think about an event in your own life (preferably in the last 12 months) in which you decided not to be completely honest in order to benefit yourself, and where this dishonesty ended up harming someone else (a little or lot). We would like to ask you to write about this event below.

Third Stage

Matrix Task

On the next page, you will be given an image that consists of 20 matrices. Your task is to find two numbers that add up to 10 in these matrices. The potential bonus you can make in this task is \$0.10 (\$0.30) per correct answer. You will have 5 minutes to complete this task. Once you press the button to continue, your time will start. You will see a timer on top of your screen. Once your time is over, you will be directed to the next page where you need to report how many pairs of numbers you had found. Once you are ready please press the button to proceed to the matrix task.

1.69	1.82	2.91	0.46	0.53	1.88	0.49	0.74	1.17	0.47	4.58	2.57
4.67	4.81	3.05	6.13	5.11	3.42	3.72	2.00	1.22	3.15	3.82	4.38
5.82	5.06	4.28	7.05	5.43	4.15	3.75	5.22	5.67	4.94	5.42	5.98
6.36	5.19	4.57	7.15	5.76	4.77	8.83	8.23	7.70	2.95	4.86	7.54
0.13	0.24	0.41	0.81	1.31	2.09	0.17	2.46	2.44	0.46	1.98	2.38
2.81	1.86	1.20	4.55	3.75	3.19	6.02	5.60	2.63	0.48	1.79	2.48
3.33	3.46	4.07	5.62	9.41	6.81	6.05	6.21	6.60	0.58	1.69	2.59
5.67	5.46	5.18	7.02	8.48	8.51	8.22	8.19	7.54	1.85	0.98	2.94
0.06	5.07	5.39	0.85	1.62	1.63	0.15	0.95	1.31	0.63	0.65	1.02
1.71	0.03	8.98	6.06	5.63	1.69	4.98	2.90	2.88	2.64	2.34	2.12
2.10	4.96	9.42	6.25	5.01	1.73	6.66	6.73	7.67	2.89	5.98	8.89
4.53	4.65	9.92	6.36	3.16	1.91	9.75	9.85	8.17	9.49	9.37	9.33
0.14	0.15	0.32	0.84	1.54	7.28	0.77	1.47	1.69	0.63	0.74	2.23
5.51	5.68	0.52	4.42	3.54	7.18	3.38	3.18	2.28	8.05	7.68	3.71
5.48	6.15	0.84	5.54	4.78	5.55	3.62	3.01	2.48	8.31	7.06	4.51
5.28	3.31	1.17	6.99	6.93	6.76	3.68	2.93	2.53	8.45	6.44	5.29
0.12	0.71	0.74	0.74	1.93	2.76	0.14	0.67	2.22	0.20	2.54	2.80
4.27	3.07	2.27	7.24	5.03	3.12	5.96	5.58	5.22	1.05	2.39	2.96
5.09	5.73	5.82	7.71	6.38	3.80	7.04	7.59	9.33	1.44	2.28	3.00
9.27	7.03	6.79	8.28	9.18	9.48	9.77	9.50	8.52	1.73	2.19	3.85

Please write how many pairs of numbers you had found that sum up to 10.

Cheap Talk Sender Receiver Game

In this task, you are asked to consider yourself in the following situation:
You are matched with another MTurk worker. Neither of you will ever know the identity of the other. Two possible monetary payments are available to you and your counterpart and are described as "Option A" or "Option B". The choice rests with the other MTurk worker who will have to choose either Option A or Option B and this will determine how much money you make and how much they will make. However, the only information your counterpart will have about the money that can be made is information sent by you in a message. That is, he or she will not know the monetary payments associated with each choice. You are the only one who knows about the monetary payments associated with each option. The potential bonus payments for this task depend upon the actual amounts specified in the two options: option A and option B and what is selected by the other MTurk worker. You need to decide which message to sent to your counterpart.

Which message would you send if the two payment options were:
Option A: $1 to you and $1.2 to the other player.
Option B: $1.2 to you and $1 to the other player.

i) Message 1 : "Option A will earn you more money than option B."
ii) Message 2: "Option B will earn you more money than option A."

Which message would you send if the two payment options were:
Option A: $1 to you and $3 to the other player.
Option B: $3 to you and $1 to the other player.

i) Message 1 : "Option A will earn you more money than option B."
ii) Message 2: "Option B will earn you more money than option A."

Modified Matrix Puzzle

In the next page, you will be a given an image that consists of 20 matrices. Your task is to find two numbers that add up to 10 in these matrices. The potential bonus you can make in this task will be decided by your ranking among all participants.If you are in the top 50% of the distribution, then you will receive $0.72 ($2.13). You will have 5 minutes to complete this task. Once you press the button to continue, your time will start. You will see a timer on top of your screen. Once your time is over, you will be directed to the next page where you need to report how many pairs of numbers you had found. Once you are ready please press the button to proceed to the matrix task. Please remember the number of pairs you had found at the end of the task.

Please write how many pairs of numbers you had found that sum up to 10.

Dictator Games

We would like you to indicate what percentage of your actual bonus from this experiment you would like to donate to "MacMillan Cancer Support". If you decide to donate any percentage of your bonus, the donation will be done by us anonymously to the charitable organisation.
The percentage that I want to keep it for myself :
The percentage that I want to donate to the charity:

What percentage of your actual bonus from this study you would like to give up for researchers to use to conduct more sessions of this experiment.
The percentage that I want to keep it for myself :
The percentage that I want to leave it for researchers :

Demand Effect Questions

If someone realizes they have done something dishonest, how likely is it that they will behave more or less honestly in the future? The slider below indicates the percentage chance of being more honest, moving from 0% (certainly more dishonest) on the left to 100% (certainly more honest) on the right. Please move the slider to the percentage chance that you think is correct.
What is the percentage chance that the experimenter expected you to behave honestly in the various tasks you had to undertake? The slider below indicates the percentage chance of being more honest, moving from 0% (certainly dishonest) on the left to 100% (certainly honest) on the right. Please move the slider to the percentage chance that you think is correct.