

Contents

1 Moral Judgement Scores and various Demographics	2
1.1 Postclass 1: Kohlberg class five score	2
1.1.1 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, personality (Chlaß 2010)	2
1.1.2 Demographics: age, gender (Chlaß and Moffatt 2012)	3
1.1.3 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, fields of study (Chlaß and Riener 2015).	4
1.1.4 Demographics: age, gender, religion, socio-economic status, religiosity, country, ethnicity, fields of study (Chlaß Jones, and Gangadharan 2015)	5
1.2 con · post: Interaction of Kohlberg’s conventional, and postconventional level of argumentation	8
1.2.1 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, personality (Chlaß 2010)	8
1.2.2 Demographics: age, gender (Chlaß and Moffatt 2012)	9
1.2.3 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, fields of study (Chlaß and Riener 2015).	10
1.2.4 Demographics: age, gender, religion, socio-economic status, religiosity, country, ethnicity, fields of study (Chlaß Jones, and Gangadharan 2015)	11

1 Moral Judgement Scores and various Demographics

1.1 Postclass 1: Kohlberg class five score

1.1.1 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, personality (Chlaß 2010)

Dependent variable: 'postclass 1' – **Kohlberg class five scores** from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N. (2010), The Impact of Procedural Asymmetry in Games of Imperfect Information, www.econstor.eu, <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/37253>

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 285 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: null results for Age, Gender, Risk Aversion, and Personality at the 5% level.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.7239	0.7084	-1.02	0.3078
age	0.0178	0.0237	0.75	0.4538
gender:female	0.2032	0.1330	1.53	0.1276
risk aversion ¹	-0.0386	0.0391	-0.98	0.3255
Extraversion ²	0.0052	0.0129	0.40	0.6894
Neuroticism	0.0135	0.0113	1.19	0.2370
Psychoticism	0.0287	0.0170	1.69	0.0931
Lie Scale ³	-0.0006	0.0175	-0.03	0.9740

*results robust to the inclusion of 126 Dummies
for subjects' field of study*

Table 1: CORRELATION OF POSTCLASS 1 SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS (2010).

¹Ordinal variable. Elicited in a 10-item Holt-Laury lottery list in which subjects choose between a binary lottery (with a high and a low outcome), and a sure payoff. The Holt-Laury list varies the probability of both outcomes of the lottery across the 10 items, the sure payoff remaining the same. The variable measures when subjects switch from a sure payoff to the lottery across the 10 items presented. The exact procedure is documented in Chlaß and Riener (2015).

²Subjects' load on personality trait 'Extraversion' score from the 101 item Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck 1990) standardized on the German population by Ruch (1999). The 'Big Five' are a higher factor resolution of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire.

³Contrary to other Personality Inventories such as the 'Big Five', the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire contains a scale which measures by how much individuals tend to give socially acceptable answers, rather than answering the test items truthfully.

1.1.2 Demographics: age, gender (Chlaß and Moffatt 2012)

Dependent variable: 'postclass 1' – Kohlberg class five scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Moffatt, G. (2012), Giving in Dictator Games – Experimenter Demand Effect or Preferences over the Rules of the Game?, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012 - 044.

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 430 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: positive correlation (5% level) of 'postclass 1' with gender:female.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.3178	0.4233	-0.75	0.4533
age	0.0065	0.0175	0.37	0.7092
gender:female	0.2483	0.1029	2.41	0.0163

*results robust to the inclusion of 211 Dummies
for subjects' field of study*

Table 2: CORRELATION OF 'postclass 1' SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLAß AND MOFFATT (2016).

1.1.3 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, fields of study (Chlaß and Riener 2015).

Dependent variable: 'postclass 1' – Kohlberg class five scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Riener, G. (2015), Lying, Spying, Sabotaging, University of Mannheim Working Paper ECON #15-17.

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 630 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: positive correlation (5% level) of *postclass 1* with gender, negative correlation (5% level) with field of study: Law.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.2701	0.4366	-0.62	0.5364
risk aversion ⁴	0.0149	0.0270	0.55	0.5815
age	-0.0081	0.0142	-0.57	0.5691
gender:female	0.1924	0.0834	2.31	0.0214
as.factor(Faculty)University of Applied Sciences	-0.1648	0.2013	-0.82	0.4131
as.factor(Faculty)Mathematics and Computer Science	0.0822	0.2555	0.32	0.7476
as.factor(Faculty)Social and Behavioral Sciences	0.2959	0.1845	1.60	0.1093
as.factor(Faculty)Philosophy	0.1650	0.1920	0.86	0.3905
as.factor(Faculty)Law	-0.4668	0.2374	-1.97	0.0497
as.factor(Faculty)Economics	-0.0358	0.2040	-0.18	0.8607
as.factor(Faculty)Biological Sciences	-0.1419	0.2258	-0.63	0.5301
as.factor(Faculty)Medical Science	0.0861	0.2743	0.31	0.7536
as.factor(Faculty)Physics and Astronomy	0.3001	0.3415	0.88	0.3798
as.factor(Faculty)Not a student	0.1683	0.3934	0.43	0.6691
as.factor(Faculty)Theology	0.7281	0.9970	0.73	0.4655

Table 3: CORRELATION OF POSTCLASS 1 SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS AND RIENER (2015).

⁴Ordinal variable. Elicited in a 10-item Holt-Laury lottery list in which subjects choose between a binary lottery (with a high and a low outcome), and a sure payoff. The Holt-Laury list varies the probability of the outcomes of the lottery across the 10 items, the sure payoff remaining the same. The variable measures when subjects switch from a sure payoff to the lottery across the 10 items presented. The exact procedure is documented in Chlaß and Riener (2015).

1.1.4 Demographics: age, gender, religion, socio-economic status, religiosity, country, ethnicity, fields of study (Chlaß Jones, and Gangadharan 2015)

Dependent variable: 'postclass 1 – Kohlberg class five scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Gangadharan, L., Jones, K. (2015), Charitable Giving and Intermediation, Monash Working Paper # 18/2015.

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 150 students, MONLEE laboratory subject pool, Monash University, Australia.

Results: null results for all demographics, including religion, religiosity, field of study, ethnicity, and country of origin.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.1159	1.3069	-0.09	0.9295
age	0.0013	0.0327	0.04	0.9680
gender	0.1261	0.2332	0.54	0.5901
howreligious1 ⁵	0.2138	0.3539	0.60	0.5472
howreligious2	-0.2235	0.3866	-0.58	0.5646
howreligious3	0.1498	0.6435	0.23	0.8164
howreligious4	0.0831	0.5066	0.16	0.8700
howreligious5	-0.4848	0.4254	-1.14	0.2576
howreligious6	0.1359	0.5162	0.26	0.7930
howreligious7	-0.6739	0.5298	-1.27	0.2067
howreligious8	-0.9005	0.5960	-1.51	0.1343
howreligious9	-0.3424	0.6733	-0.51	0.6124
howreligious10	-0.7622	0.7544	-1.01	0.3151
socioeconomic status ⁶	0.0086	0.0562	0.15	0.8791
as.factor(faculty)Arts	0.8674	0.9135	0.95	0.3449
as.factor(faculty)Business and Economics	0.5011	0.8479	0.59	0.5560
as.factor(faculty)Education	-0.3286	1.0419	-0.32	0.7532
as.factor(faculty)Engineering	0.5370	0.8824	0.61	0.5443
as.factor(faculty)Information Technology	0.2980	1.3214	0.23	0.8221
as.factor(faculty)Law	0.2379	0.9259	0.26	0.7978
as.factor(faculty)Medicine, Nursing and Health Services	0.7097	0.9415	0.75	0.4530
as.factor(faculty)Not in any faculty	0.2355	1.0741	0.22	0.8269

as.factor(faculty)Science	0.3560	0.9264	0.38	0.7017
as.factor(religion)Buddhist	-0.3979	0.8995	-0.44	0.6593
as.factor(religion)Catholic	-0.6050	0.9410	-0.64	0.5219
as.factor(religion)Hindu	-0.8188	1.2122	-0.68	0.5011
as.factor(religion)Jewish	-1.4063	1.4289	-0.98	0.3277
as.factor(religion)Muslim	-0.0285	1.1010	-0.03	0.9794
as.factor(religion)Not religious	-0.4881	0.8926	-0.55	0.5859
as.factor(religion)Other	-0.6846	1.1668	-0.59	0.5589
as.factor(religion)Other Christian	0.4118	0.9467	0.43	0.6647
as.factor(religion)Protestant	0.2633	0.9587	0.27	0.7842
as.factor(country)Bangladesh	2.4271	1.0457	2.32	0.0226
as.factor(country)India	0.1999	0.8870	0.23	0.8222
as.factor(country)Brazil	1.0107	1.4803	0.68	0.4965
as.factor(country)Brunei	0.5164	0.9294	0.56	0.5798
as.factor(country)China	0.0078	0.4784	0.02	0.9870
as.factor(country)United Kingdom	-0.6151	0.8386	-0.73	0.4652
as.factor(country)Germany	0.1448	1.4103	0.10	0.9184
as.factor(country)Hong Kong	-0.1099	0.4803	-0.23	0.8195
as.factor(country)Indonesia	-0.0668	0.7076	-0.09	0.9250
as.factor(country)Iran	0.0298	1.4495	0.02	0.9837
as.factor(country)Korea	-0.4470	1.4490	-0.31	0.7584
as.factor(country)Macau	1.5508	1.1596	1.34	0.1845
as.factor(country)Malaysia	0.4064	0.5128	0.79	0.4302
as.factor(country)Mauritius	1.3433	1.4543	0.92	0.3582
as.factor(country)Nepal	1.1791	1.4699	0.80	0.4246
as.factor(country)New Zealand	1.1713	0.6655	1.76	0.0819
as.factor(country)Pakistan	-0.7967	1.4637	-0.54	0.5876
as.factor(country)Singapore	0.1628	0.4183	0.39	0.6980
as.factor(country)Sri Lanka	1.2136	1.4894	0.81	0.4174
as.factor(country)Taiwan	1.2348	1.4238	0.87	0.3881

as.factor(country)United States	-0.0117	1.1184	-0.01	0.9917
as.factor(country)Vietnam	0.0197	0.5737	0.03	0.9727
as.factor(ethnicity)Chinese	-0.4025	0.4417	-0.91	0.3646
as.factor(ethnicity)Indian	0.1824	1.1307	0.16	0.8722
as.factor(ethnicity)Other	-0.7688	0.6695	-1.15	0.2539
as.factor(ethnicity)Other Asian	0.2645	0.4459	0.59	0.5546
as.factor(ethnicity)Pacific Islander	-0.1423	1.0905	-0.13	0.8965

Table 4: CORRELATION OF POSTCLASS 1 WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS ET AL. (2015), SAMPLE: 150 SUBJECTS AT MONASH UNIVERSITY, AUSTRALIA

⁵In an on-screen exit survey administered after the experiment, subjects ticked how religious they would say they were on a scale from 0 (not religious at all) to 10 (very religious).

⁶In an on-screen exit survey administered after the experiment, subjects also ticked their economic situation (self-reported socio-economic status SES) on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 being extremely poor, and 10 being extremely wealthy.

1.2 con · post: Interaction of Kohlberg’s conventional, and postconventional level of argumentation

1.2.1 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, personality (Chlaß 2010)

Dependent variable: ‘con · post’ – Kohlberg conventional level times Kohlberg postconventional level scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N. (2010), The Impact of Procedural Asymmetry in Games of Imperfect Information.

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 285 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: null results for age, gender, and personality.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-1.2620	0.7096	-1.78	0.0764
age	0.0288	0.0238	1.21	0.2275
gender:female	0.1409	0.1332	1.06	0.2910
risk aversion ⁷	-0.0148	0.0392	-0.38	0.7062
Extraversion	0.0200	0.0129	1.55	0.1220
Neuroticism	0.0150	0.0114	1.32	0.1889
Psychoticism	0.0190	0.0171	1.11	0.2674
Lie Scale	-0.0022	0.0176	-0.13	0.8994

*results robust to the inclusion of 126 Dummies
for subjects’ field of study*

Table 5: CORRELATION OF *con · post* SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS (2010).

⁷Ordinal variable. Elicited in a 10-item Holt-Laury lottery list in which subjects choose between a binary lottery (with a high and a low outcome), and a sure payoff. The Holt-Laury list varies the probability of the outcomes of the lottery across the 10 items, the sure payoff remaining the same. The variable measures when subjects switch from a sure payoff to the lottery across the 10 items presented. The exact procedure is documented in Chlaß and Riener (2015).

1.2.2 Demographics: age, gender (Chlaß and Moffatt 2012)

Dependent variable: 'con·post' – Kohlberg conventional level times Kohlberg postconventional level scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Moffatt, G. 2012, Giving in Dictator Games – Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game?

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 430 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: null results for age and gender.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.2488	0.4252	-0.59	0.5588
age	0.0065	0.0176	0.37	0.7126
gender:female	0.1469	0.1034	1.42	0.1560
<i>results robust to the inclusion of 211 Dummies for subjects' field of study</i>				

Table 6: CORRELATION OF 'con·post' SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS AND MOFFATT (2016).

1.2.3 Demographics: age, gender, risk aversion, fields of study (Chlaß and Riener 2015).

Dependent variable: '*con. post*' – Kohlberg conventional level times Kohlberg postconventional level scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Riener, G. 2015, Lying, Spying, Sabotaging, University of Mannheim Working Paper ECON #15-17

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 630 students, Wiwi laboratory/Max Planck Institute of Economics subject pool, University of Jena.

Results: positive correlation (1% level) of '*con. post*' with gender, and negative correlation (5% level) with field of study: Law.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.7049	0.4363	-1.62	0.1067
risk aversion ⁸	0.0183	0.0270	0.68	0.4970
age	0.0098	0.0141	0.69	0.4899
gender:female	0.2548	0.0834	3.06	0.0023
as.factor(Faculty)University of Applied Sciences	-0.0340	0.2011	-0.17	0.8660
as.factor(Faculty)Mathematics and Computer Science	-0.2846	0.2553	-1.11	0.2653
as.factor(Faculty)Social and Behavioral Sciences	0.1985	0.1844	1.08	0.2820
as.factor(Faculty)Philosophy	0.0288	0.1918	0.15	0.8809
as.factor(Faculty)Law	-0.5690	0.2372	-2.40	0.0168
as.factor(Faculty)Economics	-0.0737	0.2038	-0.36	0.7179
as.factor(Faculty)Biological Sciences	-0.2400	0.2257	-1.06	0.2879
as.factor(Faculty)Medical Science	-0.0010	0.2741	-0.00	0.9971
as.factor(Faculty)Physics and Astronomy	-0.2528	0.3413	-0.74	0.4591
as.factor(Faculty)Not a student	-0.3360	0.3932	-0.85	0.3931
as.factor(Faculty)Theology	0.7439	0.9963	0.75	0.4555

Table 7: CORRELATION OF *con.post* SCORES WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS AND RIENER (2015).

⁸Ordinal variable. Elicited in a 10-item Holt-Laury lottery list in which subjects choose between a binary lottery (with a high and a low outcome), and a sure payoff. The Holt-Laury list varies the probability of the outcomes of the lottery across the 10 items, the sure payoff remaining the same. The variable measures when subjects switch from a sure payoff to the lottery across the 10 items presented. The exact procedure is documented in Chlaß and Riener (2015).

1.2.4 Demographics: age, gender, religion, socio-economic status, religiosity, country, ethnicity, fields of study (Chlaß Jones, and Gangadharan 2015)

Dependent variable: '*con.post*' – Kohlberg conventional level times Kohlberg postconventional level scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Purely Procedural Preferences – Beyond Procedural Equity and Reciprocity, Chlaß N., Güth, W., and Miettinen, T. (2016), SITE Working Paper Nr. 2009-03.

Data: Chlaß N., Gangadharan, L., Jones, K. (2015), Charitable Giving and Intermediation, Monash Working Paper # 18/2015.

Model: linear regression.

Sample: 150 students, MONLEE laboratory subject pool, Monash University, Australia.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.5669	1.1834	-0.48	0.6331
age	0.0092	0.0296	0.31	0.7582
gender	0.1398	0.2111	0.66	0.5096
howreligious1 ⁹	0.1872	0.3205	0.58	0.5607
howreligious2	-0.2066	0.3501	-0.59	0.5566
howreligious3	0.0638	0.5827	0.11	0.9130
howreligious4	0.3125	0.4587	0.68	0.4975
howreligious5	-0.5481	0.3852	-1.42	0.1583
howreligious6	0.6309	0.4674	1.35	0.1805
howreligious7	-0.4889	0.4798	-1.02	0.3109
howreligious8	-0.3986	0.5397	-0.74	0.4621
howreligious9	-0.3370	0.6097	-0.55	0.5819
howreligious10	-0.9910	0.6831	-1.45	0.1504
socioeconomic status ¹⁰	0.0399	0.0509	0.79	0.4345
as.factor(faculty)Arts	0.5570	0.8272	0.67	0.5025
as.factor(faculty)Business and Economics	0.4539	0.7678	0.59	0.5559
as.factor(faculty)Education	-0.4313	0.9435	-0.46	0.6487
as.factor(faculty)Engineering	0.4334	0.7990	0.54	0.5889
as.factor(faculty)Information Technology	0.4370	1.1965	0.37	0.7158
as.factor(faculty)Law	0.2637	0.8384	0.31	0.7538

as.factor(faculty)Medicine, Nursing and Health Services	0.1386	0.8525	0.16	0.8712
as.factor(faculty)Not in any faculty	0.1772	0.9726	0.18	0.8558
as.factor(faculty)Science	0.2381	0.8389	0.28	0.7772
as.factor(religion)Buddhist	-0.2058	0.8145	-0.25	0.8011
as.factor(religion)Catholic	-0.1900	0.8521	-0.22	0.8240
as.factor(religion)Hindu	-0.3986	1.0977	-0.36	0.7174
as.factor(religion)Jewish	-0.9045	1.2939	-0.70	0.4863
as.factor(religion)Muslim	-0.2201	0.9970	-0.22	0.8258
as.factor(religion)Not religious	-0.2143	0.8082	-0.27	0.7915
as.factor(religion)Other	-0.4219	1.0566	-0.40	0.6906
as.factor(religion)Other Christian	0.8248	0.8573	0.96	0.3386
as.factor(religion)Protestant	0.2303	0.8682	0.27	0.7914
as.factor(country)Bangladesh	4.4240	0.9469	4.67	0.0000
as.factor(country)India	0.0029	0.8032	0.00	0.9971
as.factor(country)Brazil	0.0424	1.3404	0.03	0.9749
as.factor(country)Brunei	0.5465	0.8416	0.65	0.5178
as.factor(country)China	0.1225	0.4332	0.28	0.7780
as.factor(country)United Kingdom	-0.8151	0.7594	-1.07	0.2860
as.factor(country)Germany	0.2056	1.2770	0.16	0.8725
as.factor(country)Hong Kong	0.3173	0.4349	0.73	0.4675
as.factor(country)Indonesia	0.3936	0.6407	0.61	0.5406
as.factor(country)Iran	-0.7590	1.3125	-0.58	0.5645
as.factor(country)Korea	-0.5271	1.3121	-0.40	0.6889
as.factor(country)Macau	1.2393	1.0501	1.18	0.2411
as.factor(country)Malaysia	0.3613	0.4644	0.78	0.4386
as.factor(country)Mauritius	0.8925	1.3169	0.68	0.4997
as.factor(country)Nepal	1.5977	1.3310	1.20	0.2332
as.factor(country)New Zealand	0.7519	0.6027	1.25	0.2154
as.factor(country)Pakistan	-1.0147	1.3254	-0.77	0.4460
as.factor(country)Singapore	0.1710	0.3788	0.45	0.6528

as.factor(country)Sri Lanka	0.5572	1.3487	0.41	0.6805
as.factor(country)Taiwan	0.2449	1.2893	0.19	0.8498
as.factor(country)United States	-0.4653	1.0127	-0.46	0.6470
as.factor(country)Vietnam	0.3226	0.5195	0.62	0.5363
as.factor(ethnicity)Chinese	-0.6133	0.3999	-1.53	0.1287
as.factor(ethnicity)Indian	-0.0986	1.0239	-0.10	0.9235
as.factor(ethnicity)Other	-0.2277	0.6063	-0.38	0.7082
as.factor(ethnicity)Other Asian	0.0227	0.4038	0.06	0.9553
as.factor(ethnicity)Pacific Islander	-0.3317	0.9875	-0.34	0.7377

Table 8: CORRELATION OF *con · post* WITH VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS, DATA BY CHLASS ET AL. (2015), SAMPLE: 150 SUBJECTS AT MONASH UNIVERSITY, AUSTRALIA

⁹In an on-screen exit survey administered after the experiment, subjects ticked how religious they would say they were on a scale from 0 (not religious at all) to 10 (very religious).

¹⁰In an on-screen exit survey administered after the experiment, subjects also ticked their economic situation (self-reported socio-economic status SES) on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 being extremely poor, and 10 being extremely wealthy.

References

Ruch, W. (1999), The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised and the Construction of German Standard and Short Versions(EPQ-R and EPQ-RK), *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, 20(1), 1-24.

Eysenck, H.J. (1990), Biological Dimensions of Personality, Pervin, A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, pp. 244-276, New York: Guilford.