

## Frequencies

### Statistics

treatment

N	Valid	222
	Missing	0

		treatment			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	nature-equity	63	28.4	28.4	28.4
	nature-inequity	47	21.2	21.2	49.5
	intent-equity	44	19.8	19.8	69.4
	intent-inequity	68	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	222	100.0	100.0	

```

ONEWAY participant.payoff_plus_participation_fee scl.1.player.payoff
    experimentalEarnedMinusRiskEarnings BY treatment
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES HOMOGENEITY WELCH
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/CRITERIA=CILEVEL(0.95) .

```

## Oneway

### Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
experimental earnings with showup fee	nature-equity	63	5434.52	1310.068	165.053
	nature-inequity	47	4222.06	1242.113	181.181
	intent-equity	44	5302.84	1614.813	243.442
	intent-inequity	68	4476.94	1484.367	180.006

	Total	222	4858.42	1497.600	100.512
risk Earnings	nature-equity	63	2366.67	1347.638	169.786
	nature-inequity	47	2370.21	1112.950	162.341
	intent-equity	44	2225.00	1503.813	226.708
	intent-inequity	68	2651.47	1382.243	167.622
	Total	222	2426.58	1346.074	90.343
experimentalEarnings MinusRiskEarnings	nature-equity	63	3067.8571	388.84207	48.98950
	nature-inequity	47	1851.8511	277.47142	40.47337
	intent-equity	44	3077.8409	335.37622	50.55987
	intent-inequity	68	1825.4706	317.73426	38.53094
	Total	222	2431.8423	702.85658	47.17265

### Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
experimental earnings with showup fee	nature-equity	5104.59	5764.46	3100	8300
	nature-inequity	3857.37	4586.76	2175	6925
	intent-equity	4811.89	5793.79	2850	8800
	intent-inequity	4117.65	4836.23	1725	7500
	Total	4660.33	5056.50	1725	8800
risk Earnings	nature-equity	2027.27	2706.06	100	4800
	nature-inequity	2043.44	2696.99	800	4800
	intent-equity	1767.80	2682.20	100	5500
	intent-inequity	2316.90	2986.04	100	5500
	Total	2248.53	2604.62	100	5500
experimentalEarnings MinusRiskEarnings	nature-equity	2969.9285	3165.7858	2000.00	4000.00
	nature-inequity	1770.3824	1933.3197	1250.00	2175.00
	intent-equity	2975.8772	3179.8046	2500.00	4000.00
	intent-inequity	1748.5625	1902.3787	1250.00	2500.00
	Total	2338.8766	2524.8081	1250.00	4000.00

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
experimental earnings with showup fee	Based on Mean	1.282	3	218	.281
	Based on Median	.595	3	218	.619
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.595	3	165.725	.619

risk Earnings	Based on trimmed mean	1.145	3	218	.332
	Based on Mean	1.781	3	218	.152
	Based on Median	.720	3	218	.541
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.720	3	160.443	.541
	Based on trimmed mean	1.662	3	218	.176
experimentalEarnedMinusRiskEarnings	Based on Mean	1.800	3	218	.148
	Based on Median	1.600	3	218	.190
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.600	3	190.902	.191
	Based on trimmed mean	1.787	3	218	.151

### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
experimental earnings with showup fee	Between Groups	58528245.867	3	19509415.289	9.729
	Within Groups	437132042.174	218	2005192.854	
	Total	495660288.041	221		
risk Earnings	Between Groups	5602547.385	3	1867515.795	1.031
	Within Groups	394830650.814	218	1811149.774	
	Total	400433198.198	221		
experimentalEarnedMinusRiskEarnings	Between Groups	84659276.983	3	28219758.994	250.931
	Within Groups	24516352.499	218	112460.333	
	Total	109175629.482	221		

### ANOVA

		Sig.
experimental earnings with showup fee	Between Groups	.000
	Within Groups	
	Total	
risk Earnings	Between Groups	.380
	Within Groups	
	Total	
experimentalEarnedMinusRiskEarnings	Between Groups	.000
	Within Groups	
	Total	

### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
experimental earnings with showup fee	Welch	10.638	3	113.322	.000
risk Earnings	Welch	.934	3	114.244	.427
experimentalEarnedMinusRiskEarnings	Welch	249.169	3	114.999	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

```

ONEWAY scl.1.player.lottery_choice estimate01 compliance BY treatment
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES HOMOGENEITY WELCH
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/CRITERIA=CILEVEL(0.95) .

```

### Oneway

Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02
--------------	-------------

### Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound
riskChoice	nature-equity	63	3.46	1.119	.141	3.18
	nature-inequity	47	2.96	1.122	.164	2.63
	intent-equity	44	3.57	1.371	.207	3.15
	intent-inequity	68	3.28	1.325	.161	2.96
	Total	222	3.32	1.248	.084	3.15
beliefs	nature-equity	63	.617619	.3028239	.0381522	.541354
	nature-inequity	47	.653830	.2602720	.0379646	.577411
	intent-equity	44	.649318	.2605664	.0392819	.570099
	intent-inequity	68	.528676	.2817478	.0341669	.460479
	Total	222	.604324	.2825566	.0189640	.566951

compliance	nature-equity	63	.745508	.3755559	.0473156	.650925
	nature-inequity	47	.848950	.3223362	.0470176	.754309
	intent-equity	44	.714386	.3829318	.0577291	.597964
	intent-inequity	68	.441794	.4317403	.0523562	.337291
	Total	222	.668210	.4136241	.0277606	.613501

### Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
		Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum	
riskChoice	nature-equity	3.74	1	6	
	nature-inequity	3.29	1	5	
	intent-equity	3.98	1	6	
	intent-inequity	3.60	1	6	
	Total	3.48	1	6	
beliefs	nature-equity	.693884	.0000	1.0000	
	nature-inequity	.730249	.0000	1.0000	
	intent-equity	.728538	.0000	.9800	
	intent-inequity	.596874	.0000	1.0000	
	Total	.641698	.0000	1.0000	
compliance	nature-equity	.840090	.0000	1.0000	
	nature-inequity	.943592	.0000	1.0000	
	intent-equity	.830808	.0000	1.0000	
	intent-inequity	.546298	.0000	1.0000	
	Total	.722920	.0000	1.0000	

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
riskChoice	Based on Mean	1.036	3	218	.378
	Based on Median	.303	3	218	.823
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.303	3	207.410	.823
	Based on trimmed mean	.978	3	218	.404
beliefs	Based on Mean	.925	3	218	.429
	Based on Median	1.032	3	218	.379
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.032	3	215.038	.379

	Based on trimmed mean	.990	3	218	.398
compliance	Based on Mean	8.537	3	218	.000
	Based on Median	5.229	3	218	.002
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	5.229	3	186.549	.002
	Based on trimmed mean	9.394	3	218	.000

### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
riskChoice	Between Groups	10.240	3	3.413	2.228	.086
	Within Groups	334.052	218	1.532		
	Total	344.293	221			
beliefs	Between Groups	.605	3	.202	2.578	.055
	Within Groups	17.040	218	.078		
	Total	17.644	221			
compliance	Between Groups	5.492	3	1.831	12.348	.000
	Within Groups	32.318	218	.148		
	Total	37.810	221			

### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
riskChoice	Welch	2.428	3	113.317	.069
beliefs	Welch	2.641	3	115.563	.053
compliance	Welch	11.647	3	115.807	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

\* Generalized Linear Models.

```

GENLIN estimate01 BY intent lowWage (ORDER=DESCENDING)
  /MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage INTERCEPT=YES
  DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
  /CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
  CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
  /MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
  /PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.

```

Generalized Linear Models

Elapsed Time	00:00:00.09
--------------	-------------

Model Information

Dependent Variable	beliefs
Probability Distribution	Normal
Link Function	Identity

Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%
	lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
		3000	107	48.2%
		Total	222	100.0%

Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	beliefs	222	.0000	1.0000	.604324	.2825566

Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	17.040	218	.078
Scaled Deviance	222.000	218	
Pearson Chi-Square	17.040	218	.078
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	218	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-30.053		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	70.106		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	70.383		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	87.119		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	92.119		

Dependent Variable: beliefs

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.

b. The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

#### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
7.740	3	.052

Dependent Variable: beliefs

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \*

lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

#### Tests of Model Effects

		Type III	
Source	Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	1090.603	1	.000
intent	1.588	1	.208



lowWage	1.296	1	.255
intent * lowWage	4.472	1	.034

Dependent Variable: beliefs

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test
			Lower	Upper	Wald Chi-Square
(Intercept)	.618	.0378	.543	.692	266.287
[intent=1.00]	.032	.0542	-.075	.138	.342
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	.036	.0533	-.068	.141	.461
[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] *	-.157	.0742	-.302	-.011	4.472
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=1.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=.00]					
[intent=.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
(Scale)	.077 <sup>b</sup>	.0073	.064	.092	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	df	Hypothesis Test
		Sig.
(Intercept)	1	.000
[intent=1.00]	1	.559
[intent=.00]	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	1	.497
[lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1	.034
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
(Scale)		

Dependent Variable: beliefs

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

- Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.
- Maximum likelihood estimate.

```
* Generalized Linear Models.
GENLIN select_remuneration.1.player.satisfaction BY intent lowWage (ORDER=DESCENDING)
  /MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage INTERCEPT=YES
  DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
  /CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
  CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
  /MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
  /PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.
```

## Generalized Linear Models

### Model Information

Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?
Probability Distribution	Normal
Link Function	Identity

### Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

### Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%

lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
	3000	107	48.2%
	Total	222	100.0%

### Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	222	-2	2	.07

### Continuous Variable Information

		Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	1.115

### Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	178.227	218	.818
Scaled Deviance	222.000	218	
Pearson Chi-Square	178.227	218	.818
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	218	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-290.627		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	591.253		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	591.531		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	608.267		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	613.267		

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.

b. The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
96.161	3	.000

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

### Tests of Model Effects

Source	Wald Chi-Square	Type III	Sig.
		df	
(Intercept)	4.130	1	.042
intent	.011	1	.918
lowWage	113.300	1	.000
intent * lowWage	6.293	1	.012

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test Wald Chi-Square
			Lower	Upper	
(Intercept)	.619	.1218	.380	.858	25.842
[intent=1.00]	.290	.1706	-.044	.624	2.890
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	-.981	.1800	-1.334	-.628	29.672

[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] *	-1.077	.2411	-1.077	-.132	6.293
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=1.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=.00]					
[intent=.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
(Scale)	.803 <sup>b</sup>	.0762	.667	.967	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	Hypothesis Test	
	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	1	.000
[intent=1.00]	1	.089
[intent=.00]	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	1	.000
[lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1	.012
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
(Scale)		

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

- Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.
- Maximum likelihood estimate.

```
* Generalized Linear Models.
GENLIN select_remuneration.1.player.fairness BY intent lowWage (ORDER=DESCENDING)
  /MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage INTERCEPT=YES
  DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
  /CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
  ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
  CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
  /MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
  /PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.
```

### Generalized Linear Models

### Model Information

Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?
Probability Distribution	Normal
Link Function	Identity

### Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

### Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%
	lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
		3000	107	48.2%
		Total	222	100.0%

### Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	222	-2	2	.31

### Continuous Variable Information

		Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	1.124

### Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	179.207	218	.822
Scaled Deviance	222.000	218	
Pearson Chi-Square	179.207	218	.822
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	218	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-291.235		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	592.471		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	592.749		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	609.484		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	614.484		

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

- Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.
- The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
98.409	3	.000

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

- Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

### Tests of Model Effects

Source	Wald Chi-Square	Type III	
		df	Sig.
(Intercept)	34.611	1	.000
intent	1.420	1	.233
lowWage	111.065	1	.000
intent * lowWage	5.808	1	.016

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test
			Lower	Upper	Wald Chi-Square
(Intercept)	.921	.0934	.738	1.104	97.217
[intent=1.00]	.148	.1634	-.173	.468	.816
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	-.984	.1564	-1.291	-.678	39.597
[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] *	-.584	.2422	-1.058	-.109	5.808
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=1.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=.00]					
[intent=.00] *	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]					
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
(Scale)	.807 <sup>b</sup>	.0766	.670	.972	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	df	Hypothesis Test
		Sig.
(Intercept)	1	.000
[intent=1.00]	1	.366



[intent=.00]	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	1	.000
[lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1	.016
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
(Scale)		

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

- Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.
- Maximum likelihood estimate.

```

ONEWAY payment_info.1.player.q1 payment_info.1.player.q2 payment_info.1.player.q5
      payment_info.1.player.q4 BY treatment
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES HOMOGENEITY WELCH
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/CRITERIA=CILEVEL(0.95) .

```

## Oneway

### Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
How would an unbiased judge label your income-reporting behavior?	nature-equity	63	.29	1.211	.153
	nature-inequity	47	.26	1.276	.186
	intent-equity	44	.34	1.256	.189
	intent-inequity	68	.13	1.006	.122
	Total	222	.24	1.171	.079
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	nature-equity	63	-.73	.937	.118
	nature-inequity	47	-.66	1.027	.150
	intent-equity	44	-.64	.990	.149
	intent-inequity	68	-.40	.979	.119
	Total	222	-.59	.983	.066
How much did you anchor	nature-equity	63	2.40	.661	.083

your behavior on your estimation?	nature-inequity	47	2.26	.736	.107
	intent-equity	44	2.34	.713	.108
	intent-inequity	68	2.13	.710	.086
	Total	222	2.27	.706	.047
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	nature-equity	63	.84	.865	.109
	nature-inequity	47	-.06	1.009	.147
	intent-equity	44	1.09	.884	.133
	intent-inequity	68	-.50	1.126	.137
	Total	222	.29	1.180	.079

### Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
How would an unbiased judge label your income-reporting behavior?	nature-equity	-.02	.59	-2	2
	nature-inequity	-.12	.63	-2	2
	intent-equity	-.04	.72	-2	2
	intent-inequity	-.11	.38	-2	2
	Total	.09	.40	-2	2
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	nature-equity	-.97	-.49	-2	1
	nature-inequity	-.96	-.36	-2	2
	intent-equity	-.94	-.34	-2	2
	intent-inequity	-.63	-.16	-2	1
	Total	-.72	-.46	-2	2
How much did you anchor your behavior on your estimation?	nature-equity	2.23	2.56	1	3
	nature-inequity	2.04	2.47	1	3
	intent-equity	2.12	2.56	1	3
	intent-inequity	1.96	2.30	1	3
	Total	2.18	2.37	1	3
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	nature-equity	.62	1.06	-2	2
	nature-inequity	-.36	.23	-2	2
	intent-equity	.82	1.36	-2	2
	intent-inequity	-.77	-.23	-2	2
	Total	.13	.44	-2	2

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
How would an unbiased	Based on Mean	2.702	3	218	.046

judge label your income-reporting behavior?	Based on Median	1.982	3	218	.118
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.982	3	212.360	.118
	Based on trimmed mean	2.999	3	218	.032
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	Based on Mean	.268	3	218	.848
	Based on Median	.258	3	218	.856
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.258	3	217.046	.856
	Based on trimmed mean	.277	3	218	.842
How much did you anchor your behavior on your estimation?	Based on Mean	.509	3	218	.676
	Based on Median	.458	3	218	.712
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.458	3	217.941	.712
	Based on trimmed mean	.498	3	218	.684
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	Based on Mean	4.896	3	218	.003
	Based on Median	3.096	3	218	.028
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	3.096	3	207.503	.028
	Based on trimmed mean	4.320	3	218	.006

### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
How would an unbiased judge label your income-reporting behavior?	Between Groups	1.376	3	.459	.332
	Within Groups	301.489	218	1.383	
	Total	302.865	221		
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	Between Groups	4.086	3	1.362	1.418
	Within Groups	209.427	218	.961	
	Total	213.514	221		
How much did you anchor your behavior on your estimation?	Between Groups	2.528	3	.843	1.706
	Within Groups	107.711	218	.494	
	Total	110.239	221		
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	Between Groups	95.692	3	31.897	32.822
	Within Groups	211.858	218	.972	
	Total	307.550	221		

### ANOVA

		Sig.
How would an unbiased judge label your income-reporting behavior?	Between Groups	.802
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	Between Groups	.238
	Within Groups	
	Total	
How much did you anchor your behavior on your estimation?	Between Groups	.167
	Within Groups	
	Total	
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	Between Groups	.000
	Within Groups	
	Total	

### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
How would an unbiased judge label your income-reporting behavior?	Welch	.374	3	110.552	.772
Do you agree that it is ethical to report less than true income if you received less than your entitlement?	Welch	1.433	3	113.061	.237
How much did you anchor your behavior on your estimation?	Welch	1.739	3	112.997	.163
How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	Welch	31.771	3	114.586	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

\* Generalized Linear Models.

```

GENLIN payment_info.1.player.q4 BY intent lowWage (ORDER=DESCENDING)
  /MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage INTERCEPT=YES
  DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
  /CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
  CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
  /MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
  /PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.

```

Generalized Linear Models

Elapsed Time	00:00:00.10
--------------	-------------

Model Information

Dependent Variable	How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?
Probability Distribution	Normal
Link Function	Identity

Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%
	lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
		3000	107	48.2%
		Total	222	100.0%

Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Dependent Variable	How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	222	-2	2	.29

## Continuous Variable Information

		Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?	1.180

### Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	211.858	218	.972
Scaled Deviance	222.000	218	
Pearson Chi-Square	211.858	218	.972
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	218	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-309.814		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	629.627		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	629.905		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	646.641		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	651.641		

Dependent Variable: How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.

b. The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
82.744	3	.000

Dependent Variable: How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage<sup>a</sup>

a. Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

### Tests of Model Effects

Source	Wald Chi-Square	Type III	Sig.
		df	
(Intercept)	27.278	1	.000
intent	.507	1	.476
lowWage	90.764	1	.000
intent * lowWage	6.852	1	.009

Dependent Variable: How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test
			Lower	Upper	Wald Chi-Square
(Intercept)	.841	.1081	.629	1.053	60.522
[intent=1.00]	.250	.1705	-.085	.584	2.144
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	-.905	.1813	-1.261	-.550	24.912
[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	-.686	.2620	-1.199	-.172	6.852
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
(Scale)	.954 <sup>b</sup>	.0906	.792	1.149	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter

Hypothesis Test

	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	1	.000
[intent=1.00]	1	.143
[intent=.00]	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	1	.000
[lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1	.009
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
(Scale)		

Dependent Variable: How fair was your earnings on the image-labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage

a. Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.

b. Maximum likelihood estimate.

```
* Generalized Linear Models.
GENLIN select_remuneration.1.player.satisfaction BY intent lowWage male
(ORDER=DESCENDING) WITH age
    incomeLevelCoded
    /MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage male age incomeLevelCoded INTERCEPT=YES
    DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
    /CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
    CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
    /MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
    /PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.
```

## Generalized Linear Models

### Notes

#### Model Information

Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?
Probability Distribution	Normal



Link Function	Identity
---------------	----------

### Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

### Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%
	lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
		3000	107	48.2%
		Total	222	100.0%
	male	male	125	56.3%
		female	97	43.7%
		Total	222	100.0%

### Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	222	-2	2	.07
Covariate	age	222	19.00	120.00	22.1171
	incomeLevelCoded	222	1.00	4.00	2.7748

### Continuous Variable Information

		Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	1.115
Covariate	age	9.57016
	incomeLevelCoded	.71423

### Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	168.835	215	.785
Scaled Deviance	222.000	215	
Pearson Chi-Square	168.835	215	.785
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	215	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-284.618		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	585.235		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	585.911		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	612.457		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	620.457		

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded<sup>a</sup>

- Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.
- The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
108.179	6	.000

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded<sup>a</sup>

- Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

### Tests of Model Effects

Source	Wald Chi-Square	Type III df	Sig.
(Intercept)	.272	1	.602
intent	.131	1	.718
lowWage	113.030	1	.000
intent * lowWage	5.224	1	.022
male	4.000	1	.046
age	5.433	1	.020
incomeLevelCoded	4.087	1	.043

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test Wald Chi-Square
(Intercept)	.486	.3298	Lower -.161	Upper 1.132	2.169
[intent=1.00]	.230	.1654	Lower -.094	Upper .554	1.928
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	-1.003	.1789	Lower -1.353	Upper -.652	31.422
[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	-.544	.2381	Lower -1.011	Upper -.078	5.224
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[male=1.00]	-.233	.1167	Lower -.462	Upper -.005	4.000
[male=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.

age	-.010	.0045	-.019	-.002	5.433
incomeLevelCoded	.187	.0924	.006	.368	4.087
(Scale)	.761 <sup>b</sup>	.0722	.631	.916	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	df	Hypothesis Test	
			Sig.
(Intercept)	1		.141
[intent=1.00]	1		.165
[intent=.00]	.		.
[lowWage=1.00]	1		.000
[lowWage=.00]	.		.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1		.022
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.		.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.		.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.		.
[male=1.00]	1		.046
[male=.00]	.		.
age	1		.020
incomeLevelCoded	1		.043
(Scale)			

Dependent Variable: How satisfied are you with your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded

a. Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.

b. Maximum likelihood estimate.

\* Generalized Linear Models.

```
GENLIN select_remuneration.1.player.fairness BY intent lowWage male (ORDER=DESCENDING)
```

```
WITH age
```

```
incomeLevelCoded
```

```
/MODEL intent lowWage intent*lowWage male age incomeLevelCoded INTERCEPT=YES
```

```
DISTRIBUTION=NORMAL LINK=IDENTITY
```

```
/CRITERIA SCALE=MLE COVB=ROBUST PCONVERGE=1E-006 (ABSOLUTE) SINGULAR=1E-012
```

```
ANALYSISTYPE=3 (WALD)
```

```
CILEVEL=95 CITYPE=WALD LIKELIHOOD=FULL
```

```
/MISSING CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE
```

```
/PRINT CPS DESCRIPTIVES MODELINFO FIT SUMMARY SOLUTION.
```

### Generalized Linear Models

### Model Information

Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?
Probability Distribution	Normal
Link Function	Identity

### Case Processing Summary

	N	Percent
Included	222	100.0%
Excluded	0	0.0%
Total	222	100.0%

### Categorical Variable Information

			N	Percent
Factor	intent	intent	112	50.5%
		nature	110	49.5%
		Total	222	100.0%
	lowWage	1500	115	51.8%
		3000	107	48.2%
		Total	222	100.0%
	male	male	125	56.3%
		female	97	43.7%
		Total	222	100.0%

### Continuous Variable Information

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	222	-2	2	.31
Covariate	age	222	19.00	120.00	22.1171

incomeLevelCoded	222	1.00	4.00	2.7748
------------------	-----	------	------	--------

### Continuous Variable Information

		Std. Deviation
Dependent Variable	How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?	1.124
Covariate	age	9.57016
	incomeLevelCoded	.71423

### Goodness of Fit<sup>a</sup>

	Value	df	Value/df
Deviance	173.922	215	.809
Scaled Deviance	222.000	215	
Pearson Chi-Square	173.922	215	.809
Scaled Pearson Chi-Square	222.000	215	
Log Likelihood <sup>b</sup>	-287.912		
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	591.824		
Finite Sample Corrected AIC (AICC)	592.500		
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)	619.046		
Consistent AIC (CAIC)	627.046		

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded<sup>a</sup>

a. Information criteria are in smaller-is-better form.

b. The full log likelihood function is displayed and used in computing information criteria.

### Omnibus Test<sup>a</sup>

Likelihood Ratio		
Chi-Square	df	Sig.
105.055	6	.000

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded<sup>a</sup>

a. Compares the fitted model against the intercept-only model.

### Tests of Model Effects

Source	Wald Chi-Square	Type III	
		df	Sig.
(Intercept)	.688	1	.407
intent	2.005	1	.157
lowWage	110.579	1	.000
intent * lowWage	4.739	1	.029
male	1.941	1	.164
age	28.633	1	.000
incomeLevelCoded	1.318	1	.251

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test Wald Chi-Square
			Lower	Upper	
(Intercept)	.928	.3297	.282	1.574	7.919
[intent=1.00]	.095	.1615	-.222	.411	.343
[intent=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	-1.012	.1591	-1.324	-.700	40.446
[lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=1.00] *	-.527	.2423	-1.002	-.053	4.739
[lowWage=1.00]					

[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
[male=1.00]	-.167	.1197	-.401	.068	1.941
[male=.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.
age	-.010	.0018	-.013	-.006	28.633
incomeLevelCoded	.118	.1025	-.083	.319	1.318
(Scale)	.783 <sup>b</sup>	.0744	.650	.944	

### Parameter Estimates

Parameter	Hypothesis Test	
	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	1	.005
[intent=1.00]	1	.558
[intent=.00]	.	.
[lowWage=1.00]	1	.000
[lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	1	.029
[intent=1.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=1.00]	.	.
[intent=.00] * [lowWage=.00]	.	.
[male=1.00]	1	.164
[male=.00]	.	.
age	1	.000
incomeLevelCoded	1	.251
(Scale)		

Dependent Variable: How equitable do you find your forthcoming earnings on the image labeling task?

Model: (Intercept), intent, lowWage, intent \* lowWage, male, age, incomeLevelCoded

a. Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.

b. Maximum likelihood estimate.

```

ONEWAY scl.1.player.lottery_choice compliance estimate01 BY treatment
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES HOMOGENEITY WELCH
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/CRITERIA=CILEVEL(0.95) .

```



## Oneway

### Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound
riskChoice	nature-equity	13	3.92	1.382	.383	3.09
	nature-inequity	10	3.70	.949	.300	3.02
	intent-equity	9	2.89	1.054	.351	2.08
	intent-inequity	14	3.07	1.385	.370	2.27
	Total	46	3.41	1.275	.188	3.03
compliance	nature-equity	13	.413077	.4718570	.1308696	.127937
	nature-inequity	10	.895238	.2682493	.0848279	.703344
	intent-equity	9	.844444	.3023060	.1007687	.612072
	intent-inequity	14	.727891	.4182429	.1117801	.486405
	Total	46	.698106	.4209639	.0620677	.573095
beliefs	nature-equity	13	.526154	.3221423	.0893462	.331485
	nature-inequity	10	.606000	.2935681	.0928344	.395994
	intent-equity	9	.648889	.1608139	.0536046	.525276
	intent-inequity	14	.629286	.2231751	.0596461	.500428
	Total	46	.598913	.2573388	.0379425	.522493

### Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
		Upper Bound			
riskChoice	nature-equity	4.76	1		6
	nature-inequity	4.38	2		5
	intent-equity	3.70	1		4
	intent-inequity	3.87	1		6
	Total	3.79	1		6
compliance	nature-equity	.698217	.0000		1.0000
	nature-inequity	1.087132	.1429		1.0000
	intent-equity	1.076817	.1667		1.0000

	intent-inequity	.969377	.0000	1.0000
	Total	.823116	.0000	1.0000
beliefs	nature-equity	.720822	.0000	.9100
	nature-inequity	.816006	.0500	.9000
	intent-equity	.772501	.4000	.9000
	intent-inequity	.758143	.3000	1.0000
	Total	.675333	.0000	1.0000

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
riskChoice	Based on Mean	.550	3	42	.651
	Based on Median	.562	3	42	.643
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.562	3	39.451	.643
	Based on trimmed mean	.498	3	42	.686
compliance	Based on Mean	5.047	3	42	.004
	Based on Median	1.468	3	42	.237
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.468	3	37.064	.239
	Based on trimmed mean	5.015	3	42	.005
beliefs	Based on Mean	2.622	3	42	.063
	Based on Median	1.452	3	42	.241
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.452	3	27.677	.249
	Based on trimmed mean	2.473	3	42	.075

### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
riskChoice	Between Groups	8.312	3	2.771	1.795	.163
	Within Groups	64.841	42	1.544		
	Total	73.152	45			
compliance	Between Groups	1.650	3	.550	3.652	.020
	Within Groups	6.325	42	.151		
	Total	7.974	45			
beliefs	Between Groups	.105	3	.035	.510	.678

Within Groups		2.875	42	.068		
Total		2.980	45			

### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
riskChoice	Welch	1.814	3	22.661	.173
compliance	Welch	3.245	3	22.797	.041
beliefs	Welch	.453	3	22.240	.718

a. Asymptotically F distributed.