Contents

1 Moral Judgement Scores and various Demographics

1.1 Kohlberg class six scores

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class six scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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, robust standard errors.

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	-0.3927	0.7340	-0.5435	0.5926
age	0.0052	0.0271	0.1903	0.8490
gender: female	0.1457	0.1350	1.0788	0.2806
risk aversion[1]	-0.0400	0.0392	-1.0181	0.3086
Extraversion[2]	0.0051	0.0128	0.3942	0.6934
Neuroticism	0.0094	0.0114	0.8266	0.4084
Psychoticism	0.0356	0.0186	1.9047	0.0568
Lie Scale[3]	-0.0011	0.0199	-0.0573	0.9543
results robust to the inclusion of 126 Dummies for subjects' field of study				

Table 1: Correlation of Kohlberg class six scores with various demographics, data by Chlass (2010).

[1] Ordinal 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).

[2] Subjects' 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.

[3] Contrary 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, 2017)

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class six scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

Data: Chlaß N., Moffatt, G. (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games – Experimenter Demand Effect or Preferences over the Rules of the Game?

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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

Results: null results for age and gender at the 5% level.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)	0.0817	0.4257	0.19	0.8478
age	-0.0063	0.0176	-0.36	0.7201
gender:female	0.0969	0.1035	0.94	0.3498
results robust to the inclusion of 211 Dummies for subjects' field of study				

Table 2: Correlation of *Kohlberg class six* scores with various demographics, data by Chlass and Moffatt (2012, 2017).

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class six scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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

Results: positive correlation (5% level) of *Kohlberg class six* with gender and field of study: Not a student, negative correlation (5% level) with field of study: Law.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	0.3366	0.4741	0.7100	0.4780
risk aversion[4]	-0.0121	0.0257	-0.4727	0.6366
age	-0.0288	0.0151	-1.9026	0.0576
gender:female	0.2008	0.0839	2.3929	0.0170
as.factor(Faculty)University of Applied Sciences	-0.0091	0.2249	-0.0406	0.9676
as.factor(Faculty)Mathematics and Computer Science	0.1392	0.2357	0.5905	0.5550
as.factor(Faculty)Social and Behavioral Sciences	0.2831	0.1975	1.4338	0.1521
as.factor(Faculty)Philosophy	0.1721	0.2048	0.8404	0.4010
as.factor(Faculty)Law	-0.5349	0.2523	-2.1205	0.0344
as.factor(Faculty)Economics	-0.1278	0.2226	-0.5740	0.5662
as.factor(Faculty)Biological Sciences	0.1546	0.2303	0.6713	0.5023
as.factor(Faculty)Medical Science	0.0419	0.3040	0.1380	0.8903
as.factor(Faculty)Physics and Astronomy	0.1331	0.2851	0.4670	0.6407
as.factor(Faculty)Theology[5]	0.6524	0.1957	3.3338	0.0009
as.factor(Faculty)Not a student	0.5208	0.2308	2.2567	0.0244

Table 3: Correlation of Kohlberg class six scores with various demographics, data by Chlass and Riener (2015).

[4]Ordinal 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).

[5]The sample includes only a single observation for field of study: Theology. The coefficient therefore measures an individual effect.

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class six scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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

Results: negative correlation (5% level) for fields of study: Information Technology, Education, Law and country of origin: United Kingdom; positive correlation (5% level) for country of origin: Bangladesh, Brunei, Germany, Indonesia, Macau, Mauritius, Nepal, New Zealand, Sri Lanka, Taiwan.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	1.3039	0.6737	1.9353	0.0558
age	-0.0317	0.0160	-1.9755	0.0510
gender:female	0.1856	0.1626	1.1410	0.2566
howreligious[6]	-0.0457	0.0296	-1.5457	0.1254
socio-economic status[7]	0.0562	0.0364	1.5430	0.1260
as.factor(faculty)Arts	-0.0914	0.5549	-0.1647	0.8695
as.factor(faculty)Business and Economics	-0.8609	0.5600	-1.5372	0.1275
as.factor(faculty)Education	-1.8002	0.5886	-3.0583	0.0029
as.factor(faculty)Engineering	-0.8429	0.5425	-1.5538	0.1235
as.factor(faculty)Information Technology	-2.5285	0.6983	-3.6210	0.0005
as.factor(faculty)Law	-1.1931	0.5881	-2.0287	0.0452
as.factor(faculty)Medicine, Nursing and Health Services	-1.0531	0.5470	-1.9254	0.0571
as.factor(faculty)Not in any faculty	-0.9360	0.6338	-1.4766	0.1430
as.factor(faculty)Science	-0.6032	0.5516	-1.0935	0.2769
as.factor(religion)Buddhist	-0.0374	0.4321	-0.0867	0.9311
as.factor(religion)Catholic	0.1490	0.4882	0.3051	0.7609
as.factor(religion)Hindu	0.0182	0.6023	0.0302	0.9759
as.factor(religion)Jewish	-0.2731	0.5441	-0.5019	0.6169
as.factor(religion)Muslim	0.1044	0.5479	0.1906	0.8492

as.factor(religion)Not religious	-0.2059	0.4189	-0.4916	0.6241
as.factor(religion)Other	-0.6741	0.5952	-1.1325	0.2602
as.factor(religion)Other Christian	0.6433	0.5286	1.2170	0.2265
as.factor(religion)Protestant	0.1791	0.4741	0.3779	0.7064
as.factor(country)Bangladesh	2.2237	1.1090	2.0052	0.0477
as.factor(country)India	0.4856	0.4748	1.0227	0.3090
as.factor(country)Brazil	0.2126	0.1818	1.1691	0.2452
as.factor(country)Brunei	1.8075	0.5320	3.3973	0.0010
as.factor(country)China	0.5010	0.3333	1.5030	0.1361
as.factor(country)United Kingdom	-1.2150	0.5566	-2.1827	0.0314
as.factor(country)Germany	0.6242	0.3146	1.9840	0.0500
as.factor(country)Hong Kong	0.5924	0.3621	1.6359	0.1051
as.factor(country)Indonesia	1.0896	0.3942	2.7639	0.0068
as.factor(country)Iran	0.1165	0.5502	0.2117	0.8328
as.factor(country)Korea	-0.0857	0.4864	-0.1761	0.8605
as.factor(country)Macau	1.4854	0.3372	4.4049	0.0000
as.factor(country)Malaysia	0.5360	0.3490	1.5360	0.1278
as.factor(country)Mauritius	3.1999	0.5472	5.8481	0.0000
as.factor(country)Nepal	2.5293	0.5255	4.8130	0.0000
as.factor(country)New Zealand	1.5541	0.5604	2.7735	0.0066
as.factor(country)Pakistan	-0.7534	0.6667	-1.1299	0.2613
as.factor(country)Singapore	0.2606	0.3150	0.8271	0.4102
as.factor(country)Sri Lanka	3.0725	0.4670	6.5785	0.0000
as.factor(country)Taiwan	1.1380	0.4755	2.3933	0.0186
as.factor(country)United States	-0.5284	0.2705	-1.9536	0.0536
as.factor(country)Vietnam	-0.1029	0.3364	-0.3058	0.7604
as.factor(ethnicity)Chinese	-0.5285	0.4435	-1.1915	0.2363
as.factor(ethnicity)Indian	-0.2099	0.5666	-0.3705	0.7118
as.factor(ethnicity)Other	-0.7010	0.4997	-1.4029	0.1638

as.factor(ethnicity)Other Asian	0.2931	0.2938	0.9978	0.3209
as.factor(ethnicity)Pacific Islander	-0.6606	0.3522	-1.8754	0.0637

Table 4: Correlation of postclass 1 with various demographics, data by Chlass et al. (2015), sample: 150 subjects at Monash University, Australia.

[6]In 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).

[7]In 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 Kohlberg class three

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class three scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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, robust standard errors

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

Results: positive correlation (5% level) of *Kohlberg class three* with personality trait: Neuroticism.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	-0.8345	0.7428	-1.1235	0.2622
age	0.0023	0.0269	0.0855	0.9319
gender: female	0.1782	0.1249	1.4267	0.1548
risk aversion[8]	-0.0001	0.0359	-0.0029	0.9977
Extraversion[9]	0.0163	0.0133	1.2188	0.2240
Neuroticism	0.0255	0.0113	2.2547	0.0249
Psychoticism	0.0233	0.0155	1.5001	0.1347
Lie Scale[10]	-0.0062	0.0164	-0.3758	0.7073
results robust to the inclusion of 126 Dummies for subjects' field of study				

Table 5: Correlation of Kohlberg class three scores with various demographics, data by Chlass (2010).

[8]Ordinal 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).

[9]Subjects' 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.

[10]Contrary 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.

1.2.2 Demographics: age, gender (Chlaß and Moffatt 2012, 2017)

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class 3 scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

Data: Chlaß N., Moffatt, G. (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games – Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game?, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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(>|z|)
Intercept	-0.1923	0.3537	-0.5437	0.5870
age	0.0038	0.0149	0.2527	0.8006
gender:female	0.1573	0.0969	1.6224	0.1055
results robust to the inclusion of 211 Dummies for subjects' field of study				

Table 6: Correlation of Kohlberg class three with various demographics, data by Chlass and Moffatt (2017).

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class 3 scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Giving in Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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

Results: positive correlation (5% level) of '*Kohlberg class three*' with gender; negative correlation (5% level) with field of study: Law.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	-0.6397	0.4594	-1.3926	0.1642
risk aversion[11]	-0.0069	0.0288	-0.2383	0.8117
age	0.0055	0.0156	0.3519	0.7251
gender: female	0.2879	0.0820	3.5115	0.0005
as.factor(Faculty)University of Applied Sciences	0.1597	0.2161	0.7392	0.4601
as.factor(Faculty)Mathematics and Computer Science	-0.1622	0.2550	-0.6364	0.5248
as.factor(Faculty)Social and Behavioral Sciences	0.3356	0.1959	1.7133	0.0872
as.factor(Faculty)Philosophy	0.1825	0.2025	0.9012	0.3679
as.factor(Faculty)Law	-0.4905	0.2402	-2.0423	0.0415
as.factor(Faculty)Economics	0.0474	0.2169	0.2184	0.8272
as.factor(Faculty)Biological Sciences	0.0042	0.2294	0.0184	0.9853
as.factor(Faculty)Medical Science	0.1360	0.2817	0.4829	0.6294
as.factor(Faculty)Physics and Astronomy	-0.1141	0.2939	-0.3881	0.6980
as.factor(Faculty)Not a student	0.1054	0.3553	0.2966	0.7669
as.factor(Faculty)Theology[12]	0.8286	0.1912	4.3337	0.0000

Table 7: Correlation of Kohlberg class three with various demographics, data by Chlass and Riener (2015).

[11] Ordinal 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).

[12] The sample includes only a single observation for field of study: Theology. The coefficient therefore measures an individual effect.

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

Dependent variable: Kohlberg class 3 scores from the Moral Judgement Test by Georg Lind, standardized by sample mean and sample standard deviation as in Chlaß and Moffatt (2012, 2017), Givingin Dictator Games, Experimenter Demand Effect or Preference over the Rules of the Game, Jena Economic Research Paper # 2012-044, University of East Anglia Working Paper #2017-05.

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

Model: linear regression, robust standard errors.

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

Results: negative correlation (5% level) with field of study: Information Technology, Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, and with country: United Kingdom, United States, ; positive correlationwith country: Bangladesh, Germany,Indonesia, Macau, Malaysia, Mauritius, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Vietnam.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(>|z|)
Intercept	1.1244	0.7138	1.5752	0.1184
age	-0.0207	0.0180	-1.1515	0.2523
gender: female	0.0708	0.1612	0.4395	0.6613
howreligious[13]	-0.0306	0.0281	-1.0884	0.2791
socio-economic status[14]	0.0165	0.0382	0.4308	0.6675
as.factor(faculty)Arts	-0.6272	0.5683	-1.1036	0.2725
as.factor(faculty)Business and Economics	-0.7020	0.5577	-1.2587	0.2111
as.factor(faculty)Education	-1.2192	0.6360	-1.9168	0.0582
as.factor(faculty)Engineering	-0.8687	0.5350	-1.6237	0.1077
as.factor(faculty)Information Technology	-1.5181	0.6726	-2.2571	0.0262
as.factor(faculty)Law	-0.8745	0.5823	-1.5018	0.1364
as.factor(faculty)Medicine, Nursing and Health Services	-1.1218	0.5564	-2.0161	0.0465
as.factor(faculty)Not in any faculty	-0.7303	0.6367	-1.1469	0.2542
as.factor(faculty)Science	-0.6133	0.5805	-1.0565	0.2934
as.factor(religion)Buddhist	0.0770	0.4364	0.1763	0.8604
as.factor(religion)Catholic	-0.0071	0.5055	-0.0141	0.9888
as.factor(religion)Hindu	-0.6222	0.5272	-1.1803	0.2407
as.factor(religion)Jewish	-0.5482	0.5085	-1.0781	0.2836

as.factor(religion)Muslim	-0.4217	0.6229	-0.6770	0.5000
as.factor(religion)Not religious	-0.0080	0.4150	-0.0193	0.9847
as.factor(religion)Other	0.3625	0.5537	0.6547	0.5142
as.factor(religion)Other Christian	0.8208	0.5297	1.5495	0.1245
as.factor(religion)Protestant	-0.0563	0.4812	-0.1170	0.9071
as.factor(country)Bangladesh	4.0029	1.8261	2.1920	0.0307
as.factor(country)India	-0.1298	0.4795	-0.2706	0.7872
as.factor(country)Brazil	0.2555	0.1925	1.3276	0.1874
as.factor(country)Brunei	0.7564	0.5412	1.3978	0.1653
as.factor(country)China	0.1986	0.2728	0.7280	0.4684
as.factor(country)United Kingdom	-1.0931	0.2656	-4.1152	0.0001
as.factor(country)Germany	0.7319	0.3211	2.2793	0.0248
as.factor(country)Hong Kong	0.6344	0.3363	1.8867	0.0622
as.factor(country)Indonesia	1.3371	0.3694	3.6196	0.0005
as.factor(country)Iran	-0.3898	0.4949	-0.7876	0.4328
as.factor(country)Korea	-0.4362	0.4539	-0.9610	0.3389
as.factor(country)Macau	1.5196	0.2701	5.6263	0.0000
as.factor(country)Malaysia	0.5952	0.2973	2.0018	0.0481
as.factor(country)Mauritius	1.3897	0.4687	2.9653	0.0038
as.factor(country)Nepal	1.9067	0.4719	4.0401	0.0001
as.factor(country)New Zealand	0.6722	0.4585	1.4662	0.1458
as.factor(country)Pakistan	-0.0427	0.6720	-0.0635	0.9495
as.factor(country)Singapore	0.4279	0.2447	1.7487	0.0835
as.factor(country)Sri Lanka	1.5454	0.5160	2.9949	0.0035
as.factor(country)Taiwan	-0.8252	0.4358	-1.8934	0.0613
as.factor(country)United States	-1.4026	0.3059	-4.5851	0.0000
as.factor(country)Vietnam	0.8830	0.3463	2.5496	0.0123
as.factor(ethnicity)Chinese	-0.6468	0.3929	-1.6460	0.1030
as.factor(ethnicity)Indian	0.7320	0.4786	1.5295	0.1294

as.factor(ethnicity)Other	-0.3609	0.5051	-0.7145	0.4766
as.factor(ethnicity)Other Asian	0.0043	0.3144	0.0138	0.9890
as.factor(ethnicity)Pacific Islander	-0.2356	0.3232	-0.7289	0.4678

Table 8: Correlation of Kohlberg class three with various demographics, data by Chlass et al. (2015), sample: 150 subjects at Monash University, Australia.

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 Differenzielle 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.

[13] In 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).

[14] In 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.