

Following completion of our updated experimental design as per our update on the pre-registration on January 18th 2022, we are now planning a further robustness check on our null results.

In other dishonesty work (i.e., lying), it is often found that participants lie only to some extent but not to the full available degree. Exploiting the moral wiggle room offered in the previous treatment in our study involved quite a ‘dishonesty leap’, as it would involve moving from a substantial contribution (the mode in our studies is 5) to 0. In this treatment, there was a chance that the whole contribution towards the common pot would be lost and therefore, when seeing a 0 on the contributions table, other participants would not have been able to tell whether the participant had contributed 0 or whether they were unlucky.

We now plan a new treatment where the contributions are partially lost to ensure our null results are not due to individuals being averse to exploiting the large scope for dishonest behaviour but would be able to cheat a little bit only. In this new treatment, the contribution of unlucky participants would only be partially lost, which means that other participants would not be able to tell whether the contribution that they see is the true contribution or a smaller one due to bad luck.

Additionally, we plan another treatment where in the case that an individual’s intended contribution is lost this is made public knowledge. This allows us to test whether simply the possibility that contributions can be lost might change behaviour despite there being no moral wiggle room possibility as that players cannot hide behind the excuse of their contribution potentially been lost. In short, the risk structure of this new treatment is identical to that of our previous moral wiggle room treatment, but we vary whether there is moral wiggle room to hide behind.

To tackle this, we plan two new treatments:

1. **T2x**: This is identical to our existing moral wiggle room manipulation treatment (T2) where with 20% chance each individual intended contribution can be lost. The only difference is that whenever an individual’s contribution is lost, this is signalled to everyone in the group. As an example, see the table below how this is indicated to the participants.

You are player B.		[this column shown in T2x only]
Common Project Contributions		Lost Contributions
Player A: 5 Taler		--
Player B: 0 Taler		7 Taler
Player C: 8 Taler		--
Player D: 0 Taler		--

2. **T3**: This treatment is identical to our existing moral wiggle room manipulation treatment (T2), except that with 20% chance each individual contribution can be halved and not lost completely. That is,