

Pre-Analysis Plan

For the description of our sample, data collection and the experimental design see the pre-registration.

Variable Definitions

Main Outcome Variable: Effort provided to generate donations measured in time (continuous variable).

Balance Table of Treatment Groups

According to the following variables: Gender, Age, Church Membership

Treatment Effects

As outcome variable is continuous we will use standard OLS regressions with two-sided t-tests. Our sample is not clustered.

H1: Manipulating a negative environmental self-image increases effort compared to control (moral cleansing).

H2: Manipulating a positive environmental self-image decreases effort compared to control (moral licensing).

H1 and H2 are meant to test the predictions of Benabou and Tirole (2011) and Falk, Benabou and Tirole (2018) that agents perform moral balancing. It is supported by evidence in social psychological research on moral cleansing (West and Zhong, 2015) and moral licensing (Blanken, van de Ven and Zeelenberg 2015).

H1b: Manipulating a negative environmental self-image decreases effort compared to control (consistency).

H2b: Manipulating a positive environmental self-image decreases effort compared to control (consistency).

Contrary to H1 and H2, the existing literature has frequently found consistency effects of past behavior (Mullen and Monin, 2016). Also, the economic literature on priming of identities (e.g. Benjamin, Choi and Strickland, 2010; Benjamin, Choi and Fisher, 2016) would expect to find consistency effects.

Regressions:

Covariates to be included: gender age day daytime helper

Subgroup analysis

Heterogeneous Treatment Effects for High and Low Types

For environmentalism, we have one objective measure and one subjective measure for being a Low or a High type. Ex-ante it is not clear which of the measure is best suited to distinguish between High and Low

types in the given subject pool. While subjects have more information about their own behavior and attitudes, subjective measures can be susceptible to cheap talk and misreporting. Therefore analysis for subgroups will be conducted for both measures. Optimally, we find that objective and subjective measures correlate and yield equivalent results.

Please note: types might be variables with minimal variation as we expect very environmentally friendly subject pool. Potentially, our experiment might lack statistical power to identify heterogeneous treatment effects.

Types based on subjective measure of environmental image:

All subjects were asked the following question prior to the manipulation: “How many percent of the things you could do to protect the climate, are you actually performing?” On a scale from 0 to 100.

We use this measure to construct environmentally high types and low types at the median or at the 50% cut-off point.

Types based on objective measures:

D4: “Are you a member of or do you regularly donate to environmental organizations?”

Environmental High-Type: Subjects that respond “yes” to question D4.

Environmental Low-Type: Subjects that respond “no” to question D4.

[Types based on subjective relative measures:

D5: “As how environmentally conscious would you rate yourself compared to the other members of your religious community?” (Least/Below Average/Average/Above Average/Most).

Environmental High-Type: Subjects that respond with 4 or 5 on the 5-Point Likert scale for question D5

Environmental Low-Type: Subjects that respond with 1 or 2 on the 5-Point Likert scale for question D5.

Heterogeneous Treatment Effects for Type Uncertainty

Here we test the hypothesis from Bénabou and Tirole (2011) that moral balancing (licensing and cleansing) should increase in type uncertainty. According to the hypothesis in Bénabou and Tirole (2011), we should not observe any moral balancing (licensing and cleansing) for subjects who are highly certain of their type, as they do not need to signal their type to themselves.

Type uncertainty is operationalized with question D6 “How uncertain are you about your placement on the above scale(s)?” on a 4-Point Likert scale (highly uncertain/rather uncertain/ rather certain/ highly certain).

Literature

Cialdini, R. B. *et al.* (2006) 'Managing social norms for persuasive impact', *Social Influence*. Psychology Press Ltd , 1(1), pp. 3–15. doi: 10.1080/15534510500181459.

West, C. and Zhong, C.-B. (2015) 'Moral cleansing', *Current Opinion in Psychology*. Elsevier, 6, pp. 221–225. doi: 10.1016/J.COPSYC.2015.09.022.

Mullen, E. and Monin, B. (2016) 'Consistency Versus Licensing Effects of Past Moral Behavior', *Annual Review of Psychology*. Annual Reviews , 67(1), pp. 363–385. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115120.

Blanken, I., van de Ven, N. and Zeelenberg, M. (2015) 'A Meta-Analytic Review of Moral Licensing', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. SAGE PublicationsSage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 41(4), pp. 540–558. doi: 10.1177/0146167215572134.