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**Section A**

**Pre-registration of Experiment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Trust Between Groups with Biased | |
| Monitoring |  |

Overview ■■

Study Information

# Title

*Provide the working title of your study. It is helpful if this is the same title that you submit for publication of your final manuscript, but it is not a requirement.*

Trust Between Groups with Biased Monitoring

# Authors

*The author who submits the preregistration is the recipient of the award money and must also be an author of the published manuscript. Additional authors may be added or removed at any time.*



# Research Questions

*Please list each research question included in this study.*

SI p. 13 Theories of monitoring indicate that bias among monitors will affect the strategies of those being monitored. We derive predicted behavior for first movers in a dyadic trust game.

We ask whether the presence or absence of bias in repo rt ing by thir d-pa rty mon itors

E affect levels of trust between counterpar ts in a trust game.

- I

Prior research using trust games shows that the presence of third parties who observe the behavior of counterparts increases trust. We ask how the information provided by a third party under separate conditions of bias and non-bias creates uncertainty about others' behaviors and changes the credibility of information from a third party, which in turn affects trust between counterparts.

Hypotheses

*For each of the research questions listed in the previous section, provide one or multiple specific and testable hypotheses. Please state if the hypotheses are directional or non-directional. If directional, state the direction. A predicted effect is also appropriate here.*

1. An unbiased monitor promotes higher levels of trust between counterparts than a biased monitor or no monitor.
2. Levels of trust will not differ in the presence of a biased monitor or no monitor.
3. An unbiased monitor will promote higher levels of reciprocity than a biased monitor.
4. A biased monitor will promote higher levels of reciprocity than no monitor.
5. A potential moderator is that individuals who lose in a contest game prior to playing a trust game will show lower levels of trust in all conditions in comparison to individuals who win in the prior game. This is included because we expect that the initial levels of trust between competing groups is affected by their between group experiences.

Sampling Plan

Existing Data

SI p. 15 *Preregistration is designed to make clear the distinction between confirmatory tests, specified prior to seeing the data, and exploratory analyses conducted after observing the data. Therefore, creating a research plan in which existing data will be used presents unique challenges. Please select the*

*questions about how to answer this question {prereg@cos.io).*

• Registration prior to analysis of the data

# Expllana tion of existing data

If *you indicate that you will be using some data that already exist in this study, please describe the steps you have taken to assure that you are unaware of any patterns or summary statistics in the data. This may include an explanation of how access to the data has been limited, who has observed the data, or how you have avoided observing any analysis of the specific data you will use in your study. The purpose of this question is to assure that the line between confirmatory and exploratory analysis is clear.*

At the time of this registration, we are currently conducting the experiment on human subjects in a lab. Data collection is ongoing. We have used data from a pilot study to conduct a pre analysis and build code in R that we will use to test our hypotheses.

# Data collection procedures

Participants are recruited from undergraduates at to be who have volunt eered

part of the subject pool. Participants will be paid a show - up fee of

$5.00, and they can earn additional money based on their decisions in the experiment. I expect to pay subjects $15.00-$25. 00 for appr oxi1mat ely one hour of participation. Participants must be undergraduate students at See the attached screen shots



for this study.

*(optional)*

SI p. 17

* Jo Screenshots\_Sept\_27\_2018.pdf

* Protocol\_TRJO-"Se pt\_28\_2018. pdf

# Sample size

*Describe the sample size of your study. How many units will be analyzed in the study? This could be the number of people, birds, classrooms, plots, interactions, or countries included. If the units are not individuals, then describe the size requirements for each unit. If you are using a clustered or multilevel design, how many units are you collecting at each level of the analysis?*

The target sample size is 144.

## Sample size rationale

*This could include a power analysis or an arbitrary constraint such as time, money, or personnel.*

We used code in R provided by powerandsamplesize.com to identify the proper sample size to obtain .9 power to detect a difference between a mean of 5 and 3.25 with standard deviations set at 2 and a sampling ratio of 1.

## Stopping rule

*If your data collection procedures do not give you full control over your exact sample size, specify how you will decide when to terminate your data collection.*

We intend to have balance across our treatments. Random assignment is by session. Random assignment is blind to the experimenter (it is handled internally by the computer program). At the end of all planned sessions we will check to make certain there is balance. If not then we will add additional session(s).

# Variables

SI p. 19

## Manipulated variables

Subjects play a game where the determine whether and how many experimental currency units (ECUs) to exchange with a new, anonymous counterpart to which they are assigned across four rounds. We create three different conditions. In each condition,

there is a chance that ECUs are lost during any exchange. In one condition, a monitor (an automaton programmed within the computer) provides an honest report to subjects regarding what happened during the exchange (reports contain whether money was returned by a counterpart and how much was returned). In another condition, a monitor similarly provides a report but with a predetermined probability of falsely reporting whether ECUs sent were lost or not. The third condition is a baseline condition in which no reporting from a monitor occurs. Thus, we manipulated the existence of a monitor and the type of reporting from the monitor (i.e. always honest or sometimes dishonest). Consequently the manipulations are: (1) a biased automaton; (2) an unbiased automaton; and (3) no automaton.

*(optional)*

• No files selected

### Measured variables

The two outcome variables will be the amount of ECUs provided by first movers and the amount returned by second movers per round. Additionally, for our ancillary expectations, we will evaluate whether outcomes from a contest game that subjects play prior to the trust game moderate levels of trust across conditions. The purpose of the contest game is to create in-group cohesion after subjects are assigned to their respective groups of first and second movers. The variable of interest from this game will measure whether subjects belong to a group that lost or won the game.

***(optional)***

• No files selected

### Indices

SI p. 21

1. One test involves the mean level of trust across four trials (Sum of 1st mover ECUs sent across trials)/4

1. For reciprocators we will calculate the proportion of ECUs returned to the 1st mover. This is given by: (ECUs returned to 1st mover)/(ECUs sent by 1st mover times 3). We will then calculate the mean proportion across four trials for that reciprocator.

*(optional)*

• No files selected

Design Plan

#### Study type

*Please check one of the following statements*

• Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention experiment and includes randomized controlled trials.

#### Blinding

*Blinding describes who is aware of the experimental manipulations within a study. Mark all that apply.*

• For studies that involve human subjects, they will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.

#### Study design

We have a three -group design with three treatments (unbiased monitor, biased monitor, no monitor). It has repreated measures and is a between subjects design.

*(optional)*

• No files selected

## Randomization

*If you are doing a randomized study, how will you randomize, and at what level?*

Subjects are part of an 8 person session (often two sessions were run simultaneously). Sessions were randomly assigned to one of the three monitoring conditions by the computer program. Within a session subjects were assigned to one of two distinct groups based on how quickly they responded to a dot estimation task. These groups were then randomized to be either the 1st mover or 2nd mover. Subjects in the group, once assigned their role, kept that role throughout the experiment.

Analysis Plan

### Statistical models

We will conduct difference pairwise t-tests across each condition separately for both first movers and second movers. The outcome measure for first movers will be a measure of average trust for the first hypothesis. The outcome measure for second movers will be a measure of average reciprocity of trust for the second hypothesis. Additionally, we will use multiple regression to analyze the moderating effect of losing the contest game across condition on levels of trust and reciprocity. Also, we will conduct an exploratory analysis of time trends of trust within each condition (i.e. whether trust declines across rounds and at what rate).

*(optional)*

• No files selected

### Transformations

SI p. 25 *If you plan on transforming, centering, recoding the data, or will require a coding scheme for categorical variables, please describe that process.*

N/A

Follow-up analyses

*If not specified previously, will you be conducting any confirmatory analyses to follow up on effects in your statistical model, such as subgroup analyses, pairwise or complex contrasts, or follow-up tests from interactions? Remember that any analyses not specified in this research plan must be noted as exploratory.*

## *NIA*

Inference criteria

*What criteria will you use to make inferences? Please describe the information you'll use (e.g. specify the p-values, Bayes factors, specific model fit indices), as well as cut-off criterion, where appropriate. Will you be using one or two tailed tests for each of your analyses? If you are comparing multiple conditions or testing multiple hypotheses, will you account for this?*

We will use the standard p-values for which p<0.05 for the t-tests. Note that several of the ttests have explicit onetailed, directional predictions. The same will be true for all regressions.

Data exclusion

*How will you determine which data points or samples (if any) to exclude from your analyses? How will outliers be handled?*

## *NIA*

Missing data

*How will you deal with incomplete or missing data?*

If a subject does not complete the experiment, that subject will not be included in the analysis. Nor will the session data for the study be included. One subject leaving in the middle of an experiment will cause the full experiment to be cancelled. This is due to the randomization routines used for matching the subjects.

### Exploratory analysis

*If you plan to explore your data set to look for unexpected differences or relationships, you may describe those tests here. An exploratory test is any test where a prediction is not made up front, or there are multiple possible tests that you are going to use. A statistically significant finding in an exploratory test is a great way to form a new confirmatory hypothesis, which could be registered at a later time. (optional)*

We are unsure about the moderating effect of each subject's experience in the contest game. We will fully explore this effect. We are also sensitive to the different bargaining strategies used by males and females. We will collect these data and may incorporate it for purely exploratory reasons.

# Scripts

## Upload an analysis script with clear comments

*This optional step is helpful in order to create a process that is completely transparent and increase the likelihood that your analysis can be replicated. We recommend that you run the code on a simulated dataset in order to check that it will run without errors. (optional)*

* Jo Screenshots\_Sept\_27\_2018.pdf
* Protocol\_TRJO\_Sept\_28\_2018.pdf

## Other

### Other

*If there is any additional information that you feel needs to be included in your preregistration, please enter it here. (optional)*

**Section B**

**Time timeline of experiment**

Figure B.1 – Timeline for the Experiment
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Section C

Additional Analysis

Section C.1

In this section we provide additional information about the trust decisions across treatments.

The findings indicate that the distributions are fundamentally different and Figure C.1 elaborates this point. Panel A plots the cumulative density of what the first mover sent by each treatment. In Panel B, the distributions of amounts sent are separately plotted as histograms under each treatment. In the cumulative density plots, lines to the left indicate that less is being sent in that treatment. Both the *Biased* and *No Monitor* conditions show far less being sent.

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure C.1** |
| **Panel A: Cumulative densities of amount sent by treatment group** |
| **Panel B: Distributions of amount sent by treatment group** |

**Section C.2**

**Non-registered comparisons.**

We think it is appropriate to look at the first mover’s choices a little more carefully. This will enable us to capture the effect of repetition (time) and changing beliefs. This portion of the analysis is not part of our registered hypotheses. Keep in mind that each first mover made four choices, with feedback at each choice. We treat these as panel data and, because the first mover faces a new second mover at each choice, we model this as a random effects Tobit regression censored at 0 and 100.

Model 1, in Table C.2.1, predicts what was sent including only the main effects of the treatment and the period. The *No Monitor* condition is the omitted variable. We observe that the presence of a monitor results in an increase in what is sent, although this is offset by experience across periods. Model 2 accounts for the sequence of choices by including the period in which the choice was made and the interaction with the treatment. From this model it appears that for the *Unbiased Monitor* condition that trust increases over time. However, this is a very tenuous claim as seen in subsequent models. Model 3 adds first movers’ beliefs (predictions about what will be returned). As expected, beliefs are positively correlated with the amount sent. Two things stand out. First, for the *Biased Monitor* the main effect for the treatment is large and positive. Second, when we add dummy variables for the interactions for treatment and beliefs, the presence of a *Biased Monitor* drives beliefs downward. Figure C.2.1 shows the effect of this interaction. Model 4 adds back in the Period and Period and Treatment interactions from Model 2. The effects associated with period disappear. Those in the *Unbiased Monitor* condition positively update their beliefs, while those in the *Biased Monitor* condition decrease their beliefs. Finally, Model 5 adds a variable counting the total number of wins in the contest game and whether the first mover was female. An increase in winning contests is positively correlated with trusting one’s counterpart. Consistent with several studies in the trust game, women are less trusting. These additional covariates do not change the general findings from Model 4. In short, the presence of an *Unbiased Monitor* steadily increases trust in beliefs. A *Biased Monitor* undermines already low levels of trust.

**Table C.2.1: Tobit Regression Analysis, Random Effects by First Mover ID**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | |
|  | Dependent variable: | | | | |
|  |  | | | | |
|  | Amount Sent by First Mover | | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|  | | | | | |
| Unbiased Monitor | 9.033\* | -11.157 | 0.434 | -10.242 | -15.473 |
|  | (4.926) | (8.873) | (5.789) | (10.646) | (11.137) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased Monitor | 6.714 | 5.556 | 28.819\*\*\* | 3.049 | 1.443 |
|  | (4.931) | (9.395) | (5.015) | (10.380) | (11.365) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period | -2.090\* | -4.948\*\* |  | -1.971 | -2.037 |
|  | (1.250) | (2.269) |  | (2.216) | (2.217) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unbiased x Period |  | 8.136\*\*\* |  | 4.248 | 4.221 |
|  |  | (3.000) |  | (3.526) | (3.488) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased x Period |  | 0.469 |  | -0.410 | -0.168 |
|  |  | (3.198) |  | (2.840) | (2.938) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beliefs |  |  | 0.697\*\*\* | 0.679\*\*\* | 0.644\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.055) | (0.061) | (0.064) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unbiased x Beliefs |  |  | 0.018 | 0.014 | 0.090 |
|  |  |  | (0.095) | (0.098) | (0.098) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased x Beliefs |  |  | -0.357\*\*\* | -0.352\*\*\* | -0.334\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.061) | (0.065) | (0.071) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Group Wins |  |  |  |  | 5.446\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (2.641) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  | -18.788\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (5.396) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| logSigmaMu | 3.686\*\*\* | 3.680\*\*\* | 3.336\*\*\* | 3.245\*\*\* | 3.208\*\*\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.056) | (0.071) | (0.077) | (0.089) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| logSigmaNu | 3.053\*\*\* | 3.030\*\*\* | 2.823\*\*\* | 2.823\*\*\* | 2.807\*\*\* |
|  | (0.027) | (0.027) | (0.025) | (0.033) | (0.035) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 38.452\*\*\* | 45.462\*\*\* | -4.752 | 2.060 | 15.886 |
|  | (4.942) | (6.712) | (3.948) | (7.704) | (10.174) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | |
| Observations | 288 | 288 | 288 | 288 | 288 |
|  | | | | | |
| Note: | *Standard errors reported in parentheses; p<0.1=\*, p<0.05=\*\*, p<0.01=\*\*\** | | | | |
|  |  | | | | |

**Figure C2.1: Marginal effects of monitor type and beliefs on trust**

Chart

Description automatically generated

**Section C.3**

**Trusthwothiness.**

To more clearly illustrate differences in what is sent and returned by pairs of subjects, Panels A, B and C of Figure C.3.1 plot what the second mover returned to the first mover by treatment. The points on this “bubble” plot increase in size as more points occupy the same position. A solid line overlaid on the plot is the best fitting linear model for the data. The dashed line is plotted for convenience and indicates the break-even point for first movers. Amounts appearing below the dashed line indicate that trust did not pay. Points above the line indicate that trust paid. The Panels each make the point noted in the text: in the *Unbiased Monitor* case trust most often pays; in the *Biased Monitor* case trust pays at the lower end, but not as more is sent; and for the *No Monitor* case, trust rarely pays.

**Figure C.3.1: Bubble plots of amount sent by amount returned and treatment group**

|  |
| --- |
| Panel A  Chart, scatter chart  Description automatically generated |
| Panel B  Chart, scatter chart  Description automatically generated |
| Panel C  Chart, scatter chart  Description automatically generated |

Mimicking our analysis in Section 3.2, we look at the percentage returned by the second mover in a regression framework. We treat these as panel data, excluding instances in which the first mover sent nothing. The analysis is simple OLS with random effects. We run models like those in Table C.2.1 above. The first model in Table C.3.1 looks at the main effects and the period in which the decision was made. The omitted category is the *No Monitor* condition. We find that the *Unbiased Monitor* condition is statistically significant, but not the *Biased Monitor* condition. This is what we might expect given the pooled data above. Accounting for time (periods) is significant and negative. This implies that subjects are learning that they can hide behind uncertain or hidden information. Model 2 adds interaction terms for the treatments. Here, we see the coefficients moving in the directions we expect – positive for the *Unbiased Monitor* condition and negative for the *Biased Monitor* condition. However, the effects are quite small. Model 3 drops the period variable and includes beliefs. These are the beliefs that the second mover holds concerning how much the first mover will send. That coefficient and the interactions with treatment are negligible. Model 4 adds the period and treatment interactions back in. The period effect remains significant and the interactions retain their signs. Model 5 adds the number of wins the subject experiences in the contest game and whether the subject was female. Neither of these coefficients are significant, nor do they change what we have observed about the period effects. In short what we find is common with reciprocity models. There are few predictors of what will be returned, although clearly individuals decrease the percentage returned over time.

**Table C.3.1: OLS Regression Analysis Random Effects by Second Mover ID**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | |
|  | Dependent variable: | | | | |
|  |  | | | | |
|  | Percentage Returned by Second Mover | | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|  | | | | | |
| Unbiased Monitor | 11.571\* | 10.918 | 8.473 | 6.426 | 6.489 |
|  | (6.191) | (8.278) | (7.673) | (9.847) | (9.915) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased Monitor | 3.667 | 4.061 | 2.972 | 3.212 | 3.521 |
|  | (6.187) | (8.190) | (7.925) | (10.220) | (10.441) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period | -3.000\*\*\* | -3.032\* |  | -3.246\*\* | -3.269\*\* |
|  | (0.920) | (1.603) |  | (1.649) | (1.649) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unbiased x Period |  | 0.264 |  | 0.536 | 0.542 |
|  |  | (2.269) |  | (2.319) | (2.318) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased x Period |  | -0.163 |  | -0.134 | -0.121 |
|  |  | (2.274) |  | (2.345) | (2.346) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beliefs |  |  | -0.049 | -0.105 | -0.112 |
|  |  |  | (0.145) | (0.144) | (0.144) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unbiased x Beliefs |  |  | 0.102 | 0.145 | 0.147 |
|  |  |  | (0.175) | (0.173) | (0.174) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biased x Beliefs |  |  | 0.037 | 0.051 | 0.051 |
|  |  |  | (0.178) | (0.178) | (0.178) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Group Wins |  |  |  |  | 0.002 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (3.079) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  | -2.195 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (5.226) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 36.272\*\*\* | 36.343\*\*\* | 30.295\*\*\* | 39.487\*\*\* | 40.885\*\*\* |
|  | (4.909) | (5.809) | (5.634) | (7.228) | (8.842) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | |
| Observations | 222 | 222 | 222 | 222 | 222 |
| R2 | 0.080 | 0.080 | 0.040 | 0.084 | 0.085 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.067 | 0.059 | 0.018 | 0.050 | 0.042 |
| F Statistic | 18.743\*\*\* | 18.636\*\*\* | 8.623 | 19.479\*\* | 19.496\*\* |
|  | | | | | |
| Note: | *Standard errors reported in parentheses; p<0.1=\*, p<0.05=\*\*, p<0.01=\*\*\** | | | | |

Section D

JEPS Reporting Guidelines

**A. Hypotheses**

• Specific objectives or hypotheses.

**B. Subjects and Context**

* Eligibility and exclusion criteria for participants.
  + Subject pool was part of an on-line subject pool maintained by the Behavioral Research Lab at Rice University.
  + Subjects signed up for a specific day and time. If too few subjects showed to fill out a session they were paid a show up fee and rescheduled for another date. If too many subjects showed up to fill out a session, they were paid a show-up see and rescheduled for another date. The experimenter would ask whether anyone wanted to volunteer to exit if the session was too full. If there were no volunteers a small deck of cards was shuffled and subjects drew to determine who would be rescheduled.
  + There we no changes to recruitment.
* Procedures used to recruit and select participants.

o Custom designed subject pool.

* Recruitment dates: September 1, 2018 – October 1, 2018 and March 26, 2019 – April 4, 2019.
* All data was collected in the Behavioral Research Lab at Rice University.
  + All data was collected in a controlled laboratory setting.
  + The student population was from a small private University (Rice University).
* If there is a survey: Not Applicable

**C. Allocation Method**

* Random assignment by the computerized program. Blind to the experimenters.
* No restrictions.  
  o Unit of randomization was the session level. This was required because subjects were paired with one another and they maintained their role in each period. There were four periods. To minimize the number of subjects needed in each session, we constructed sessions of 8 subjects.
* See Code in DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK.
* If demographic or other pretreatment variables were collected: Not applicable.
* If blocking was used: Not Applicable ,
* Blinding: Subjects and experimenters were blind to assignment.
* If blinding took place how was it accomplished: Assignment by session was computerized. Subjects were randomly assigned to session (when two or more sessions were run simultaneously) by drawing a card that assigned them to a specific computer.

**D. Treatments**

* See the full discussion in the text.

o Screenshots of all instructions are provided in the Supporting Information and available at DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK.

* All manipulations were administered by computerized code.
* Method of delivery: All via computer instructions and interactions.
  + Full code is given at: DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK
* For lab experiments (and other experiments, when relevant):
  + Number of 8-person sessions: 36
  + Time span: each experiment lasted less than one hour.
  + There was no deception.
  + Treatment fidelity
    - No anomalies
    - No quizzes on experimental instructions
    - No practice rounds
    - Subjects received a full debriefing. Post experiment 91.7% reported the instructions were clear or very clear.
    - Experimental team did not observe the intervention – they were on individual computer screens.
    - There were no manipulation checks.
  + Incentives were provided. Subjects were paid their earnings (in cash), in private, following the end of the experiment.

**E. Results  
1. Outcome Measures and Covariates**

* Provide precise definition of all primary and secondary measures and covariates.  
  o See text for complete description.

exact question wording in an appendix. Please provide a copy of the complete survey

questionnaire (in an on-line appendix if it is long).

* Pre-registered hypotheses are located: DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK Exploratory analysis is labeled in the Supporting Information.

**2. Complete CONSORT Participant Flow Diagram**

* All subjects who were eligible participated. There was no attrition and no exclusions.

**3. Statistical Analysis**

* Full statistical analysis reported in the text. All results based on ITT.

**F. Other Information**

* Was the experiment reviewed and approved by an IRB?
  + Yes. IRB #: IRB-FY2019-68
* If the experimental protocol was registered, where and how can the filing be accessed?
  + DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK
* What was the source of funding?
  + National Science Foundation. No restrictions nor involvement.
* No COIs
* If a replication data set is available, provide the URL.
  + DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q5JBK

Section E

Experiment Screenshots

Listing of screen shots.

Pages 39-66 All players see these screens. The only difference is the color of the group to which they belong.

Pages 67-71. First movers see these screens.

Pages 72-75. Second movers see these screens.

Pages 76-95. Everyone sees these screens.

Pages 96-99. Subjects in Baseline condition with NO Monitor see these instructions.

Pages 100-116. Subjects in UnBiased Monitor condition see these instructions.

Pages 117-127. Subjects in Biased Monitor condition see these instructions.

















































































































































































