


School of Business,
Economics and Law
UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

WORKING PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

No 374

Easy come, easy go

The role of windfall money in lab and field experiments

Fredrik Carlsson,

Haoran He,

Peter Martinsson

August 2009

ISSN 1403-2473 (print)

ISSN 1403-2465 (online)

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND LAW, UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Department of Economics
Visiting adress Vasagatan 1,
Postal adress P.O.Box 640, SE 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden
Phone + 46 (0)31 786 0000

Easy come, easy go

- The role of windfall money in lab and field experiments

Fredrik Carlsson, University of Gothenburg, Sweden[A]
Haoran He, University of Gothenburg, Sweden[B]
Peter Martinsson, University of Gothenburg, Sweden[C]

Abstract

A growing number of experimental studies focus on the differences between the lab and the field. Important in this issue is the role of windfall money. By conducting a dictator game, where the recipient is a charity organization, in exactly the same way in the laboratory and in the field, we investigate the influence of windfall and earned endowment on behavior. We find a strong effect on donation amounts of earned endowment in the lab and the field. Subjects donate more if the endowment is a windfall gain. Thus, windfall money is important not only in a lab environment. However, even for earned endowment, there is a significant difference in behavior between the lab and the field.

Key words: Charitable giving; Dictator game; Laboratory experiment; Field experiment; Windfall money.

JEL codes: C91, C93, D64.

Acknowledgments: Financial support from Sida to the Environmental Economics Unit at the University of Gothenburg is gratefully acknowledged. We have received valuable comments from Martin Dufwenberg and seminar participants at the University of Gothenburg, Ratio Institute, the University of California Berkeley, and IMEBE 2009 in Granada.

[A] Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg, Box 640, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden; Ph +46 31 786 41 74; Fax +46 31 786 10 43; E-mail fredrik.carlsson@economics.gu.se (Corresponding author).
[B] Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg, Box 640, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden; Ph +46 31 786 47 28 Fax +46 31 773 10 43; E-mail haoran.he@economics.gu.se.
[C] Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg, Box 640, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden; Ph +46 31 786 52 55; Fax +46 31 786 10 43; E-mail peter.martinsson@economics.gu.se.

1. Introduction

Laboratory experiments are an important tool for gaining various economic insights that cannot easily be obtained using market data or field experiment data. Also, many experiments are designed to investigate human behavior. Thus, a crucial question is whether subjects' behavior in the laboratory is consistent with their behavior outside the lab. There are of course many differences between the laboratory and the field, and therefore it is difficult to compare behaviors in these two settings. For example, if people do not give away a large share of their income to charity, it does not prove that the behavior in a dictator game, where subjects on average give away 20% of their endowment (e.g., Camerer, 2003), is not externally valid. Levitt and List (2007) argue that a number of factors can explain the behavioral differences found between the laboratory and the real world: scrutiny, context, stakes, selection of subjects, and restrictions on time horizons and choice sets. One development in lab experiments is therefore to reduce the differences, by for example using non-standard subject pools and having subjects earn the endowment. An important reason for the increased use of non-windfall gain is the intent to mimic the setting outside the lab, where almost all incomes are earned rather than obtained as windfalls. The evidence of the effect of windfall money on subject behavior in the lab is mixed. In dictator games, the dictators contribute less when the endowment is earned (Cherry et al., 2002; Ruffle, 1988; Oxoby and Spraggon, 2008). On the other hand, Cherry et al. (2005) and Clark (2002) find no evidence of a windfall-gains effect on contributions in a public good experiment, while Kroll et al. (2007) find significant differences in a public good experiment with heterogeneous endowment.[1] In a recent paper, Smith (2009) argues that using laboratory experiments have resulted in many insights into human behavior, but the extent to which these can be carried over to behavior when own money is involved is questionable.[2]

In this paper, we are interested in analyzing the behavioral effects of conducting experiments in the lab and the field, and in particular we investigate the role of windfall and

[1] However, see the comment by Harrison (2007), where it is shown that the windfall gain in the experiment by Clark (2002) actually shows a significant effect on the share of free-riding subjects.

2 It should however be noted that stake, selection of subjects, and choice sets and time horizons of the experiment have shown to have a significant impact on behavior. For experiments on stake size effects in dictator games, see e.g., Carpenter et al. (2005) and Cherry et al. (2002) and on selection of subjects see, e.g., Fehr and List (2004). For effects of choice sets in dictator games see Bardsley (2008) and List (2007), who allow some of the subjects in a traditional dictator game to also take money from the recipients' endowments.

non-windfall money in the lab and the field. To do this, we use a 2×2 experimental design. We let the subjects participate in a dictator game with a charity organization as the recipient (see, e.g., Eckel and Grossman, 1996, for a similar experiment). In the experiment, we keep all others factors such as stake, selection of subjects, and choice sets and time horizons of the experiment constant and only vary windfall gain and whether the experiment is conducted in the lab or in the field. This means that the main differences between the lab and the field in our experiment are due to the environment per se and the degree of scrutiny.[3] The advantage of using a dictator game is that the experiment is very easy to understand and there are no strategic motives involved. The game also resembles a charitable giving situation, which means that it is possible for us to compare the behavior with that in a field experiment involving charitable giving. Treatment 1 is a standard lab experiment with windfall endowment, and Treatment 2 is a lab experiment with earned endowment. Treatment 3 is a field experiment with windfall endowment, and Treatment 4 is a field experiment with earned endowment. Our design allows us to make two important comparisons. First, we can investigate the effect of windfall gain in the lab (by comparing Treatment 1 and Treatment 2) and in the field (Treatments 3 and 4). Second, by comparing Treatments 1 and 3, and 2 and 4, we can make an overall comparison between the lab and the field conditional on the way the endowment is received.

Why would windfall money matter in a dictator game? One explanation to the potential difference is that people's preferences for the distribution of money depend on, among other things, the input of the subjects (Konow, 2000). When the endowment is a windfall gain, the dictator prefers to split the money more evenly, since he/she does not do anything to receive the money. Cherry et al. (2002) make a similar argument: non-windfall money legitimizes the endowment and invokes a more selfish behavior. In psychology, it has been suggested that subjects use different mental accounts for non-windfall and windfall money (Arkes et al., 1994).

[3] It is likely that subjects will feel more scrutinized in the lab than in the field. This is not to say that subject in the natural field experiment do not feel scrutinized at all. Even if ensuring anonymity of their behavior, they might still have the feeling of being observed by for example the solicitor. Scrutiny is also related to the degree of anonymity in an experiment, which could be anything from publicly announced behavior to a double-blind procedure. The general finding is that when the degree of anonymity is reduced, people behave less selfishly (e.g., List et al., 2004; Rege and Telle, 2004; Soetevent, 2005). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect a difference in behavior between the lab and the field due to scrutiny.

A number of previous studies have studied the differences in behavior between the lab and the field (e.g., List, 2006; Karlan, 2006; Benz and Meier, 2008; Laury and Taylor, 2008; Antonovics et al., 2009; Carpenter and Seki 2009). However, the only other study we are aware of that makes a direct comparison between lab and field using a dictator game is the one by Benz and Meier (2008), who use an ingenious within-subject design to compare individuals' donation behaviors in the field and in the lab. They conduct a dictator game with two social funds as external recipients, and compare the behavior in the experiment with actual charitable giving by the same subjects. They find a stronger donation behavior in the lab, but that it is correlated with the behavior in the field. One important reason for the difference between the lab and the field setting could be that the lab experiment uses windfall money, while the field experiment does not involve an experimental endowment at all. This is exactly what our experimental design allows us to test.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the experimental design, and Section 3 reports the experimental results. Section 4 concludes the findings.

2. Experimental design

The experiment was conducted in October 2008 at Renmin University of China, which is located in the northern part of the capital Beijing and has approximately 22,000 full-time and 13,000 part-time students. We conducted a one-shot dictator experiment. The subjects were given ten 5-Yuan bills and were subsequently asked how much they would like to donate to the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation.[4] This type of campaign is not uncommon in China, and the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation occasionally conducts similar campaigns on campus to give students the opportunity to donate money, old clothes, or other consumer goods to the poor or those in need. In order to test for (i) the difference between the lab and the field and (ii) the effect of windfall gains, we designed an experiment with four

[4] This is China's largest and most well-known charitable organization for poverty alleviation. Its main activities include community development, disaster relief, education and training, information technology services, relief, and shelter and housing provision. Traditionally, there has been a low level of trust and thereby low levels of donations to charities in China. However, in the aftermath of the Sichuan earthquake, there were numerous media reports about the earthquake and how the donations that people made actually went to and helped the people in need.

treatments using a 2×2 experimental design.

The laboratory experiment was conducted at the School of Economics at Renmin University of China, while we used a supermarket located on the campus of Renmin University of China as the scene for our field experiment. The endowment was given as either a windfall or a non-windfall gain, where in the latter case subjects earned the endowment by answering a lengthy questionnaire. The recruitment to all treatments was such that every third customer that exited the supermarket was approached. In the laboratory experiment, the customers were approached by one of our experimenters and asked if they would like to participate in a study conducted by university researchers. The field experiments were done in collaboration with the supermarket, and the experimenters were employed by the supermarket. Therefore, in the field experiments the customers were approached by one of our experimenters dressed in a supermarket uniform and asked if they would like to participate in a campaign conducted by the supermarket. Since we want to keep the subject pool variations at a minimum, we only allowed students from Renmin University to participate and therefore all treatments began with a screening question asking whether or not they were students at the university.

We begin by describing the laboratory experiment treatments and then the field experiment treatments. The full scripts are presented in Appendix. Table 1 below summarizes the key features of the experimental design.

Table 1. Summary of the experimental design.

	Laboratory experiment	**Field experiment**
Windfall endowment	Treatment 1	Treatment 3
Non-windfall endowment	Treatment 2	Treatment 4

In the laboratory experiment treatments, subjects were asked to participate in an experiment conducted by the School of Economics at Renmin University at a scheduled time.[5]

[5] The recruitment procedure was the same in all experiments, and although the refusal rate was somewhat higher for Treatments 1 and 2, we do not expect any significant differences in subject pools due to the recruitment from a homogeneous subject pool consisting of students. Since the subjects in Treatments 2 and 4 answered the same survey, we can test whether there are any differences in a number of socio-economic characteristics. We cannot reject the hypothesis of equal means between Treatments 2 and 4 in the variables gender, age, education, and income by using a proportion test and t-tests respectively. However, not all of the recruited subjects showed up at their scheduled time in Treatments 1 and 2. If this is correlated with subject characteristics, we could have a

They were told they would receive 10 Yuan as a show-up payment if they agreed to participate. When subjects arrived at the lab, they were randomly assigned to either the windfall or the non-windfall treatment. In the treatment with windfall endowment (Treatment 1), an experimenter welcomed the subject who was then led to a cashier where the 50 Yuan was given in ten 5-Yuan notes. After the subject had received the money, the experimenter presented the opportunity to donate to the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation using the money that had just been received. The objectives of the foundation and for what purpose the donations would be used were then explained. At this point, the subjects were again told that the donation campaign was part of a research study. In order to ensure that the decision was anonymous, we put up a booth in which the subjects could make their decisions privately. The subjects were asked to leave any donation in a supplied envelope and keep the remaining money, then seal and put the envelope in an official donation box from the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation.[6]

The lab experiment with earned endowment (Treatment 2) was the same as Treatment 1 except that upon arriving at the lab the experimenter asked the subjects whether they would be willing to answer a survey on the use of plastic bags and their views on the supermarket in general. They were told that if they completed the survey they would receive 50 Yuan.[7] The subjects were again reminded that the donation campaign was part of a study conducted by researchers from the School of Economics. It was made clear that the money was a compensation for their time and effort. Once the survey had been completed, the experimenter asked the subject to follow along to the cashier, who paid the 50 Yuan in ten 5-Yuan notes. After the subject had received the money, the dictator game was conducted in exactly the same way as in Treatment 1.

In the field experiment with windfall endowment (Treatment 3), the experimenter informed the subject that the supermarket was conducting a "Thank you customer" campaign

---

difference in subject pool.

[6] The box could only be opened by a foundation representative, and subjects were clearly informed about this.

[7] The survey was a face-to-face interview with questions about the use of plastic bags. The reason why we asked about the use of plastic bags was that four months before the experiment, a new policy was implemented in China requiring all shops to charge money for plastic shopping bags. The survey took 20 minutes, and the experimenters were instructed to use the same amount of time for all surveys.

and that the subject had been randomly selected to receive 50 Yuan. In China, it is common that supermarkets conduct commercial campaigns to improve their customer relations, although in most cases vouchers valid at the supermarket are used rather than cash. In order to keep logistics the same, the money was given by the cashier. Once the subject had received the money, the experimenter explained that there was an opportunity to donate to the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation using the money that had just been received. The donation was made in private in a booth. In order to keep the differences between the laboratory and the field settings at a minimum, we used the same recruitment procedure, the same experimenters, the same payout and donation procedure, the same cashiers, the same charity and dictator game introduction script, and the same donation booth.

Finally, in the field experiment with earned endowment (Treatment 4), the experimenter asked the subjects if they would be willing to participate in a survey carried out by the supermarket on the use of plastic bags and on views on the supermarket in general. The survey was exactly the same as in Treatment 2. They were told that if they chose to participate, they would be paid 50 Yuan in cash. It was made clear that the money was a compensation for their time and effort. Once the survey had been completed, the experimenter asked the subject to follow along to the cashier, who paid the 50 Yuan in ten 5-Yuan notes. After the subject had received his/her earnings, the dictator game was conducted in the same way as in the previous treatments.

We used the same experimenters in all treatments, i.e., female university students not from Renmin University of China. The cashiers who handed out the money were always the same male students (not from Renmin University of China). Each experimenter and cashier conducted the same number of experiments in each treatment. The supermarket where the experiments were conducted is the largest supermarket on the campus of Renmin University with around 1,000 customers per day. Treatments 3 and 4 were conducted first over a two-day period. Then the recruitments to Treatments 1 and 2 were made over a two-day period, and the lab experiments were conducted during the two days that followed.

3. Results

In total 211 subjects participated in the experiments. Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics of the donations for all treatments. The mean donation amount and the share of subjects donating the whole endowment of 50 Yuan vary considerably across treatments.[8] In the standard dictator game (Treatment 1), the average donation is 37.1 Yuan, corresponding to 74% of the endowment. In the other three treatments, the donations are much lower. The mean donations are higher in the laboratory experiment treatments (Treatments 1-2) than in the field experiment treatments (Treatments 3-4). This is to a large extent explained by a higher fraction of subjects donating everything in the laboratory experiments.

Table 2. Description of donation behavior for each treatment.

	Treatment 1	**Treatment 2**	**Treatment 3**	**Treatment 4**
	Lab experiment with windfall	Lab experiment without windfall	Field experiment with windfall	Field experiment without windfall
Mean	37.1	14.5	18.6	9.5
Standard Deviation	17.8	14.7	16.4	9.7
Share of zero donations	0%	6%	0%	10%
Share donating everything (50 Yuan)	61%	7%	14%	2%
Number of observations	54	54	53	50
Mean (if donation is above zero and below 50)	16.9	12.4	12.2	9.7
Standard deviation (if donation is above zero and below 50)	11.7	11.0	10.6	9.7
Number of observations	21	47	44	44

Table 3 reports the results from statistical tests of the effects of windfall money in lab and the field environments. We conduct a Wilcoxon rank-sum test of equality of distributions for amounts donated as well as a t-test to test for mean differences across treatments. Moreover, we test the hypothesis of equally sized zero-Yuan and 50-Yuan donation shares and perform rank-sum tests and t-tests for amount donated conditional on giving a positive amount but less

[8] Since we could not limit the individual donations to 50, particularly not in the field setting, we have three subjects who donated more than 50 Yuan. We truncate these donations at 50 Yuan.

than 50 Yuan.

We can reject the null hypothesis of no effect of windfall gain both in the lab and in the field. In both cases, the mean donation is significantly lower when the subjects have to earn their endowment, and this is largely explained by the large difference in share of subjects donating 50 Yuan. The proportion of subjects giving 0 or 50 Yuan is significantly different between windfall and non-windfall at the 5% significance level for both the lab and the field experiments, except for the proportion of subjects giving 0 Yuan in the lab. However, there is no difference in the amount donated if the two extreme values of donating either nothing (0 Yuan) or fully (50 Yuan) are removed. This is true for both the lab and the field experiments. Consequently, in both the lab and the field, the major effect of introducing non-windfall endowment is that it increases the share of zero donations and decreases the share of full (50 Yuan) donations.

Table 3. Test of difference between windfall and non-windfall.

	Windfall vs. earned in the lab	**Windfall vs. earned in the field**
Treatments	1 vs. 2	3 vs. 4
Differences in mean	22.6	9.1
t-test test (p-value)	0.000	0.006
Rank-sum test (p-value)	0.000	0.001
Differences in proportion giving 0 Yuan	-0.06	-0.1
Proportional test (p-value)	0.079	0.018
Differences in proportion giving 50 Yuan	0.54	0.12
Proportional test (p-value)	0.000	0.010
Differences in mean donation if above zero and below 50 Yuan	4.5	2.5
T-test test (p-value)	0.132	0.204
Rank-sum test (p-value)	0.085	0.377

Finally, Table 4 reports the statistical test results of the null hypothesis of no difference between the lab and the field, conditional on that the endowment was obtained in the same manner. We can reject the hypothesis of equal donation amounts for both the windfall and the earned endowment treatments. However, the difference is much smaller when the endowment is earned. If the extreme donations are deleted, the difference in mean donations is reduced substantially. For the two treatments with earned endowment, the difference in mean donations is not significant using both a t-test and a rank-sum test. For the two treatments with windfall endowment, the difference is significant using a rank-sum test, but not significant using a t-test.

Table 4. Test of differences between the lab and field experiment contexts.

	Lab vs. field with windfall endowment	**Lab vs. field with earned endowment**
Treatments	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 4
Differences in mean	18.5	5.0
T-test test (p-value)	0.000	0.044
Rank-sum test (p-value)	0.000	0.038
Differences in proportion giving 0 Yuan	0	-0.04
Proportional test (p-value)	n.a.	0.395
Differences in proportion giving 50 Yuan	0.47	0.05
Proportional test (p-value)	0.000	0.198
Differences in mean donation if above zero and below 50 Yuan	4.7	2.7
T-test test (p-value)	0.109	0.168
Rank-sum test (p-value)	0.061	0.126

4. Conclusions

The present paper investigates how behavior is affected by laboratory and field environments as well as by windfall endowments. By using a dictator game and the same set-up between laboratory and field experiments, we can in a clean way compare the two settings. In particular we are able to compare them conditional on how the endowment is obtained. First, we find a substantial and significant difference in behavior between using windfall and earned endowment both in the lab and in the field. The absolute and relative differences are larger in the lab environment, but this can partly be due to the overall higher contribution levels in the lab. Consequently, the strong effects of windfall money found in previous lab experiment studies are not only an artifact of lab experiments. Even outside the lab, subjects consider how the endowment is obtained, and are much less pro-social when the endowment is earned. Second, there are sizeable and significant differences in behavior between the lab and the field, in particular with windfall endowment. The differences are smaller, but still significant, when non-windfall money is used. The present study is a first attempt to investigate the issue of windfall gain in different experimental environments, keeping other things constant apart from the basic characteristics of lab and field environments. Future studies are needed to understand how sensitive our results are to using different donation recipients, and at a more general level how different games, e.g., public games, are affected by these design features. However, if it is important to achieve a similarity in behavior between the lab and the field, earned endowments should be used in the lab as well.

References

Antonovics, K., P. Arcidiacono and R. Walsh, 2009, The effects of gender interactions in the lab and in the field, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91, 152-162.

Arkes, H., C. Joyner, and M. Pezzo, 1994, The psychology of windfall gains, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 59, 331-347.

Bardsley, N., 2008, Dictator game giving: Altruism or artifact? *Experimental Economics*, 11, 122-133.

Benz, M. and S. Meier, 2008, Do People Behave in Experiments as in The Field? – Evidence from Donations, *Experimental Economics* 11, 268-281.

Camerer, C., 2003, Behavioral Game Theory, Princeton University Press, Scottsdale.

Carpenter, J., C. Collonny and C. Knowles Myers, 2008, Altruistic behavior in a representative dictator experiment, *Experimental Economics* 11, 282-298.

Carpenter, J. and E. Seki, 2009, Do social preferences increase productivity? Field experimental evidence from fishermen in Toyama bay, *Economic Inquiry*, Forthcoming.

Carpenter, J., E. Verhoogen and S. Burks, 2005, The effect of stakes in distribution experiments, *Economics Letters* 86, 393-398.

Cherry, T.L., P. Frykblom and J. F. Shogren, 2002, Hardnose the Dictator. *The American Economic Review* 92, 1218-1221.

Cherry, T.L., S. Kroll and J.F. Shogren, 2005, The impact of endowment heterogeneity and origin on public good contributions: evidence from the lab, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 57, 357–365.

Clark, J., 2002, House money effects in public good experiments, *Experimental Economics* 5, 223-231.

Eckel, C.C. and P.J. Grossman. 1996, Altruism in Anonymous Dictator Games, *Games and Economic Behavior* 16, 181–191.

Fehr, E. and J. List, 2004, The hidden costs and returns of incentives-trust and trustworthiness among CEOs, *Journal of the European Economic Association* 2, 743-771.

Harrison, G. (2007) House money effects in public good experiments: Comment. *Experimental Economics* 10, 429-437.

Karlan, D., 2006, Using experimental economics to measure social capital and predict financial decisions, *American Economic Review* 95, 1688-1699.

Konow, J., 2000, Fair shares: Accountability and cognitive dissonance in allocation decisions, *American Economic Review* 90, 1072-1091.

Kroll, S., T.L. Cherry and J. Shogren, 2007, The impact of endowment heterogeneity and origin on contributions in best-shot public good games, *Experimental Economics* 10, 411-428.

Laury, S. and L. Taylor, 2008, Altruism spillovers: Are behaviors in context-free experiments predictive of altruism toward a naturally occurring public good?, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 65, 9-29.

Levitt, S. D., and J.A. List, 2007, What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21, 153–74.

List, J. 2006, The Behaviouralist Meets the Market: Measuring Social Preferences and Reputation Effects in Actual Transactions, *Journal of Political Economy* 114, 1-37.

List, J.A., 2007, On the interpretation of giving in dictator games, *Journal of Political Economy* 115, 482-493.

List, J., R. Berrens, A. Bohara and J. Kerkvilet, 2004. Examining the role of social isolation on stated preferences. *American Economic Review* 94, 741–752.

Oxoby, R.J. and J. Spraggon, 2008, Mine and yours: Property Rights in Dictator Games, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 65, 703-713.

Rege, M. and K. Telle, 2004. The impact of social approval and framing on cooperation in public good situations. *Journal of Public Economics* 88, 1625–1644.

Ruffle, B.J., 1998, More is better, but fair is fair: Tipping in dictator and ultimatum games. *Games and Economic Behavior* 22, 247-265.

Smith, V. L., 2009, Theory and Experiment: What Are the Questions? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, forthcoming.

Soetevent, A.R., 2005. Anonymity in giving in a natural context: An economic field experiment in thirty churches. *Journal of Public Economics* 89, 2301–2323.

Thaler, R. and E. Johnson (1990). Gambling with the house money and trying to break even: The effects of prior outcomes on risky choice. *Management Science* 36, 643-660.

Appendix Script

Recruitment

Treatment	
1,2	*"Good morning/afternoon! I am an enumerator from the School of Economics. Are you a student at this university?"*
3, 4	*"Good morning/afternoon! I am a representative from Wu-mart Supermarket. Are you a student at this university?"*

All	IF NO: "*I'm sorry for having disturbed you, but we are only looking for students from this university*" Terminate the campaign without payment.

1,2	IF YES: *"The School of Economics is conducting a study. The study will be conducted this Wednesday and Thursday in the Ming De building classroom 405, which is close to here. All in all it will last a few minutes. We will pay you 10 Yuan for showing up at a scheduled time. If you want to participate, let us make an appointment that is convenient for you. Do you have time to participate?"*
3	IF YES: *"To show our appreciation to our customers we are conducting a 'Thank you customer' campaign. Do you have time to participate?"*
4	IF YES: *"Wu-mart Supermarket is conducting a survey about the use of plastic shopping bags and your opinion about the campus supermarket. The survey will last about 20 minutes. If you participate, we will pay you 50 Yuan in cash after you have completed the survey as compensation for your work with answering the survey. Do you have time to participate?"*

All	IF NO: *"That's alright. Thank you anyway."* Terminate the campaign here without payment.

1,2	IF YES: *"Thank you for participating in this research study! Could you please let me see your receipt?"* Receive his/her receipt and have a look at it and keep it. *Let's make an appointment. The study will be conducted this Wednesday and Thursday in the Ming De building classroom 405. What time are you available on these days?"* Check the answer with the available times slots on the list. *"Could you please come on …. (day) at…. (time)?"* If YES continue. If NO, check another time and ask. If NO again, show the list of available times and ask what time would be convenient to come. --- IF SUBJECT CANNOT PARTICIPATE: because of not being able to make an appointment at the available times: *"Thank you anyway. I understand."* Terminate the campaign here without payment. IF SUBJECT CAN PARTICIPATE: "*Ok, so you will come on …. (day) at … (time) to the Ming De building classroom 405*." Fill in a confirmation card and write down the appointment in the time schedule. *"Here is your confirmation card. Since we cannot remind you again, please don't forget to come on time and bring this card with you. Thank you."* Hand over the card. [Tell the subject he/she will be returned the receipt when he/she comes to participate in the research study if he/she asks for the receipt.] Pack up all the appointment files and paste his/her receipt behind the enumerator's part of the confirmation card.
3	IF YES: *"Thank you for participating in this campaign! Could you please let me see your receipt?"* Receive his/her receipt, have a look at it and keep it.
4	IF YES: *"Thank you for participating in this survey! Could you please let me see your receipt?"* Receive his/her receipt, have a look at it and keep it.

Experiment

1	*"Hello, are you here for participating in the study conducted by the School of Economics?"* IF YES: *"Could you give me your confirmation card?"* Take card, check the card. [If he/she cannot show the card, ask him/her what time his/her appointment time was and check the schedule. If appointment EXISTS continue. If NOT, ask the person to leave.] "*Please come with me.*" Go to interview room. Check the campaign number on the card and take the file with the same number. [check this carefully] *"Thank you for coming here to participate in the research conducted by the School of Economics. At the end of the study we will pay you 10 Yuan for showing up at the scheduled time. In this study by the School of Economics, we would like to give you 50 Yuan."*
2	*"Hello, are you here for participating in the study conducted by the School of Economics?"* IF YES: *"Could you give me your confirmation card?"* Take card, check the card. [If he/she cannot show the card, ask them what their appointment time was and check the schedule. If appointment EXISTS continue. If NOT, ask the person to leave.] "*Please come with me.*" Go to interview room. Check the campaign number on the card and take the file with the same number. [check this carefully] *"Thank you for coming here to participate in the research conducted by the School of Economics. At the end of the study we will pay you 10 Yuan for showing up at the scheduled time. The thing is, the School of Economics is conducting a survey about the use of plastic shopping bags and your opinion about the campus supermarket. The survey will last about 20 minutes. If you participate, we will pay you an extra 50 Yuan in cash after you have completed the survey as compensation for your work with answering the survey. Do you have time to participate?"* IF NO: *"I understand. Thank you anyway. Please come with me to the cashier to get the 10 Yuan."* Lead the subject to the cashier. *"Here is the confirmation card and receipt. Please give him/her the 10 Yuan for showing up."* Hand over the card and the receipt to the cashier and be prepared to sign the form. Cashier: Take card and receipt, and write down the number of the receipt in the form. Let the enumerator sign the form. Take out two 5-Yuan bills from the money box and count them. (These two 5-Yuan bills should have been prepared in advance, so that you only show the subject the two 5-Yuan bills when they come to you.) Cashier: "*Here is your money*" Hand over the money to the subject. *"Let me sign the form."* Sign the form. "*Ok, we are done*." Terminate the campaign. When the subject has left, the enumerator needs to write down the gender on the script page. IF YES: *"Thank you for participating in this survey!"* Conduct the survey *"As compensation for your work with answering the survey by the School of Economics, we would like to give you 50 Yuan."*
3	*"To show our appreciation in this "Thank you customer" campaign, the Wu-mart supermarket would like to give you 50 Yuan."*
4	Conduct the survey *"As compensation for your work with answering the survey by the Wu-mart Supermarket, the Wu-mart supermarket would like to give you 50 Yuan."*

All	*"Please come with me to the cashier to get the money."* Lead the subject to the cashier. *"Here is the receipt"* Give receipt to the cashier and be prepared to sign the form. Cashier: Take receipt and write down the number of the receipt in the form. Let the enumerator sign the form. Take out ten 5-yuan bills from the moneybox and count them. (These ten 5-Yuan bills should have been prepared in advance, so that you only show them subject the ten 5-Yuan bills). Cashier: "*Here is your money*" Hand over the money to the subject. *"Let me sign the form."* Sign the form. "*Ok, we are done.*" Enumerator: Make sure that you stand behind the subject, so that when you start talking, the subject has to turn around, facing you but not the cashier. Preferably walk away a few meters from the cashier.

1,2	*"We are doing a research study on a donation campaign. The donations will be used for covering expenditures for advertisement material for collecting money for the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation. The Foundation is a nationwide charitable organization working on poverty alleviation. Before you leave, you have the opportunity to donate money to the foundation. Over there is a donation box. Please come with me."* Lead the subject to the booth and show the donation box to him/her. *"This is a donation box from the foundation. The donations will be deposited into a special account for covering administrative expenditures for collecting money for the foundation. Your donation is anonymous."* *"Here is a donation envelope from the foundation."* Take out the envelope and hand it over it to the subject. "*When I have walked away from here, please go in the booth and leave the money you want to donate in the envelope. Keep the remaining money for yourself and pocket it. Seal the envelope and put it into the donation box. Then go to the place where you received the 50 Yuan to collect your extra 10 Yuan for showing up. Thank you! Goodbye."* Walk away from the donation booth.
3,4	*"We are doing a donation campaign. The donations will be used for covering expenditures for advertisement material for collecting money for the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation. The Foundation is a nationwide charitable organization working on poverty alleviation. Before you leave, you have the opportunity to donate money to the foundation. Over there is a donation box. Please come with me."* Lead the subject to the booth and show the donation box to him/her. *"This is a donation box from the foundation. The donations will be deposited to a special account for covering administrative expenditures for collecting money for the Foundation. Your donation is anonymous."* *"Here is a donation envelope from the foundation."* Take out the envelope and hand it over it to the subject. "*When I have walked away from here, please go in the booth and leave the money you want to donate in the envelope. Keep the remaining money for yourself and pocket it. Seal the envelope and put it into the donation box. Thank you! Goodbye."* Walk away from the donation booth.