Variables used in the Regressions:

Variable Names	Meaning
Default Present = Yes	1 =Any default present, 0 otherwise
Default Level = None	No default present
Reactance	Average of 11 items on Hong and Faeda (1996) Reactance scale
Income	Income categories; 1= under $30K, 2=$30-50K, 3 = $50-80K, 4=$80-110K, 5=$110-140K, 6 = above $140K
Default Size	Amount of defaulted option (in dollars)
Default Order	Order of the defaulted option within the menu
Num Options	Number of options on the donation menu
Default Framing	Suggested donation (1) vs. randomly generated default (-1) with control set to 0
Org Favorability	Average rating, on a 1 ("Very Unfavorable") to 5 ("Highly Favorable" scale, of the organization in the pre-test (Appendix D).
Org Appeal	Average amount, out of $1000, allocated to charity in the pre-test
Positive Info	1 = positive information presented, 0 = neutral/negative/no information presented
Negative Default Attitudes	Average of two items ("trying to determine your choice for you", "felt like a heavy-handed direction"), rated on a 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree") scale
Positive Default Attitudes	Average of "coming from a trustworthy source", "felt like a helpful guidance", "useful to you in making your donation decision" on 1-5 scale
Charity Attitudes	Average of three items: trustworthiness and favorability (rated on a 1 to 5 scale) and fit with personal goals (rated on 1 to 3 scale)
Org Pos Charity	Average rating on Charity Attitudes (above) of the organization in the pre-test
Donation Attitudes	Average rating of 10 items, rated on a 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree") scale
Low Default Level	Low Default =1, 0 Otherwise
Medium Default Level	Medium Default =1, 0 Otherwise
High Default Level	High Default =1, 0 Otherwise
Default Level = Medium or High	Medium or High Defaults = 1, 0 Otherwise
Designated Options = 5	1=Five allocation options, 0=Two allocation options
Reminder = Yes	1=Reminder about last donation amount, 0 otherwise
Consec. Yrs. of Giving to AF	Number of consecutive years of giving to the Annual Fund
Age	Age of the Donor in Years
Male	Male=1, Female=0
Donated Last Year	Last year, but not yet in the current year
Log Lifetime Amt. to AF	Total Amount donated to the Annual Fund over Donor's lifetime
Log Lifetime Amt. to School	Total Amount donated to the School over the Donor's lifetime
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	Value of the middle option in the menu = last donation amount

Table A1: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.545	0.613	0.889	.376
Default Present = Yes	0.535	0.749	0.715	.476
Default Present X Reactance	-0.005	0.203	-0.025	.980
Reactance	-0.182	0.250	-0.727	.469

Table A2: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.464	0.457	1.015	.313
Default Present = Yes	0.654	0.558	1.172	.244
Default Present X Reactance	0.038	0.151	0.249	.804
Reactance	-0.241	0.187	-1.290	.201

Table A3: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.121	0.747	1.500	.140
Default Present = Yes	-0.224	0.940	-0.238	.813
Default Present X Reactance	-0.067	0.246	-0.273	.786
Reactance	0.111	0.320	0.346	.731

Table A4: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.900	0.491	1.833	.070
Default Present = Yes	-0.008	0.193	-0.040	.968
Default Size	0.006	0.268	0.022	.982
Default Size x Reactance	0.000	0.090	-0.002	.999
Reactance	-0.125	0.161	-0.775	.440

Table A5: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.962	0.361	2.666	.009
Default Present = Yes	0.119	0.142	0.837	.405
Default Size	-0.113	0.197	-0.574	.568
Default Size x Reactance	0.005	0.066	0.080	.936
Reactance	-0.130	0.118	-1.103	.273

Table A6: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Reactance (Study 1)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.064	0.616	1.726	.091
Default Present = Yes	-0.222	0.223	-0.996	.325
Default Size	0.148	0.313	0.473	.639
Default Size x Reactance	0.022	0.109	0.199	.843
Reactance	-0.048	0.201	-0.238	.813

Table A7: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.814	0.254	18.972	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-0.223	0.198	-1.131	0.258
Study 2b fixed effect	-0.636	0.338	-1.882	0.060
Study 2c fixed effect	-0.43	0.433	-0.995	0.320
Study 2e fixed effect	0.709	0.316	2.245	0.025
Study 2e fixed effect	-0.446	0.264	-1.686	0.092
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.262	0.301	-4.200	<.001

Table A8: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.557	.024	22.855	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.002	.019	-.081	.935
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.157	.031
Study 2c fixed effect	-.006	.042	-.142	.887
Study 2e fixed effect	.251	.030	8.266	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.187	.025	7.354	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.011	.029	-.387	.699

Table A9: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.703	.318	27.338	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.445	.230	-1.936	.053
Study 2b fixed effect	-.105	.439	-.240	.810
Study 2c fixed effect	-.736	.543	-1.355	.176
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.726	.363	-4.754	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.705	.317	-8.525	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.152	.376	-5.719	<.001

Table A10: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.308	.278	15.488	<.001
Default Level = None	.469	.233	2.015	.044
Default Size	.031	.015	1.996	.046
Study 2b fixed effect	-.636	.338	-1.884	.060
Study 2c fixed effect	-.533	.435	-1.223	.221
Study 2e fixed effect	.835	.322	2.593	.010
Study 2e fixed effect	-.328	.271	-1.210	.226
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.256	.300	-4.182	<.001

Table A11: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.598	.027	22.394	<.001
Default Level = None	-.035	.022	-1.577	.115
Default Size	-.005	.001	-3.118	.002
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.157	.031
Study 2c fixed effect	.009	.042	.226	.822
Study 2e fixed effect	.232	.031	7.507	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.169	.026	6.504	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.012	.029	-.419	.675

Table A12: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.420	.329	22.575	<.001
Default Level = None	1.133	.260	4.357	<.001
Default Size	.097	.018	5.537	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.039	.436	-.089	.929
Study 2c fixed effect	-1.052	.543	-1.939	.053
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.350	.367	-3.680	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.370	.321	-7.380	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.179	.374	-5.827	<.001

Table A13: Regression Predicting Effect of Reactance on Revenue per Person (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	-.817	.123	-6.644	<.001
Reactance	-.640	.336	-1.904	.057
Study 2b fixed effect	-.367	.430	-.853	.394
Study 2c fixed effect	.663	.311	2.131	.033
Study 2e fixed effect	-.473	.258	-1.835	.067
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.253	.297	-4.222	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.817	.123	-6.644	<.001

Table A14: Regression Predicting Effect of Reactance on Donation Rate (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.726	.041	17.671	<.001
Reactance	-.058	.012	-4.863	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.071	.032	-2.199	.028
Study 2c fixed effect	.000	.041	-.011	.991
Study 2e fixed effect	.251	.030	8.365	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.189	.025	7.608	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.008	.029	-.277	.782

Table A15: Regression Predicting Effect of Reactance on Average Donation (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	10.502	.510	20.610	<.001
Reactance	-.716	.146	-4.905	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.084	.438	-.193	.847
Study 2c fixed effect	-.627	.541	-1.159	.247
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.800	.360	-5.003	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.764	.313	-8.837	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.159	.373	-5.781	<.001

Table A16: Regression Predicting Effect of Income on Revenue per Person (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.092	.267	15.310	<.001
Income	.320	.078	4.095	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.647	.337	-1.918	.055
Study 2c fixed effect	-.239	.435	-.551	.582
Study 2e fixed effect	.520	.332	1.566	.117
Study 2e fixed effect	-.512	.259	-1.978	.048
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.316	.298	-4.418	<.001

Table A17: Regression Predicting Effect of Income on Donation Rate (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.528	.026	20.459	<.001
Income	.015	.008	2.036	.042
Study 2b fixed effect	-.072	.033	-2.198	.028
Study 2c fixed effect	.004	.042	.093	.926
Study 2e fixed effect	.251	.032	7.816	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.186	.025	7.454	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.012	.029	-.420	.675

Table A18: Regression Predicting Effect of Income on Average Donation (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.784	.328	23.728	<.001
Income	.339	.090	3.770	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.092	.440	-.210	.834
Study 2c fixed effect	-.486	.547	-.890	.374
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.971	.379	-5.195	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.801	.314	-8.919	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.246	.375	-5.989	<.001

Table A19: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.644	.829	9.216	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.749	.911	-.822	.411
Default Present X Reactance	.168	.298	.565	.572
Reactance	-.951	.263	-3.616	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.631	.336	-1.876	.061
Study 2c fixed effect	-.351	.430	-.817	.414
Study 2e fixed effect	.712	.314	2.264	.024
Study 2e fixed effect	-.410	.263	-1.561	.119
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.213	.299	-4.056	<.001

Table A20: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.722	.080	9.037	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.005	.088	.053	.958
Default Present X Reactance	-.003	.029	-.094	.925
Reactance	-.056	.025	-2.191	.029
Study 2b fixed effect	-.071	.032	-2.197	.028
Study 2c fixed effect	.000	.041	-.005	.996
Study 2e fixed effect	.252	.030	8.310	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.190	.025	7.487	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.007	.029	-.250	.802

Table A21: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	11.379	1.000	11.377	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-1.175	1.082	-1.085	.278
Default Present X Reactance	.245	.359	.683	.495
Reactance	-.912	.319	-2.860	.004
Study 2b fixed effect	-.087	.438	-.199	.842
Study 2c fixed effect	-.649	.541	-1.200	.230
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.740	.362	-4.812	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.682	.316	-8.484	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.103	.375	-5.611	<.001

Table A22: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.176	.385	10.850	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.139	.388	-.359	.720
Default Present X Income	-.004	.178	-.022	.982
Income	.321	.155	2.077	.038
Study 2b fixed effect	-.644	.338	-1.908	.056
Study 2c fixed effect	-.231	.435	-.530	.596
Study 2e fixed effect	.552	.335	1.647	.100
Study 2e fixed effect	-.472	.264	-1.787	.074
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.290	.300	-4.296	<.001

Table A23: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.539	.037	14.495	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.014	.037	-.379	.704
Default Present X Income	.008	.017	.484	.629
Income	.009	.015	.613	.540
Study 2b fixed effect	-.071	.033	-2.191	.029
Study 2c fixed effect	.004	.042	.093	.926
Study 2e fixed effect	.251	.032	7.747	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.186	.026	7.284	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.012	.029	-.423	.672

Table A24: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.840	.481	16.286	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.122	.470	-.260	.795
Default Present X Income	-.126	.215	-.588	.556
Income	.433	.190	2.278	.023
Study 2b fixed effect	-.101	.440	-.229	.819
Study 2c fixed effect	-.495	.547	-.905	.365
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.920	.381	-5.034	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.730	.317	-8.600	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.196	.376	-5.833	<.001

Table A25: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	6.521	.545	11.964	<.001
Default Level = None	.511	.231	2.206	.027
Default Size	.070	.060	1.165	.244
Default Size x Reactance	-.012	.019	-.638	.523
Reactance	-.761	.158	-4.806	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.638	.336	-1.899	.058
Study 2c fixed effect	-.455	.433	-1.052	.293
Study 2d fixed effect	.855	.320	2.670	.008
Study 2e fixed effect	-.276	.269	-1.024	.306
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.196	.299	-4.002	<.001

Table A26: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.758	.052	14.433	<.001
Default Level = None	-.032	.022	-1.428	.153
Default Size	-.003	.006	-.562	.574
Default Size x Reactance	.000	.002	-.201	.840
Reactance	-.055	.015	-3.599	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.071	.032	-2.195	.028
Study 2c fixed effect	.014	.042	.348	.728
Study 2d fixed effect	.234	.031	7.575	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.173	.026	6.661	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.008	.029	-.280	.779

Table A27: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Reactance (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	9.295	.638	14.559	<.001
Default Level = None	1.146	.259	4.428	<.001
Default Size	.144	.072	2.002	.045
Default Size x Reactance	-.016	.023	-.661	.509
Reactance	-.650	.185	-3.514	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.021	.435	-.047	.962
Study 2c fixed effect	-.951	.541	-1.760	.079
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.343	.365	-3.674	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.327	.320	-7.276	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.113	.372	-5.674	<.001

Table A28: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	3.881	.334	11.636	<.001
Default Level = None	.393	.237	1.658	.097
Default Size	.003	.027	.124	.902
Default Size x Income	.015	.012	1.215	.225
Income	.247	.099	2.505	.012
Study 2b fixed effect	-.640	.337	-1.897	.058
Study 2c fixed effect	-.272	.440	-.618	.537
Study 2d fixed effect	.684	.341	2.007	.045
Study 2e fixed effect	-.355	.271	-1.310	.190
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.283	.300	-4.276	<.001

Table A29: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.583	.032	18.127	<.001
Default Level = None	-.041	.023	-1.785	.074
Default Size	-.007	.003	-2.551	.011
Default Size x Income	.001	.001	.870	.384
Income	.010	.010	1.039	.299
Study 2b fixed effect	-.071	.033	-2.185	.029
Study 2c fixed effect	.024	.042	.559	.576
Study 2d fixed effect	.231	.033	7.022	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.167	.026	6.385	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.013	.029	-.462	.644

Table A30: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Income (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	6.927	.391	17.699	<.001
Default Level = None	1.078	.266	4.056	<.001
Default Size	.072	.032	2.208	.027
Default Size x Income	.016	.015	1.070	.285
Income	.266	.112	2.371	.018
Study 2b fixed effect	-.021	.437	-.048	.962
Study 2c fixed effect	-.775	.548	-1.414	.157
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.511	.385	-3.922	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.386	.321	-7.425	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.230	.374	-5.964	<.001

Table A31: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Controlling for Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.334	.337	12.846	<.001
Default Level = None	.449	.310	1.448	.148
Default Size	.035	.042	.845	.398
Default Order	-.110	.793	-.139	.889
Study 2b fixed effect	-.636	.336	-1.893	.058
Study 2c fixed effect	-.753	.561	-1.343	.179
Study 2d fixed effect	.837	.321	2.610	.009
Study 2e fixed effect	-.317	.278	-1.140	.254
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.259	.301	-4.180	<.001

Table A32: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Controlling for Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.601	.032	18.484	<.001
Default Level = None	-.039	.030	-1.320	.187
Default Size	-.004	.004	-.985	.325
Default Order	-.010	.076	-.136	.892
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.164	.031
Study 2c fixed effect	.033	.054	.614	.539
Study 2d fixed effect	.232	.031	7.519	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.170	.027	6.343	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.013	.029	-.447	.655

Table A33: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Controlling for Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.403	.390	18.999	<.001
Default Level = None	1.193	.351	3.404	.001
Default Size	.091	.047	1.931	.054
Default Order	.083	.878	.095	.924
Study 2b fixed effect	-.040	.435	-.093	.926
Study 2c fixed effect	-1.761	.688	-2.558	.011
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.353	.366	-3.700	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.375	.329	-7.222	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.167	.374	-5.799	<.001

Table A34: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.264	.341	12.502	<.001
Default Level = None	.555	.319	1.740	.082
Default Size	.232	.146	1.593	.111
Default Order	-.268	.800	-.335	.738
Default Size x Default Order	-.183	.130	-1.409	.159
Study 2b fixed effect	-.635	.336	-1.889	.059
Study 2c fixed effect	-.749	.561	-1.336	.182
Study 2d fixed effect	.839	.321	2.619	.009
Study 2e fixed effect	-.348	.279	-1.248	.212
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.422	.323	-4.408	<.001

Table A35: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.604	.033	18.400	<.001
Default Level = None	-.045	.031	-1.471	.141
Default Size	-.015	.014	-1.049	.294
Default Order	-.002	.077	-.022	.982
Default Size x Default Order	.010	.013	.799	.424
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.166	.030
Study 2c fixed effect	.033	.054	.610	.542
Study 2d fixed effect	.232	.031	7.514	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.171	.027	6.386	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.004	.031	-.130	.897

Table A36: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Default Order (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.304	.391	18.686	<.001
Default Level = None	1.372	.356	3.848	<.001
Default Size	.561	.183	3.069	.002
Default Order	-.489	.903	-.541	.588
Default Size x Default Order	-.429	.161	-2.663	.008
Study 2b fixed effect	-.042	.434	-.097	.923
Study 2c fixed effect	-1.760	.687	-2.561	.010
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.360	.365	-3.725	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.442	.329	-7.414	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.551	.400	-6.376	<.001

Table A37: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Number of Menu Options (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	3.216	.467	6.889	<.001
Default Level = None	.870	.316	2.755	.006
Default Size	.142	.041	3.453	.001
Num Options	.178	.068	2.610	.009
Default Size x Num Options	-.019	.007	-2.668	.008
Study 2b fixed effect	-.644	.342	-1.880	.060
Study 2e fixed effect	-.420	.320	-1.310	.190

(Studies 2a, 2b and 2e only)

Table A38: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Number of Menu Options (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.458	.044	10.448	<.001
Default Level = None	-.005	.030	-.184	.854
Default Size	-.001	.004	-.364	.716
Num Options	.035	.006	5.461	<.001
Default Size x Num Options	.000	.001	-.682	.495
Study 2b fixed effect	-.072	.032	-2.166	.030
Study 2e fixed effect	.075	.030	-.130	.897

(Studies 2a, 2b and 2e only)

Table A39: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Number of Menu Options (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.321	.542	13.500	<.001
Default Level = None	1.432	.329	4.360	<.001
Default Size	.331	.053	6.285	<.001
Num Options	-.132	.078	-1.702	.089
Default Size x Num Options	-.041	.009	-4.634	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	.061	.431	.141	.888
Study 2e fixed effect	-1.320	.354	-3.731	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b and 2e only)

Table A40: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Default Framed as Suggested (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.883	.369	24.057	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-1.010	.288	-3.502	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	.055	.535	.103	.918
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.604	.453	-3.539	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.770	.393	-7.040	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A41: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Default Framed as Suggested (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	6.715	.424	15.827	<.001
Default Level = None	1.912	.330	5.799	<.001
Default Size	.150	.028	5.427	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	.151	.529	.286	.775
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.149	.455	-2.524	.012
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.408	.394	-6.106	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A42: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Default Framed as Suggested (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	3.707	.372	9.962	<.001
Default Level = None	1.020	.311	3.275	.001
Default Size	.070	.025	2.834	.005
Study 2b fixed effect	-.524	.410	-1.278	.201
Study 2d fixed effect	1.267	.409	3.098	.002
Study 2e fixed effect	-.192	.339	-.568	.570

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A43: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Default Framed as Random (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.752	.385	22.704	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.407	.297	-1.370	.171
Study 2b fixed effect	.020	.558	.035	.972
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.577	.475	-3.317	.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.454	.415	-5.912	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A44: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Default Framed as Random (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.793	.452	17.234	<.001
Default Level = None	.837	.343	2.443	.015
Default Size	.074	.030	2.503	.012
Study 2b fixed effect	.046	.557	.082	.935
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.381	.481	-2.874	.004
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.264	.421	-5.379	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A45: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Default Framed as Random (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.134	.388	10.653	<.001
Default Level = None	.462	.321	1.437	.151
Default Size	.016	.026	.619	.536
Study 2b fixed effect	-.429	.425	-1.009	.313
Study 2d fixed effect	1.108	.420	2.638	.008
Study 2e fixed effect	.222	.355	.625	.532

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A46: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.903	.266	18.416	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.370	.231	-1.604	.109
Default Framing	-.155	.106	-1.455	.146
Study 2b fixed effect	-.635	.343	-1.853	.064
Study 2d fixed effect	.735	.322	2.284	.022
Study 2e fixed effect	-.409	.270	-1.514	.130

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A47: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.556	.025	22.619	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.000	.021	-.002	.999
Default Framing	.011	.010	1.083	.279
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.206	.028
Study 2d fixed effect	.251	.030	8.450	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.187	.025	7.479	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A48: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.887	.330	26.938	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.707	.260	-2.720	.007
Default Framing	-.332	.118	-2.821	.005
Study 2b fixed effect	-.117	.443	-.265	.791
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.697	.367	-4.629	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.670	.321	-8.317	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A49: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.198	.294	14.283	<.001
Default Level = None	.639	.263	2.424	.015
Default Size	.037	.018	2.084	.037
Default Framing	-.339	.148	-2.287	.022
Default Size x Framing	.030	.017	1.732	.083
Study 2b fixed effect	-.631	.342	-1.843	.065
Study 2d fixed effect	.885	.329	2.691	.007
Study 2e fixed effect	-.278	.278	-1.003	.316

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A50: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rates, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.607	.027	22.386	<.001
Default Level = None	-.041	.024	-1.684	.092
Default Size	-.006	.002	-3.486	<.001
Default Framing	.013	.014	.916	.360
Default Size x Framing	-.000034	.002	-.111	.912
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.204	.028
Study 2d fixed effect	.229	.030	7.529	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.166	.026	6.474	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A51: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation, Depending on Default Framing (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.241	.339	21.347	<.001
Default Level = None	1.395	.285	4.899	<.001
Default Size	.113	.020	5.635	<.001
Default Framing	-.553	.157	-3.514	<.001
Default Size x Framing	.038	.019	1.947	.052
Study 2b fixed effect	-.030	.439	-.069	.945
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.267	.371	-3.419	.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.303	.325	-7.094	<.001

(Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e only)

Table A52: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Organization Favorability (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.330	1.756	.757	.449
Default Present = Yes	3.252	1.897	1.715	.086
Org Favorability	1.182	.591	2.001	.045
Default Present X Favorability	-1.142	.620	-1.842	.066
Study 2b fixed effect	-.735	.344	-2.138	.033
Study 2c fixed effect	-.448	.433	-1.035	.301
Study 2d fixed effect	.654	.317	2.061	.039
Study 2e fixed effect	-.589	.286	-2.064	.039
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.455	.335	-4.342	<.001

Table A53: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Organization's Donor Appeal (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.556	.276	16.531	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.098	.251	.390	.696
Org Appeal	.012	.005	2.575	.010
Default Present X Appeal	-.010	.005	-2.057	.040
Study 2b fixed effect	-.665	.338	-1.971	.049
Study 2c fixed effect	-.444	.432	-1.027	.304
Study 2d fixed effect	.665	.317	2.102	.036
Study 2e fixed effect	-.620	.276	-2.241	.025
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.483	.317	-4.680	<.001

Table A54: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Organization Favorability (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.273	.169	1.619	.106
Default Present = Yes	.320	.182	1.757	.079
Org Favorability	.096	.057	1.688	.092
Default Present X Favorability	-.106	.060	-1.775	.076
Study 2b fixed effect	-.077	.033	-2.318	.021
Study 2c fixed effect	-.007	.042	-.180	.857
Study 2dfixed effect	.246	.030	8.064	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.178	.027	6.501	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.022	.032	-.694	.488

Table A55: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate, Depending on Organization's Donor Appeal (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.528	.026	19.947	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.036	.024	1.477	.140
Org Appeal	.001	<.001	2.972	.003
Default Present X Appeal	-.001	<.001	-2.478	.013
Study 2b fixed effect	-.073	.032	-2.256	.024
Study 2c fixed effect	-.007	.042	-.180	.857
Study 2d fixed effect	.246	.030	8.088	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.169	.027	6.358	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.034	.030	-1.118	.264

Table A56: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Organization Favorability (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	6.639	1.940	3.422	.001
Default Present = Yes	1.254	2.105	.596	.551
Org Favorability	.702	.646	1.085	.278
Default Present X Favorability	-.555	.685	-.810	.418
Study 2b fixed effect	-.172	.444	-.387	.699
Study 2c fixed effect	-.730	.543	-1.344	.179
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.747	.364	-4.800	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.816	.339	-8.317	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.306	.411	-5.607	<.001

Table A57: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Average Donation, Depending on Organization's Donor Appeal (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.627	.342	25.223	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.365	.289	-1.265	.206
Org Appeal	.004	.005	.765	.444
Default Present X Appeal	-.002	.005	-.431	.667
Study 2b fixed effect	-.115	.439	-.262	.794
Study 2c fixed effect	-.734	.543	-1.350	.177
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.734	.364	-4.770	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.782	.330	-8.442	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.250	.393	-5.728	<.001

Table A58: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Revenue per Person,
Depending on whether Charity Navigator Rating was included (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.845	.256	18.906	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.276	.207	-1.333	.182
Navigator Rating Shown	-1.166	.663	-1.759	.079
Default Present x Shown	.599	.693	.865	.387
Study 2b fixed effect	-.634	.338	-1.879	.060
Study 2c fixed effect	-.427	.433	-.987	.324
Study 2d fixed effect	.721	.316	2.279	.023
Study 2e fixed effect	-.432	.265	-1.630	.103
Study 2f fixed effect	-.903	.358	-2.520	.012

Table A59: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Donation Rate,
Depending on whether Charity Navigator Rating was included (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.560	.025	22.740	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.006	.020	-.324	.746
Navigator Rating Shown	-.086	.064	-1.347	.178
Default Present x Shown	.056	.067	.835	.404
Study 2b fixed effect	-.070	.032	-2.153	.031
Study 2c fixed effect	-.006	.042	-.134	.894
Study 2d fixed effect	.252	.030	8.293	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.188	.025	7.391	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	.011	.034	.322	.747

Table A60: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Average Donation,
Depending on whether Charity Navigator Rating was included (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.726	.321	27.202	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.481	.238	-2.022	.043
Navigator Rating Shown	-1.242	.871	-1.427	.154
Default Present x Shown	.560	.908	.617	.538
Study 2b fixed effect	-.105	.439	-.240	.810
Study 2c fixed effect	-.737	.543	-1.358	.175
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.720	.363	-4.738	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.698	.318	-8.498	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.764	.445	-3.968	<.001

Table A61: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Revenue per Person, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.268	.301	14.180	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.218	.245	.890	.374
Positive Info	1.336	.389	3.434	.001
Default Present X Positive Info	-1.236	.402	-3.073	.002
Study 2b fixed effect	-.360	.356	-1.011	.312
Study 2c fixed effect	-.174	.446	-.390	.697
Study 2d fixed effect	.559	.335	1.668	.095
Study 2e fixed effect	-.412	.264	-1.561	.119
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.056	.319	-3.308	.001

Table A62: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Donation Rate, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.513	.029	17.727	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.028	.024	1.189	.235
Positive Info	.105	.037	2.820	.005
Default Present X Positive Info	-.083	.039	-2.149	.032
Study 2b fixed effect	-.044	.034	-1.281	.200
Study 2c fixed effect	.019	.043	.443	.658
Study 2d fixed effect	.233	.032	7.224	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.189	.025	7.440	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	.010	.031	.337	.736

Table A63: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Average Donation, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	8.383	.390	21.510	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.132	.304	-.433	.665
Positive Info	.649	.445	1.459	.145
Default Present X Positive Info	-.721	.460	-1.570	.117
Study 2b fixed effect	.013	.462	.028	.978
Study 2c fixed effect	-.604	.563	-1.074	.283
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.729	.381	-4.538	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.668	.318	-8.382	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.078	.400	-5.193	<.001

Table A62: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Revenue per Person, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	2.475	.565	4.378	<.001
Default Present = Yes	2.356	.747	3.156	.002
Positive Info	3.640	.827	4.404	<.001
Default Present X Positive Info	-3.236	1.076	-3.008	.003

Table A63: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Donation Rate, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.354	.049	7.221	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.255	.065	3.951	<.001
Positive Info	.279	.072	3.892	<.001
Default Present X Positive Info	-.283	.093	-3.039	.003

Table A64: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Presence on Average Donations, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.000	.886	7.903	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.932	1.060	.879	.380
Positive Info	2.673	1.133	2.359	.019
Default Present X Positive Info	-1.944	1.401	-1.388	.166

Table A65: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	2.513	.691	3.638	<.001
Default Level = None	.351	.738	.476	.635
Default Size	.208	.062	3.348	.001
Positive Info	2.808	.685	4.100	<.001
Default Size X Positive Info	-.188	.073	-2.581	.010

Table A66: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rate, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.596	.060	9.948	<.001
Default Level = None	-.209	.064	-3.271	.001
Default Size	-.001	.005	-.229	.819
Positive Info	.208	.059	3.492	.001
Default Size X Positive Info	-.015	.006	-2.445	.015

Table A67: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donations, Depending on Information Valence (Study 2a)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.526	.768	5.890	<.001
Default Level = None	2.891	.846	3.419	.001
Default Size	.348	.071	4.929	<.001
Positive Info	1.990	.832	2.393	.017
Default Size X Positive Info	-.107	.087	-1.221	.223

Table A68: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Negative Default Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	3.919	.188	20.843	<.001
Default Size	.053	.003	17.159	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.085	.086	-.993	.321
Study 2c fixed effect	-.294	.107	-2.756	.006
Study 2d fixed effect	-.125	.076	-1.641	.101
Study 2e fixed effect	.069	.069	.998	.318
Study 2f fixed effect	.220	.078	2.814	.005
Org Pos Charity	-.110	.063	-1.756	.079

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A69: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Positive Default Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.071	.151	27.037	<.001
Default Size	-.019	.002	-7.628	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.098	.069	-1.427	.154
Study 2c fixed effect	-.133	.085	-1.559	.119
Study 2d fixed effect	-.090	.061	-1.469	.142
Study 2e fixed effect	.076	.055	1.388	.165
Study 2f fixed effect	-.043	.062	-.689	.491
Org Pos Charity	-.054	.050	-1.079	.281

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A70: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	4.902	.943	5.199	<.001
Default Size	.022	.015	1.421	.155
Study 2b fixed effect	-1.000	.429	-2.328	.020
Study 2c fixed effect	-1.041	.535	-1.948	.052
Study 2d fixed effect	.235	.382	.615	.538
Study 2e fixed effect	-.881	.344	-2.557	.011
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.519	.391	-3.884	<.001
Org Pos Charity	-.032	.314	-.100	.920

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A71: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Revenue per Person, Controlling for Attitudes Towards the Default (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	5.520	1.123	4.914	<.001
Default Size	.082	.016	5.163	<.001
Positive Default Attitudes	.707	.119	5.934	<.001
Negative Default Attitudes	-.893	.095	-9.352	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-1.006	.419	-2.400	.016
Study 2c fixed effect	-1.210	.523	-2.315	.021
Study 2d fixed effect	.187	.373	.501	.616
Study 2e fixed effect	-.873	.336	-2.598	.009
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.292	.382	-3.382	.001
Org Pos Charity	-.091	.307	-.298	.766

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A72: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rates (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.685	.092	7.419	<.001
Default Size	-.006	.002	-3.710	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.094	.042	-2.242	.025
Study 2c fixed effect	-.075	.052	-1.431	.153
Study 2d fixed effect	.163	.037	4.344	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.096	.034	2.846	.004
Study 2f fixed effect	-.053	.038	-1.390	.165
Org Pos Charity	-.008	.031	-.253	.800

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A73: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Rates, Controlling for Attitudes Towards the Default (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.401	.108	3.704	<.001
Default Size	.001	.002	.555	.579
Positive Default Attitudes	.140	.011	12.179	<.001
Negative Default Attitudes	-.073	.009	-7.900	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.087	.040	-2.151	.032
Study 2c fixed effect	-.078	.050	-1.544	.123
Study 2d fixed effect	.166	.036	4.622	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.090	.032	2.790	.005
Study 2f fixed effect	-.031	.037	-.851	.395
Org Pos Charity	-.008	.030	-.278	.781

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A74: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	7.355	1.057	6.957	<.001
Default Size	.095	.018	5.335	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.322	.538	-.598	.550
Study 2c fixed effect	-.696	.683	-1.019	.308
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.373	.432	-3.177	.002
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.333	.400	-5.826	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-2.008	.469	-4.278	<.001
Org Pos Charity	.017	.350	.048	.962

(Includes default conditions only)

**Table A75: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Average Donation,
Controlling for Attitudes Towards the Default (Study 2)**

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	11.155	1.283	8.693	<.001
Default Size	.129	.019	6.899	<.001
Positive Default Attitudes	-.288	.138	-2.097	.036
Negative Default Attitudes	-.697	.115	-6.085	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.370	.532	-.695	.487
Study 2c fixed effect	-.712	.676	-1.053	.292
Study 2d fixed effect	-1.364	.428	-3.184	.001
Study 2e fixed effect	-2.178	.397	-5.487	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-1.811	.466	-3.890	<.001
Org Pos Charity	-.088	.347	-.253	.800

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A76: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Charity Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.171	.224	5.229	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.023	.029	.789	.430
Study 2b fixed effect	-.458	.048	-9.609	<.001
Study 2c fixed effect	-.439	.058	-7.586	<.001
Study 2d fixed effect	.170	.042	4.007	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	.179	.039	4.522	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	-.352	.055	-6.359	<.001
Org Pos Charity	.693	.078	8.827	<.001

Table A77: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.803	.263	6.846	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-.276	.205	-1.343	.179
Study 2b fixed effect	.501	.351	1.427	.154
Study 2c fixed effect	-.088	.449	-.196	.845
Study 2d fixed effect	15.039	.328	45.835	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	14.406	.275	52.475	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	14.422	.312	46.224	<.001

Table A78: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Charity Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.264	.252	5.010	<.001
Default Size	-.004	.002	-1.617	.106
Study 2b fixed effect	-.471	.060	-7.818	<.001
Study 2c fixed effect	-.447	.073	-6.142	<.001
Study 2d fixed effect	.133	.052	2.549	.011
Study 2e fixed effect	.150	.048	3.088	.002
Study 2f fixed effect	-.353	.065	-5.440	<.001
Org Pos Charity	.684	.088	7.772	<.001

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A79: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.628	.360	4.520	<.001
Default Size	-.00032	.017	-.019	.985
Study 2b fixed effect	.595	.470	1.266	.206
Study 2c fixed effect	-.092	.590	-.156	.876
Study 2d fixed effect	14.710	.422	34.871	<.001
Study 2e fixed effect	14.290	.361	39.610	<.001
Study 2f fixed effect	14.394	.398	36.188	<.001

(Includes default conditions only)

Table A80: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Size on Donation Attitudes (Study 2)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	.310	.039	7.916	<.001
Default Present = Yes	.206	.046	4.494	<.001
Number of Options	.065	.008	8.430	<.001
Default Present x Num Options	-.043	.008	-5.298	<.001
Study 2b fixed effect	-.075	.032	-2.337	.020
Study 2c fixed effect	-.054	.054	-1.002	.317
Study 2d fixed effect	.088	.038	2.344	.019
Study 2e fixed effect	.076	.030	2.557	.011
Study 2f fixed effect	-.083	.030	-2.780	.005

Table A81: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Log of Revenue per Person (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.03	0.01	2.59	<.001
Default Present = Yes	0.025	0.01	2.34	.019
Designated Options = 5	-0.009	0.01	-0.91	.364
Reminder = Yes	0.005	0.01	0.49	.626
Consecutive Years Giving to AF	0.19	0.004	38.53	<.001

Table A82: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Levels on Log of Revenue per Person (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.08	0.01	5.75	<.001
No Default	-0.04	0.01	-2.96	.003
Default Level = Medium or High	-0.025	0.01	-1.82	.069
Designated Options = 5	-0.009	0.01	-0.88	.377
Reminder = Yes	0.005	0.01	0.49	.627
Consecutive Years Giving to AF	0.19	0.004	38.53	<.001

Table A83: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Levels on Log of Revenue per Person, Depending on Donor Age (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.03	0.01	2.10	.036
Low Default Level	0.05	0.01	3.32	<.001
Medium Default Level	0.009	0.02	0.64	.520
High Default Level	0.02	0.02	1.57	.118
Age	0.02	0.007	2.38	.017
Designated Options = 5	-0.009	0.01	-0.85	.394
Reminder = Yes	0.008	0.01	0.73	.463
Consecutive Years Giving to AF	0.18	0.005	35.16	<.001
Age x Low Default Level	0.04	0.01	2.96	.003
Age x Medium Default Level	0.02	0.01	1.14	.254
Age x High Default Level	0.0035	0.01	0.235	.814

Table A84: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Log of Revenue per Person, Depending on Number of Consecutive Years of Giving (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.035	0.01	2.65	.008
Default Present = Yes	0.025	0.01	2.36	.018
Consec. Yrs. of Giving to AF	0.14	0.006	20.96	<.001
Designated Options = 5	-0.01	0.01	-0.94	.346
Reminder = Yes	0.005	0.01	0.53	.599
Consecutive Years Giving to AF x Default Present	0.11	0.009	11.41	<.001

Table A85: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Log of Revenue per Person, Depending on Donation in the Last Campaign (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.04	0.01	2.87	.004
Default Present = Yes	-0.002	0.01	-0.19	.851
Donated Last Year	-0.04	0.03	-1.25	.210
Designated Options = 5	-0.009	0.01	-0.89	.371
Reminder = Yes	0.004	0.01	0.36	.720
Consecutive Years Giving to AF	0.17	0.006	28.38	<.001
Donated Last Year x Default Present	0.38	0.04	9.85	<.001

Table A86: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Donation Rate Depending on Donation in the Last Campaign (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	P
Constant	-6.96	0.46	-14.98	<.001
Default Present = Yes	0.71	0.31	2.25	.024
Designated Options = 5	-0.16	0.29	-0.55	.581
Reminder = Yes	0.09	0.29	0.32	.747
Age	0.85	0.13	6.66	<.001
Consecutive Years Giving to AF	0.12	0.04	3.25	.001
Donated Last Year	4.11	0.35	11.75	<.001

Table A87: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Level on Log of Average Donation (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.74	0.27	2.75	.007
No Default	0.37	0.12	3.10	.003
Medium Default Level	0.20	0.13	1.53	.130
High Default Level	0.37	0.13	2.77	.007
Designated Options = 5	-0.19	0.10	-1.91	.059
Reminder = Yes	0.007	0.10	0.08	.939
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	0.215	0.10	2.08	.041
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.80	0.05	14.47	<.001

Table A88: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Present on Log of Average Donation (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.14	0.31	3.69	<.001
Default Present = Yes	-0.23	0.11	-2.08	.041
Designated Options = 5	-0.24	0.10	-2.33	.022
Reminder = Yes	0.02	0.10	0.17	.865
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	0.19	0.11	1.77	.080
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.81	0.06	13.92	<.001

Table A89: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Level on Log of Average Donation, Depending on Prior Donation Reminder (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.36	0.30	1.18	.242
No Default	0.55	0.20	2.71	.008
Medium Default Level	0.29	0.19	1.53	.129
High Default Level	0.74	0.19	3.77	<.001
Designated Options = 5	0.26	0.16	1.66	.100
Reminder = Yes	-0.13	0.10	-1.33	.188
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	0.17	0.10	1.69	.094
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.85	0.06	14.83	<.001
Reminder x No Default	-0.36	0.25	-1.41	.163
Reminder x Medium Default Level	-0.19	0.26	-0.75	.454
Reminder x High Default Level	-0.69	0.28	-2.51	.014

Table A90: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Level (Low vs. Medium/High) on Log of Average Donation, Depending on Prior Donation Reminder (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	0.48	0.30	1.59	.116
No Default	0.55	0.21	2.67	.009
Default Level = Medium or High	0.51	0.16	3.15	.002
Designated Options = 5	0.25	0.16	1.56	.122
Reminder = Yes	-0.17	0.09	-1.72	.091
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	0.20	0.10	1.96	.054
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.83	0.06	14.62	<.001
Reminder x No Default	-0.33	0.26	-1.30	.198
Reminder x Medium or High Default	-0.43	0.23	-1.88	.063

Table A91: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Level on Log of Average Donation, Depending on Last Donation Amount (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.41	0.34	4.04	<.001
Low Default Level	-1.56	0.49	-3.20	.002
Medium Default Level	-0.49	0.57	-0.855	.395
High Default Level	-0.10	0.61	-0.169	.866
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.73	0.07	10.83	<.001
Designated Options = 5	-0.16	0.10	-1.63	.107
Reminder = Yes	0.06	0.10	0.62	.537
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	0.21	0.11	2.03	.046
Log Middle Option x Low Default	0.26	0.10	2.53	.014
Log Middle Option x Medium Default	0.07	0.12	0.57	.568
Log Middle Option x High Default	0.025	0.13	0.20	.842

Table A92: Regression Predicting Effect of Default Level on Log of Average Donation, Depending on Lifetime Donation Amount (Study 3)

Source	β	Std. Error	t	p
Constant	1.04	0.31	3.33	.001
Default Present = Yes	-0.26	0.11	-2.32	.023
Log Lifetime Amt. to School	-0.67	0.47	-1.43	.157
Designated Options = 5	0.64	0.46	1.40	.166
Reminder = Yes	0.83	0.06	13.61	<.001
Log Lifetime Amount to AF	-0.22	0.10	-2.22	.029
Log Value of Middle Menu Option	0.03	0.10	0.29	.767
Log Lifetime Amount to School x Default Present	0.23	0.18	1.25	.214

In the paper, we have reported an overall analysis, combining Studies 2A to 2F. We have noted that the results vary somewhat across studies. In part, this is because of differences in the charities and decision contexts tested in the different studies. In this section, we discuss the general robustness of the findings across the studies and report more detailed results.

Effects of Default Inclusion.

Table B1 shows the effect of including a defaulted option (e.g., default vs. control) in each study. Table B2 provides a comparison between each specific default tested in each study and the relevant control condition.

Revenue per Person. Two studies showed directionally positive effects and five studies showed directionally negative effects. In particular, for one study (2e) defaults had a significant negative effect ($5.06 vs. $4.03, t = 3.13, *p*=.002), and in another study (2d) we found a marginal negative effect of defaults ($6.16 vs. $5.15, t = 1.83, *p*=.07). The differences in the other studies were not significant.

Donation rate. Three studies showed directionally positive effects and four studies showing directionally negative effects. In particular, defaults significantly increased participation in one study (2a: 48% vs. 61%, t = 2.60, *p*=.01), and significantly decreased participation in another study (2e: 83% vs. 73%, t = 2.92, *p*=.004). We also found a marginal negative effect of defaults (2c: 64% vs. 50%, t = 1.66, *p*=.099). The differences in the other studies were not significant.

Average Donation. The donation amount was directionally higher in two of the studies, and lower in five of the studies. None of the effects in individual studies were significant.

However, in two studies, donors' amounts were marginally higher in the control vs. default conditions (2d: $7.41 vs. $6.42, t = 1.72, p=.09; 2e: $6.13 vs. $5.53, t = 1.71, p =.09).

Effects of Default Size.

Table B3 shows the correlation between default size and each of the dependent variables for each study, except for 2c which only tested a single default amount.

Revenue per Person. In the individual studies, higher defaults had stronger net effects in five studies, and weaker net effects in one study. Only one study had a significant effect, with higher defaults leading to higher net contributions (2a: β=.12, t = 2.35, p=.02).

Donation Rate. Across the individual studies, participation was directionally lower for higher defaults in five of the six studies. This negative effect of higher defaults on participation was significant in one study (2b: β = -.018, t = 3.78, p<.001), and marginally significant in three other studies (2a: β = -.009, t = 1.94, p=.053; 2d: β = -.006, t=1.78, p=.076; 2e: β=-.004, t=1.76, p=.079).

Average Donation. Across the studies, higher defaults yielded directionally higher net contributions in five of six studies. There was a significant positive effect of higher defaults in three studies (2a: β=.297, t=5.31, p<.001; 2b: β=.197, t=2.89, p=.004; 2e: β=.058, t=.215, p=.031).

Table B1: Effects of All Defaults vs. Control For Each Study

Study	N	Donated		Average Donation		Revenue per person	
		Difference	Significance	Difference	Significance	Difference	Significance
2a	453	+12%	χ^2=6.7, p=.01	-$.34	t=-.49, p=.63	+$.86	t=1.6, p=.12
2b	364	+6%	χ^2=1.4, p=.23	-$1.22	t=1.4, p=.15	-$.04	t=-.06, p=.95
2c	169	-13%	χ^2=2.7, p=.10	+$1.07	t=1.0, p=.31	-$.40	t=-.47, p=.64
2d	487	-3%	χ^2=.46, p=.50	-$.99	t=-1.7, p=.09	-$1.01	t=-1.8, p=.07
2e	1411	-10%	χ^2=8.5, p<.01	-$.60	t=-1.7, p=.09	-$1.03	t=-3.1, p<.01
2f	602	+4%	χ^2=.67, p=.42	+$.40	t=.74, p=.46	+$.45	t=1.1, p=.28

Table B2: Effects of Specific Defaults vs. Control For Each Study

Study	Default	N	Donated		Average Donation		Revenue per person	
			Mean (SD)	vs. Control	Mean (SD)	vs. Control	Mean (SD)	vs. Control
2a	None	186	48%		$8.63 (5.56)		$4.18 (5.79)	
	$0.50	90	69%	χ^2=10.3, p<.001	$5.64 (4.16)	t=-3.6, p<.001	$3.88 (4.33)	t=-.43, p=.67
	$15.00	177	56%	χ^2=2.4, p=.12	$9.95 (5.00)	t=2.3, p=.02	$5.62 (6.20)	t=1.7, p=.09
2b	None	141	45%		$9.10 (5.44)		$4.06 (5.80)	
	$0.50	76	68%	χ^2=11.2, p<.001	$6.33 (4.58)	t=2.9, p<.01	$4.33 (4.80)	t=.34, p=.73
	$15.00	147	42%	χ^2=.18, p=.67	$9.18 (5.58)	t=.08, p=.93	$3.87 (5.80)	t=-.28, p=.78
2c	None	58	64%		$7.05 (4.59)		$4.50 (5.00)	
	$15.00	111	50%	χ^2=2.7, p=.10	$8.13 (5.13)	t=1.0, p=.31	$4.10 (5.46)	t=-.47, p=.64
2d	None	95	83%		$7.41 (4.93)		$6.16 (5.28)	
	$0.25	103	83%	χ^2=.01, p=.91	$5.99 (4.76)	t=-1.9, p=.06	$4.94 (4.89)	t=-1.7, p=.09
	$0.50	93	77%	χ^2=.98, p=.32	$6.31 (4.44)	t=-1.4, p=.15	$4.89 (4.72)	t=-1.7, p=.08
	$2.00	98	87%	χ^2=.48, p=.49	$6.41 (4.45)	t=-1.4, p=.17	$5.56 (4.68)	t=-.85, p=.40
	$15.00	98	73%	χ^2=2.7, p=.10	$7.07 (4.15)	t=-.46, p=.64	$5.19 (4.74)	t=-1.3, p=.18
2e	None	201	83%		$6.13 (4.30)		$5.06 (4.55)	
	$0.25	204	77%	χ^2=1.7, p=.20	$5.15 (3.97)	t=-2.1, p=.03	$3.99 (4.10)	t=-2.5, p=.01
	$0.50	101	69%	χ^2=6.9, p=.01	$5.59 (4.40)	t=-.87, p=.39	$3.87 (4.48)	t=-2.1, p=.03
	$1.00	94	72%	χ^2=4.1, p=.04	$5.65 (4.14)	t=-.78, p=.44	$4.09 (4.34)	t=-1.7, p=.08
	$2.00	208	75%	χ^2=3.5, p=.06	$4.77 (3.43)	t=-3.1, p<.01	$3.57 (3.62)	t=-3.7, p<.001
	$3.00	94	71%	χ^2=4.9, p=.03	$5.69 (4.08)	t=-.71, p=.48	$4.06 (4.31)	t=-1.8, p=.07
	$5.00	202	75%	χ^2=3.3, p=.07	$5.89 (4.17)	t=-.49, p=.62	$4.43 (4.42)	t=-1.4, p=.16
	$10.00	104	68%	χ^2=8.1, p<.01	$6.11 (4.41)	t=-.03, p=.98	$4.17 (4.62)	t=-1.6, p=.11
	$15.00	203	69%	χ^2=2.7, p=.11	$5.95 (4.53)	t=-.46, p=.64	$4.10 (4.67)	t=-1.3, p=.18
2f	None	138	51%		$5.89 (3.77)		$3.03 (4.00)	
	$0.25	90	53%	χ^2=.08, p=.78	$5.86 (4.31)	t=-.04, p=.97	$3.13 (4.30)	t=.17, p=.86
	$5.00	145	57%	χ^2=.96, p=.33	$6.58 (4.27)	t=1.1, p=.29	$3.77 (4.59)	t=1.4, p=.15
	$10.00	42	48%	χ^2=.19, p=.66	$6.20 (2.07)	t=.36, p=.72	$2.95 (3.44)	t=-.11, p=.91
	$15.00	94	62%	χ^2=2.4, p=.12	$6.06 (4.43)	t=.24, p=.81	$3.74 (4.56)	t=1.3, p=.21
	$19.00	93	52%	χ^2=0.0, p=.98	$6.53 (3.88)	t=.90, p=.37	$3.37 (4.29)	t=.61, p=.54

Table B3: Effects of Default Size For Each Study

Study	N	Donated	Average Donation	Revenue per person
2a	267	$r = -.12, p = .05$	$r = .41, p < .001$	$r = .14, p = .02$
2b	223	$r = -.25, p < .001$	$r = .27, p < .01$	$r = -.04, p = .55$
2d	392	$r = -.09, p = .08$	$r = .08, p = .15$	$r = .01, p = .82$
2e	1210	$r = -.05, p = .09$	$r = .07, p = .03$	$r = .02, p = .45$
2f	464	$r = .002, p = .97$	$r = .02, p = .80$	$r = .01, p = .84$

WEB APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL STUDY DETAILS AND STIMULI

Study 2a: Web respondents (N=453) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2). They were then randomly assigned to a 2 (Information about the charitable organization: Positive, Neutral) X 2 (Number of non-zero menu options in the ask: 1, 5) X 2 (Framing of the pre-selected or defaulted menu option: Suggested option, Pre-selected at Random) X 3 (Default Levels: $0.50, $15, None) experimental design (see Figures C3, C4, C5 for a sample stimuli). The menu options in the condition with 1 non-zero ask was $15 and included a $0 option for respondents to indicate non-participation. The menu options in the condition with 5 non-zero ask were $15, $10, $5, $2, $0.50, and also included a $0 option for respondents to indicate non-participation. Respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate a part of their surprise reward to the charitable organization i.e. Direct Relief International in the event of them being selected in the lucky draw. The decision was therefore consequential. A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Study 2b: Web respondents (N=364) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2). They were then randomly assigned to a 2 (Information about the charitable organization: Negative, Neutral) X 2 (Number of non-zero menu options in the ask: 1, 5) X 2 (Framing of the pre-selected or

defaulted menu option: Suggested option, Pre-selected at Random) X 3 (Default Levels: $0.50, $15, None) experimental design (see Figure C6 for information about the charity; Figures C4, C5 for the menu options of a sample stimuli). The setup for this study, including the menu options, was the same as Study 2a except for just one change regarding the valence of the information manipulation. Respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate a part of their surprise reward to the charitable organization i.e. Children's Charity Fund in the event of them being selected in the lucky draw. The decision was therefore consequential. A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Study 2c: Web respondents (N=169) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2). They were then randomly assigned to a 2 (Framing of the pre-selected or defaulted menu option: Suggested option, control) X 2 (Design of the ask: open text-box, five non-zero menu options) X 2 (Default Level: $15, None) experimental design (see Figures C7, C8). The five non-zero menu options were the same as the previous studies i.e. $15, $10, $5, $2, $0.50, including a $0 option to indicate non-participation. Respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate a part of their surprise reward to the charitable organization i.e. Direct Relief International in the event of them being selected in the lucky draw. The decision was therefore consequential. A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Study 2d: Web respondents (N=487) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2). They were then randomly assigned to a 2 (Information about the charitable organization: Mildly Positive, More Positive) X 2 (Framing of the pre-selected or defaulted menu option: Suggested option, Pre-selected at Random) X 5 (Default Levels: $0.25, $0.50, $2, $15, None) experimental design (see Figures C9, C10 for a sample stimuli). The purpose of the more information condition was to highlight the relief work Direct Relief International was doing in Philippines in the aftermath of the super typhoon Haiyan. This study also employed a longer menu of options: $15, $10, $5, $3, $3, $1, $0.50, $0.25 including a $0 option for respondents to indicate non-participation. The purpose of this longer menu was to increase options to donate low amounts. Respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate a part of their surprise reward to the charitable organization in the event of them being selected in the lucky draw. The decision was therefore consequential. A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Study 2e: Web respondents (N=1411) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2). All respondents first indicated if they had donated to a list of Top 15 US Charities in the past two years. If they answered in the affirmative for one or more charities they were marked as warm donors, otherwise they were marked as cold donors. The cold donors were then presented with the same list of charities, and asked to indicate if they had any preferred charities (only one).

Respondents were then randomly assigned to a 2 (Charity type: Preferred, Assigned) X 2 (Number of menu options in the ask: 4, 8) X 2 (Framing of the pre-selected or defaulted menu option: Suggested option, Pre-selected at Random) experimental design (see Figures C12 and C13). The menu options were: $0.25, $0.50, $1, $2, $3, $5, $10, $15, None, or $15, $5, $2, $0.25, None, and all the non-zero menu options in the ask were used as defaults in this experiment and comprised the last factor in the design. Instead of using a $0 option to indicate non-participation, the menu of options included a choice saying "I am not interested in donating at this time". The assigned organization was Direct Relief International which was not in the Top 15 list (see Figure C11). Respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate a part of their surprise reward to the charitable organization in the event of them being selected in the lucky draw. The decision was therefore consequential. A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Study 2f: Web respondents (N=602) participated in a survey about judgment and decision making where there were no correct or wrong answers. Respondents were told that five of them could win a $20 surprise reward for real at the end of the survey (see Figure C2).   They were then randomly assigned to one of 18 charities that comprised Top 15 US Charities that were used in Study 2e, Direct Relief International, and two other charities – American Refugee Committee and Palestine Children's Relief Fund. Apart from this factor, the study varied the menu options that were presented to the respondents along with the default options – $0.25, $1, $3, $5, $15 (default = $0.25, $5, $15); $5, $6, $8, $10, $19 (default = $5, $15, $19); $0.25, $5, $10, $15, $19 (default = $0.25, $5, $15, $19). Instead of using a $0 option to indicate non-participation,

the menu of options included a choice saying "I am not interested in donating at this time". In the page showing information about the assigned charity, a random group of respondents were given quality information using CharityNavigator.org rating of its overall performance based on efficiency, accountability and transparency. Furthermore, in the same page that contained information about the assigned charity, a random group of respondents were asked to indicate if they would like to donate some of their reward if they are randomly chosen to receive the surprise amount. This prompting was done before respondents saw the actual menu of options along with the defaulted options, if any. Respondents were then presented with the options to indicate their donation amount. On this page, a random group of respondents were assigned to an additional appeal manipulation that highlighted either "Every penny helps!" or "Every dollar helps!" or no such additional appeal was used (see Figures C14 and C15). A few questions about trait reactance, trust in the organization etc. followed.

Table C1: Manipulations used in Studies 2a to 2f

Study#	Manipulation 1	Manipulation 2	Manipulation 3	Manipulation 4	Manipulation 5
2a	Suggested vs. Random Default framing	One vs. Five non-zero menu options*	Positive vs. Neutral information about the Fundraising Organization		
2b	Suggested vs. Random Default framing	One vs. Five non-zero menu options*	Negative vs. Neutral information about the Fundraising Organization		
2c	Suggested vs. Nothing	A menu of options (including 0*) vs. an open text-box			
2d	Suggested vs. Random Default framing		Mildly Positive vs. More Positive information about the Fundraising Organization		
2e	Suggested vs. Random Default framing	Four vs. Eight menu options[#]	Participants indicated if they had donated to a list of Top 15 US Charities in the past two years (Yes = Warm Donor, No=Cold Donor). Cold donors were then asked to indicate their preferred organization in the list. Warm Donors were randomly assigned to either one of the organizations to which they had donated in the past two years, or a pre-selected organization (*Direct Relief International*[$]) Cold Donors were randomly assigned to their preferred organization or a pre-selected organization (*Direct Relief International*[$])		
2f		Both length and menu option were manipulated. The menu options[#] were:0.25,1,3, 5, 15; 5, 6, 8, 10, 19; 0.25, 5,10, 15, 19	Quality Information vs. No Quality Information (charitynavigator.org rating) for the Top 15 US Charities, along with DRI, ARC, and PCRF. Participants were randomly assigned to one organization.	*Before* seeing the menu options, a random group of participants were asked to indicate if they would like to donate some of their reward if they are randomly chosen to receive the surprise amount	Every penny helps! vs. Every dollar helps! (vs control i.e. no additional appeal)

* A zero option was included in the menu options for respondents to indicate non-participation.

[#] To indicate non-participation, the menu included an option "I am not interested in donating at this time"

[$] *Direct Relief International* is not in the list of Top 15 US Charities. Unlike the Top 15 charities where only their names were mentioned, a little more information was provided about Direct Relief International.

FIGURES

Figure C1: Stimuli used for Study 1. The figure shows a default = $3.

We are doing a charity donation drive for respondents of the CRL Lab this week, and would like to know if you would be willing to donate a part of the money you earned from studies today to the American Red Cross.

All the money collected from respondents like you will be donated directly to the American Red Cross.

Please choose the amount you would like to donate today (a suggested option has been pre-selected).

- ☑ $3.00
- ☐ $2.50
- ☐ $2.00
- ☐ $1.50
- ☐ $1.00
- ☐ $0.50
- ☐ $0

Thank you for your consideration.

Figure C2: Common Stimuli used in Studies 2a to 2f to inform participants about the surprise reward.

Here is your chance to win a $20 surprise reward!!

At the end of this survey we will do a lucky draw and **FIVE participants from this survey will be selected at random and will be given a $20 surprise reward FOR REAL.** This extra money will be paid as an Mturk bonus within two days after this study is completed.

Since anyone participating in this survey can win the surprise reward with equal probability, you have as good a chance as anyone else participating in this survey.

Figure C3: Positive versus Neutral Information in Study 2a.

Direct Relief INTERNATIONAL

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Direct Relief International**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

A little information about Direct Relief Interational:

Founded in 1948, Direct Relief International (www.directrelief.org) is California's largest international humanitarian nonprofit organization. Direct Relief provides medical assistance to improve the health and lives of people affected by poverty and disaster - at home and throughout the world.

Forbes magazine has rated Direct Relief 100% efficient in fundraising for the eighth time in 2010 (meaning that every dollar donated is spent on relief efforts and not on overhead or fundraising). Independent charity rating agency, Charity Navigator (www.charitynavigator.org) has given this organization the highest rating (4-star) on both financial performance, and accountability and transparency.

Since you may be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Direct Relief, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Direct Relief INTERNATIONAL

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Direct Relief International**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

Since you might be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Direct Relief, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Figure C4: Menu options with two choices (including a zero option to indicate non-participation) showing suggested versus random default framing in Study 2a. The figure shows a default = $15.

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (A suggested option has been pre-selected.)

◉ $15

◯ $0

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (An option has been pre-selected at random).

◉ $15

◯ $0

Figure C5: Menu options with six choices (including a zero option to indicate non-participation) showing suggested versus random default framing in Study 2a. The figure shows a default = $15.

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (A suggested option has been pre-selected.)

◉ $15

◯ $10

◯ $5

◯ $2

◯ $0.50

◯ $0

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (An option has been pre-selected at random).

- ◉ $15
- ○ $10
- ○ $5
- ○ $2
- ○ $0.50
- ○ $0

Figure C6: Negative versus Neutral Information in Study 2b. The menu options in this study were the same as Study 2a as shown in Figures C2 to C5.

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Children's Charity Fund, Inc.**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

A little information about Children's Charity Fund, Inc.:

Founded in 1991, Children's Charity Fund, Inc. (www.childrenscharityfund.org) educates and informs the public concerning the needs of handicapped and disabled children. They also purchase medical equipment for handicapped and disabled children and provide educational grants to help such children further their education.

Independent charity rating agency, Charity Navigator (www.charitynavigator.org) has given this organization their lowest rating (0-star) on both financial performance, and accountability & transparency. According to Charity Navigator, this organization spends $0.86 to raise each dollar in support, making them one of the most inefficient charities. This inefficiency forces them to devote more than 85% of their budgets to fundraising, limiting the difference they can make with your dollars.

Since you may be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Children's Charity Fund and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Children's Charity Fund, Inc.**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

Since you may be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Children's Charity Fund and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Figure C7: Menu options used in Study 2c showing suggested default versus no default framing. The study only used a high default ($15) and a no default condition.

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win.

Suggested Donation: $15

○ $15

○ $10

○ $5

○ $2

○ $0.50

○ $0

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win.

One of the potential options has been pre-selected for you.

◉ $15

○ $10

○ $5

○ $2

○ $0.50

○ $0

Figure C8: Open text-box used in Study 2c showing suggested default versus no default framing. The figure shows a default = $15.

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please enter below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win.

Suggested Donation: $15

Amount in Dollars (don't put a '$' sign) [   ]

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win.

A potential amount has been pre-entered for you.

Amount in Dollars (don't put a '$' sign) [15   ]

Figure C9: Information manipulation (mildly positive versus more positive) used in Study 2d.

DirectRelief INTERNATIONAL®

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Direct Relief International**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

A little information about Direct Relief Interational:

Founded in 1948, Direct Relief International (www.directrelief.org) is California's largest international humanitarian nonprofit organization. Direct Relief provides medical assistance to improve the health and lives of people affected by poverty and disaster - at home and throughout the world.

Forbes magazine has rated Direct Relief 100% efficient in fundraising for the eighth time in 2010 (meaning that every dollar donated is spent on relief efforts and not on overhead or fundraising). Independent charity rating agency, Charity Navigator (www.charitynavigator.org) has given this organization the highest rating (4-star) on both financial performance, and accountability and transparency.

Since you may be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Direct Relief, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

DirectRelief INTERNATIONAL®

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **Direct Relief International**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

A little information about Direct Relief Interational:

Founded in 1948, Direct Relief International (www.directrelief.org) is California's largest international humanitarian nonprofit organization. Direct Relief provides medical assistance to improve the health and lives of people affected by poverty and disaster - at home and throughout the world.

Forbes magazine has rated Direct Relief 100% efficient in fundraising for the eighth time in 2010 (meaning that every dollar donated is spent on relief efforts and not on overhead or fundraising). Independent charity rating agency, Charity Navigator (www.charitynavigator.org) has given this organization the highest rating (4-star) on both financial performance, and accountability and transparency.

Now, more than 1.5 tons of emergency medicine and medical supplies – valued at $275,000 – are en route to the Philippines, with more on the way, as Direct Relief's Emergency Team continues to monitor health-related needs following Super Typhoon Haiyan – the most powerful storm to ever make landfall.

The typhoon battered the island nation early Friday morning (local time) with winds equivalent to a Category 5 hurricane. One million people are displaced and 12 million could potentially be affected, officials estimate. Electricity and communications lines have been cut off in most of the affected area – an area still reeling from a 7.2 magnitude earthquake that hit less than one month ago. Direct Relief International is currently raising money for these relief efforts.

Since you may be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to Direct Relief, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Figure C10: Menu options with nine choices (including a zero option to indicate non-participation) showing suggested versus random default framing in Study 2d. The figure shows a default = $15.

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (A suggested option has been pre-selected.)

⦿ $15

○ $10

○ $5

○ $3

○ $2

○ $1

○ $0.50

○ $0.25

○ $0

Imagine that you do get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey. You could choose to donate, if you wish.

Please select below how much money you choose to donate to Direct Relief International, in case you win. (An option has been pre-selected at random).

⦿ $15

○ $10

○ $5

○ $3

○ $2

○ $1

○ $0.50

○ $0.25

○ $0

Figure C11: Information about Direct Relief International (DRI) provided in Study 2e. A random group of *Warm* donors (who had donated to at least one of the Top 15 US Charities) and a random group of *Cold* donors (who had not donated to any of the Top 15 US Charities) were assigned to DRI at runtime.

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **${e://Field/OrgName}**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

A little information about Direct Relief International:

Founded in 1948, Direct Relief International (www.directrelief.org) is California's largest international humanitarian nonprofit organization. Direct Relief provides medical assistance to improve the health and lives of people affected by poverty and disaster - at home and throughout the world.

Forbes magazine has rated Direct Relief 100% efficient in fundraising for the eighth time in 2010 (meaning that every dollar donated is spent on relief efforts and not on overhead or fundraising). Independent charity rating agency, Charity Navigator (www.charitynavigator.org) has given this organization the highest rating (4-star) on both financial performance, and accountability and transparency.

Hurricanes pose an annual threat to millions of people living in at-risk regions around the world. The best defense is smart preparation. Since 2007, Direct Relief has done just that by providing vulnerable partner health facilities with medicines and medical supplies to improve their ability to respond quickly. During the recent Super Typhoon Haiyan in Philippines (November 2013), more than 1.5 tons of emergency medicine and medical supplies – valued at $275,000 – were sent to the country. Direct Relief's Emergency Team continues to monitor health-related needs following the typhoon, and are currently raising money for these relief efforts.

Figure C12: Menu options with nine choices (including an explicit option to indicate non-participation) showing suggested versus random default framing in Study 2e. The figure shows a default = $15.

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to
${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

(A suggested option has been pre-selected)

◉ $15

◯ $10

◯ $5

◯ $3

◯ $2

◯ $1

◯ $0.50

◯ $0.25

◯ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to
${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

(An option has been pre-selected at random)

- ◉ $15
- ○ $10
- ○ $5
- ○ $3
- ○ $2
- ○ $1
- ○ $0.50
- ○ $0.25
- ○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

Figure C13: Menu options with five choices (including an explicit option to indicate non-participation) showing suggested versus random default framing in Study 2e. The figure shows a default = $15.

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to
${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

(An option has been pre-selected at random)

- ⦿ $15

- ○ $5

- ○ $2

- ○ $0.25

- ○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to
${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

(An option has been pre-selected at random)

- ⦿ $15

- ○ $5

- ○ $2

- ○ $0.25

- ○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

Figure C14: One of the Top 15 US Charities used in Study 2f showing manipulations for no quality information versus quality information (*CharityNavigator.org* rating). The bottom panel also shows the manipulation to ask participants to indicate their intent to donate before looking at the menu options.

United Way — **LIVE UNITED**

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **${e://Field/OrgName}**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

Since you might be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to ${e://Field/OrgName}, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

United Way — **LIVE UNITED**

Remember that you could get a $20 surprise reward as part of this survey.

Next, you will be asked if you would want to donate a part of this reward to **${e://Field/OrgName}**. The rest of the money would be for you to keep.

America's leading independent charity evaluator, Charity Navigator, rates ${e://Field/OrgName} a 4 (out of 4) on its overall performance (based on efficiency, accountability and transparency).

Since you might be randomly chosen to receive the surprise $20 reward, your decision here is consequential. If you happen to be selected in the lucky draw, we will donate the allotment you choose here to ${e://Field/OrgName}, and the remaining balance will be paid to you through Mturk.

Do you think you would like to donate some of your reward if you are randomly chosen to receive the reward?

○ Yes

○ No

Figure C15: The three menu options used in Study 2f along with the penny helps, dollar helps, or control additional appeal.

Every penny helps!

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to ${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

- ○ $19
- ◉ $15
- ○ $10
- ○ $5
- ○ $0.25
- ○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

Every dollar helps!

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to ${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

- ◉ $15
- ○ $5
- ○ $3
- ○ $1
- ○ $0.25
- ○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

If you are randomly selected to receive the $20 surprise reward as part of this survey, you could choose to donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, if you wish. If you do choose to donate, we will donate the amount you specify directly to ${e://Field/OrgName}, and you will receive the remainder via Mturk.

You need to make your decision about donating now. Please select below how much money, if any, you would donate to ${e://Field/OrgName}, in case you win.

○ $19

○ $10

○ $8

○ $6

○ $5

○ *I am not interested in donating at this time*

Figure C16: Example of two pledge cards sent to donors i.e. people with prior donation history. The top panel shows a card in a treatment condition with a suggested default, no reminders, and two designates of the donated fund. The bottom panel shows a control pledge card with no defaults, but with a reminder and two designates of the donated fund. This example has a reminder and two possible designates of the donated fund. The information about the identity of the specific donor and the school are shown as hidden.

Figure C17: Example of two pledge cards sent to non-donors i.e. people with no prior donation history. The menu options in these pledge cards are fixed because there is no prior donation information. The top panel shows a card sent in the treatment condition and the bottom panel shows a card sent in the control condition. Each of these example cards have two possible designates of the donated fund, and, by definition, are no reminders. The information about the identity of the specific donor and the school are shown as hidden.

Table C2: Table shows that all the experimental cells are well-balanced on the major demographics in Study 3.

Conditions	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	p-value of F-test[#]
Mean Age in years	52	51	52	52	52	50	52	51	52	51	51	53	52	52	51	51	.99
Mean Years of association with School	24	23	22	24	23	22	23	23	23	23	24	24	24	23	23	23	.99
Mean Number of consecutive years of giving to Annual Fund	0.18	0.21	0.20	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.09	0.20	0.25	0.18	0.23	0.14	0.18	0.21	.99
Mean Lifetime giving to Annual Fund ($)	1193	1355	1096	1124	1150	1531	1210	1362	918	1136	1528	1753	1502	1073	1120	1413	.08
Mean Lifetime giving to School ($)	1266	1394	1147	1554	1201	2185	1317	1391	973	1453	1842	1976	1758	1144	1131	1609	.28
Mean middle menu option in ask string ($)	184	202	205	162	182	199	186	175	146	187	207	187	187	185	156	178	.11
DONATED LAST YEARs (%)	7	7	6	6	8	7	7	8	5	8	8	9	5	6	8	7	.99
SYBUNTs (%)	20	22	21	19	18	25	21	22	21	20	18	19	22	18	22	22	.85
LNNs (%)	73	71	73	75	74	68	72	70	74	72	73	72	73	76	71	71	.99
Number of Observations	338	328	362	344	372	382	362	369	329	346	372	363	373	351	367	2486	

[#] Using bootstrapped F-distribution calculated from the entire data

Table C3: Condition Legends indicating various experimental cells with description of factors manipulated in Study 3.

Conditions	Last Donation	Menu Options	Default Level	Reminder	#Designate of Funds
C1	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	High amount (2d)	No	2
C2	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	High amount (2d)	Yes	2
C3	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Medium amount (d)	No	2
C4	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Medium amount (d)	Yes	2
C5	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Low amount (0.5d)	No	2
C6	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Low amount (0.5d)	Yes	2
C7	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	None	No	2
C8	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	None	Yes	2
C9	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	High amount (2d)	No	5
C10	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	High amount (2d)	Yes	5
C11	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Medium amount (d)	No	5
C12	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Medium amount (d)	Yes	5
C13	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Low amount (0.5d)	No	5
C14	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	Low amount (0.5d)	Yes	5
C15	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	None	No	5

C16	d	2d, d, 0.5d, Other	None	Yes	5

d=Last donation amount in Dollars

Table C4: Scale used in Study 2 to measure Donation Attitudes

Helping others is usually a waste of time.
When given the opportunity, I enjoy aiding others who are in need.
It feels wonderful to assist others in need.
Unless they are part of my family, helping the elderly isn't my responsibility.
Children should be taught about the importance of helping others.
I feel at peace with myself when I have helped others.
I feel proud when I know that my generosity has benefited a needy person.
Helping people does more harm than good because they come to rely on others and not themselves.
I rarely contribute money to a worthy cause.
Giving aid to the poor is the right thing to do.

Adapted from Nickell, G.S. (1998, August). The Helping Attitude Scale: A new measure of prosocial tendencies. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

WEB APPENDIX D: CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS PRETEST

All the 19 Charitable organizations used in Studies 1 and 2a to 2f were pre-tested with a random sample of online participants (N=218). The following table shows all the charities along with the pre-test scores on the four important dimensions.

Table D1: Pre-test scores of all Charitable Organizations used in Studies 1 and 2

	Organization Name	Awareness	Positive View	Personal Involvement	Relative Donor Appeal
1	Direct Relief International	1.96	2.82	0.01	11.18
2	United Way	1.12	3.27	0.16	39.92
3	Salvation Army	1.01	3.49	0.30	79.11
4	Task Force for Global Health	1.96	2.87	0.01	13.48
5	Feeding America	1.39	3.34	0.04	60.73
6	Catholic Charities USA	1.59	2.91	0.06	26.24
7	Goodwill Industries International	1.04	3.30	0.28	56.10
8	Food for the Poor	1.90	3.25	0.03	34.49
9	American Cancer Society	1.02	3.65	0.16	91.87
10	YMCA	1.04	3.50	0.19	46.61
11	World Vision	1.72	3.01	0.02	27.81
12	St. Jude Children's Research Hospital	1.04	3.80	0.13	206.21
13	Boys & Girls Club of America	1.07	3.54	0.13	58.51
14	American National Red Cross	1.00	3.66	0.20	64.22
15	Habitat for Humanity	1.06	3.78	0.14	85.78
16	Feed the Children	1.42	3.39	0.03	49.23
17	Palestine Children's Relief Fund	1.97	2.80	0.01	25.44
18	American Refugee Committee International	1.93	2.84	0.00	8.41
19	Children's Charity Fund Inc.	1.90	3.01	0.01	15.47

The top 15 US Charities are shown shaded in the table (rows 2 and 16) and were used in Study 2e. Study 2f used charities 1 to 18. Study 2b used charity 19. Except for Study 2b, all charities used Direct Relief International.

Below we describe the meaning of each of the 4 column of scores for the charities.

Awareness: Every Participant was asked if they either Heard of the Charity (1) or Are not familiar with the Charity (2). The scores represent average across all participants. Lower value indicates greater awareness.

Positive View: Every Participant rated each of the charities on:

a) How favorable they feel about the programs each of these organizations run with the money they collect from private donations (1- Very unfavorable to 5- Highly favorable)
b) How trustworthy do they think each of the charitable organizations is (1- Not at all trustworthy to 5- Very trustworthy)
c) How closely does the mission of these organizations fit with their personal goals that currently are most important to them (1- Not at all to 3- Very close fit).

These scores were highly correlated (Cronbach's alpha = 0.97, bootstrapped 95% CI [0.94, 0.98]) and therefore they were combined. The Positive View column reflects the average of these scores. Higher value indicates more positive view.

Personal Involvement: Participants were asked if they or their family have ever donated to, volunteered with or benefited from any of these organizations. For each organization, participants indicated if any of the above three were applicable (0=No, 1=Yes).

We combined these scores (Cronbach's alpha = 0.59, bootstrapped 95% CI [0.47, 0.68]) and used these scores to indicate Personal Involvement. Higher score indicates higher involvement.

Relative Donor Appeal: Participants were asked to imagine that $1,000 was going to be donated to these charities, and they were responsible for deciding how much would go to each. participants then allocated the sum across these charities. The online interface ensured that the sum of the allocations added to $1,000. The Amount Donated scores indicate the money allocated. Higher value indicates higher dollar amount allocated, on average.

WEB APPENDIX E: EFFECTS OF SUGGESTION AMOUNTS IN PRIOR STUDIES

	Relative Amount	Δ Donation Rate	Δ Average Donation	Δ Revenue
Dhingra et al (2012) -- $0	-100%	-14%	-3%	-16%
Altmann et al (2014) -- €10	-80%	1%	0%	1%
Alpizar et al (2008) -- $2 reference	-67%	30%	-40%	-23%
Briers et al (2007) -- S2 €0.5 exchange	-66%	48%	5%	55%
Altmann et al (2014) -- €20	-60%	0%	0%	-1%
Shang and Croson (2009) -- $75	-30%	N/A	3%	N/A
Alpizar et al (2008) -- $5 reference	-17%	6%	-34%	-30%
Edwards and List (2014) -- $20	-16%	49%	-19%	20%
Altmann et al (2014) -- €50	-1%	-4%	9%	5%
Dhingra et al (2012) -- $5	25%	41%	4%	46%
Adena et al (2014) -- €100	40%	-10%	23%	13%
Alpizar et al (2008) -- $10 reference	67%	4%	-1%	4%
Shang and Croson (2009) -- $180	69%	N/A	4%	N/A
Briers et al (2007) -- S2 €3.0 exchange	105%	-22%	105%	60%
Schwarzwald et al (1983) -- ISL 40	115%	3%	15%	18%
Dhingra et al (2012) -- $10	150%	58%	22%	93%
Schwarzwald et al (1983) -- ISL 50	169%	-28%	21%	-12%
Adena et al (2014) -- €200	180%	-26%	43%	7%
Shang and Croson (2009) -- $300	181%	N/A	37%	N/A
Schwarzwald et al (1983) -- ISL 60	223%	-23%	-35%	-50%
Croson and Shang (2013) -- $600	397%	N/A	43%	N/A
Fraser, Hite and Sauer (1988) -- $20	400%	-27%	190%	112%
Croson and Shang (2013) -- $1000	728%	N/A	16%	N/A

Raw Cell-Level Correlation	**-0.43**	**0.45**	**0.42**
	p=.071	*p*=.031	*p*=.086

Sample-Weighted Correlation	**-0.47**	**0.60**	**0.48**
	p=.025	*p*=.002	*p*=.022

Relative amount is the percent increase or decrease of the suggested amount, relative to the average donation in the control condition among donors.