

Supplementary information
for
The Voluntariness of Voluntary Consent
Roseanna Sommers & Vanessa K. Bohns

Balance tables.....	1
Study 1.....	1
Study 2.....	2
Study 3.....	3
Data broken out by compliance behavior.....	4
Study 1.....	4
Study 2.....	4
Study 3.....	4

Balance tables

In all 3 studies, we randomized solely on the intervention. At the end of the study, participants filled out a demographic questionnaire reporting their age, race, and gender. We now examine whether the two conditions—Experiencers and Forecasters—are balanced on these demographic factors. We also examine whether they are balanced on how participants self-report using their phones.

Study 1

	Forecasters (N = 100)	Experiencers (N = 103)	Difference
Age	20.38	20.67	.29
Gender			
Female %	.71	.77	.06
Race			
White %	.28	.35	.07
Black %	.16	.03	.13 *
Asian %	.41	.44	.03
Hispanic %	.06	.11	.05
Phone usages			
Photos	.98	1.00	.02
Email	.93	.99	.06
Texting	.99	1.00	.01
Mobile banking	.85	.72	.13 *
Storing contacts	.96	.99	.03
Sensitive information	.60	.41	.19 *

In Study 1, there was a significant imbalance on race, ($\chi^2(4) = 10.93, p = .027$): of the 18 Black participants, 15 were assigned to the Forecasting condition and 3 were assigned to the Experiencing condition. However, a binary logistic regression demonstrates that the effect of condition on compliance behavior remains significant even after accounting for race, $b = 4.50, SE = .64, p < .001$.

For what it is worth, actual compliance among the 3 Black Experiencers was 100% whereas predicted compliance among the 15 Black Forecasters was 29%, and there was no significant interaction between race and condition on compliance behavior, suggesting that Black participants were no different from the rest of the population in how they were affected by the manipulation.

Study 1 also showed a significant imbalance in the proportion of participants reporting that they use their phones for banking and for storing personal information such as passwords. Forecasters were more likely than Experiencers to report using their phone for banking ($\chi^2(1) = 4.12, p = .042$) and for sensitive information ($\chi^2(1) = 6.74, p = .009$). It should be noted that these covariates (like demographics) were measured at the end. It is plausible that the imbalance can be attributed to the manipulation: perhaps Experiencers became more reluctant to acknowledge that they use their phones for these purposes, having just handed their phones over to the experimenter. Binary logistic regressions demonstrate that the effect of condition on compliance behavior remains significant after taking account of banking, $b = 4.54, SE = .65, p < .001$ or storing sensitive information, $b = 4.41, SE = .63, p < .001$.

Study 2

	Forecasters (<i>N</i> = 95)	Experiencers (<i>N</i> = 105)	Difference
Age	20.06	20.12	.06
Gender			
Female %	.63	.66	.03
Race			
White %	.35	.40	.05
Black %	.08	.12	.04
Asian %	.41	.30	.11 *
Hispanic %	.01	.10	.09 *
Other %	.14	.07	.07
Phone usages			
Photos	.96	.98	.02
Email	.88	.91	.03
Texting	.91	.95	.04
Mobile banking	.87	.72	.15 *
Storing contacts	.86	.88	.02
Sensitive information	.61	.55	.06

In Study 2, race was imbalanced between Forecasters Experiencers, ($\chi^2(5) = 13.63, p = .018$): of the 12 Hispanic/Latinx participants, 11 were assigned to the Experiencing condition. However, a

binary logistic regression demonstrates that the effect of condition on compliance behavior remains significant even after accounting for race, $b = 3.37$, $SE = .42$, $p < .001$.

Study 2 also showed a significant imbalance in the proportion of participants reporting that they use their phones for mobile banking. This time, Forecasters were more likely than Experiencers to report using their phone for banking ($\chi^2(1) = 5.99$, $p = .014$). However, the effect of condition on compliance behavior remains significant after taking account of banking behavior, $b = 3.27$, $SE = .40$, $p < .001$.

Study 3

	Forecasters (<i>N</i> = 29)	Experiencers (<i>N</i> = 31)	Difference
Age	22.45	20.55	1.90
Gender			
Female %	.77	.64	.13
Race			
White %	.40	.29	.11
Black %	.08	.04	.04
Asian %	.40	.54	.14
Hispanic %	.12	.12	.00
Phone usages			
Photos	.84	.93	.09
Email	.97	.93	.04
Texting	1.00	1.00	.00
Mobile banking	.58	.93	.35 *
Storing contacts	1.00	.90	.10
Sensitive information	.45	.28	.17

In Study 3, there was a significant imbalance in the proportion of participants reporting that they use their phones for banking. This time, Experiencers were more likely to report using their phone for banking ($\chi^2(1) = 8.03$, $p = .005$). A binary logistic regression shows that the effect of condition on compliance behavior remains significant after taking account of self-reported banking behavior, $b = .31$, $SE = .12$, $p = .011$.

Data broken out by compliance behavior

Study 1

	How free would <u>a reasonable person</u> feel? Mean (SD)		How free would <u>you</u> feel? Mean (SD)		How free <u>did you</u> feel? Mean (SD)
All Forecasters (n = 100)	4.11 (1.10)	All Forecasters (n = 98)	4.14 (1.44)	All Experiencers (n = 103)	3.28 (.95)
Forecasters who imagined a reasonable person complying (n = 14)	3.46 (.64)	Forecasters who imagined themselves complying (n = 27)	3.45 (1.43)	Experiencers who complied (n = 100)	3.28 (.96)
Forecasters who imagined a reasonable person refusing (n = 85)	4.23 (1.12)	Forecasters who imagined themselves refusing (n = 71)	4.40 (1.37)	Experiencers who refused (n = 3)	3.33 (1.14)
<p>Note. Scales ranged from 1 – 7 with higher numbers indicating higher feelings of freedom. Out of 100 Forecasters, 97 answered the both compliance questions (“Would a reasonable person hand over their phone? Would you hand over your phone?”). One Forecaster who did not answer the compliance question did answer the questions about how free a reasonable person would feel.</p>					

Study 2

	How free would <u>a reasonable person</u> feel? Mean (SD)		How free would <u>you</u> feel? Mean (SD)		How free <u>did you</u> feel? Mean (SD)
All Forecasters (n = 95)	4.39 (1.14)	All Forecasters (n = 95)	4.49 (1.33)	All Experiencers (n = 105)	3.71 (1.16)
Forecasters who imagined a reasonable person complying (n = 31)	3.86 (1.13)	Forecasters who imagined themselves complying (n = 20)	4.28 (1.48)	Experiencers who complied (n = 91)	3.56 (1.09)
Forecasters who imagined a reasonable person refusing (n = 64)	4.65 (1.06)	Forecasters who imagined themselves refusing (n = 75)	4.54 (1.29)	Experiencers who refused (n = 11)	4.66 (1.19)

Study 3

	How many of 100 participants would comply? Mean (SD)	How free would <u>did the immediately preceding</u> <u>Experiencer</u> feel? Mean (SD)		How many of 100 participants would comply? Mean (SD)	How free did <u>you</u> feel? Mean (SD)
All Forecasters (n = 31)	54.77 (24.79)	3.66 (1.12)	All Experiencers (n = 29)	76.86 (22.74)	3.74 (1.15)
Forecasters who guessed that the preceding Experiencer complied (n = 17)	70.35 (12.21)	3.27 (1.02)	Experiencers who complied (n = 26)	79.58 (20.55)	3.67 (1.16)
Forecasters who guessed that the preceding Experiencer refused (n = 14)	35.86 (23.08)	4.14 (1.07)	Experiencers who refused (n = 3)	53.33 (32.15)	4.33 (1.14)