Supplementary materials

Sensitivity analysis- Experiment 1

To determine the effect size that our sample size allowed detecting we ran a sensitivity analysis. Since this test does not exist for the generalized linear mixed model, we ran the sensitivity analysis for the variable of our main interest, namely- minimal allocation. A sensitivity analysis for a One-Way repeated measures ANOVA with alpha = 0.05 and a power of 80% revealed that our sample size was sufficient to detect a small effect size, $f = .09$ for a sample size of 205 participants, with a correlation of $r = .50$ among repeated measures.

To compare the analysis result to our actual data, we first calculated for each participant the amount of trials in which he decided to discard the reward in each level of the minimal allocation. Next, we ran a repeated measures ANOVA with minimal allocation as a within factor, and the amount of decisions to discard as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed a small-to-medium effect size, $\eta^2_p = .028$, which is equivalent to $f = .17$. Hence, our sample size was apt for detecting the observed effect.

Additional analyses for Experiment 1- REI-10

We computed for each participant the two subscales of the REI-10, Faith in Intuition ($\alpha = .813$) and Need For Cognition ($\alpha = .695$). The two subscales were not correlated with one another ($r = .032$, $p = .648$). We entered both subscales into our primary model, and ran the generalized linear mixed model logistic regression with allocator type, domain, minimal allocation, cost of equity and all of their interactions, as well as the Faith in Intuition and Need for Cognition as predictors for the likelihood to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation. The analysis revealed very similar results to those of the model without the REI-10 subscales-

the main effect for the minimal allocation ($F(2, 1807) = 17.82$, $p < .001$), as well as the minimal allocation X domain interaction ($F(2, 1807) = 4.40$, $p = .012$) remained highly significant. Additionally, both Faith in Intuition and Need For Cognition did not have a significant effect on the propensity to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation, F's < 1.

Additional analyses for Experiment 1- SSVS

We ran a generalized linear mixed model logistic regression with allocator type, domain, minimal allocation, cost of equity and all of their interactions, as well as the ten values as measured by the SSVS as predictors for the likelihood to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation. The analysis revealed very similar results to those of the model without the SSVS values- the main effect for the minimal allocation ($F(2, 1800) = 18.00$, $p < .001$), as well as the minimal allocation X domain interaction ($F(2, 1800) = 4.46$, $p = .012$) remained highly significant. Additionally, none of the ten values had a significant effect on the likelihood to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation, F's < 2.27, p's > .132.

Additional analyses for Experiment 1- PANAS

We ran a generalized linear mixed model logistic regression with allocator type, domain, minimal allocation, cost of equity and all of their interactions, as well as Positive Affect and Negative Affect scales as predictors for the likelihood to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation. The analysis revealed very similar results to those of the model without the PANAS scales- the main effect for the constraint ($F(2, 1887) = 17.82$, $p < .001$), as well as the constraint X framing interaction ($F(2, 1807) = 4.42$, $p = .012$) remained highly significant. Additionally, both Positive Affect and Negative Affect did not have a significant effect on the propensity to choose the efficient yet inequitable allocation, F's < 2.03, p's > .155