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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Default Source** | | | Total |
| Most  Rational Choice | Expert Opinion | Previous Respondents/Random  Selection |
| **Experimental condition** | Gain Sure | Frequency | 88 | 26 | 29 | 143 |
| Expected Frequency | 74.1 | 35.6 | 33.3 | 143.0 |
| Residual | 13.9 | -9.6 | -4.3 |  |
| Loss Sure | Frequency | 87 | 38 | 31 | 156 |
| Expected Frequency | 80.8 | 38.9 | 36.3 | 156.0 |
| Residual | 6.2 | -.9 | -5.3 |  |
| Gain Risk | Frequency | 65 | 44 | 47 | 156 |
| Expected Frequency | 80.8 | 38.9 | 36.3 | 156.0 |
| Residual | -15.8 | 5.1 | 10.7 |  |
| Loss Risk | Frequency | 74 | 43 | 34 | 151 |
| Expected Frequency | 78.2 | 37.6 | 35.1 | 151.0 |
| Residual | -4.2 | 5.4 | -1.1 |  |
| Total | | Frequency | 314 | 151 | 141 | 606 |
| Expected Frequency | 314.0 | 151.0 | 141.0 | 606.0 |

Table S1 – Frequency of respondents in each of the three default source groups across the four experimental conditions.