**Charismatic speech (# of words: 573)**

Hi, my name is Jean and I have been asked by the experimenters to brief you about the stakes in this game. I stand to win or lose nothing from how you play; however, there will be no greater pleasure for you than to see your group benefit together. Let me tell you why.

Have you heard about the tragedy of the commons? Suppose there is a common grazing ground for the farmers to share. The common interest is to protect the grazing ground, so that it recovers, and new grass can grow on it. It is in the common interest of the famers to cooperate and fairly share the ground, because with cooperation they can all benefit. However, each farmer may have a selfish interest, to have his or her cows graze as much as possible. But if all farmers do that the common good will break down. The field will turn from lush green grass into mud.

In this example, there is a common moral interest pitted against a selfish immoral interest. The game you will play is similar. Either you all cooperate and you all benefit, or you chose the selfish option and collectively lose. In your dilemma, there will be three things at stake: your monetary benefit, but also your pride, and your feeling of self-worth. Why?

You will be given 20 points in each period. Putting them all in the shared account protects the public good; putting them all in your personal account protects your self-interest. If everyone acts selfish you all earn 200 points; however, if you all cooperate and always put all your points in the shared account, you can each make 320 points. That is 60% more. Who would not want that?

There may be a cunning person out there thinking: “I will let the fools put their money in the shared account, but I will always put mine in my private account and profit from their cooperation.” Do you want to be this person? Would this feel right to you? Is it just? Even if one of your group members puts nothing in the common account, as long you three continue to contribute, the cooperators can still make 240 points. That’s is 20% more than if everyone played selfishly. The defector may make more money, but he will walk out of this lab knowing he let you all down, took advantage of the group, and acted selfishly.

Finally, think twice before you retaliate by playing selfishly following selfish actions by someone else. Civil rights leader Martin Luther King said the method of passive resistance is not weak, for it’s the strong person who does not retaliate. This method works on your opponent’s conscience.

Even if someone defects from the beginning, you can send this person a signal by still contributing to the shared account. The defector will see that you still believe in him, in the common good, and that cooperation is better than defection, and may change. But if the defector does not change, you will still leave this lab with your head held high. And, what if you are the only contributor? The fewer the contributors the greater your share of honor.

So, do what is right, do what takes courage, and think of the common good. Turn the tragedy of the commons into the triumph of cooperation, and walk out of this lab proud. So, what are you going to do?

**Non-charismatic speech (# of words: 574)**

Hi, my name is Jean and I have been asked by the experimenters to brief you about the stakes in this game. I stand to win or lose nothing from how you play; however, there will be no greater pleasure for you than to see your group benefit together. Let me tell you why.

I suppose that most of you have heard about the tragedy of the commons. It refers to a public good situation where there are multiple players that have a common resource to share. If they all contribute to the common resource they all benefit. Contributing means that they each incur some costs and by doing so, they collectively benefit. By protecting the public good they can increase public welfare. In such situations if individuals chose to not cooperate, public wealth is destroyed. Therefore individuals have to consider their private interests in relation to their collective interest; the rational action for the long term is cooperation.

The tragedy of the commons is classic in economics because it highlights the friction between private and common interest. The game you will play is similar and cooperation between the players translates into collective increased payoffs for all. Individuals are in a dilemma and the utility they gain from partaking will depend on money but it can also be psychological in nature.

You will be given 20 points in each period. Putting them all in the shared account is the cooperative option and putting them all in your personal account translate into looking out for your self-interest. With everyone doing the latter, you can make a maximum of 200 points. With everyone cooperating the maximum you make is 320 points, which is 60% more and which means more earnings for everyone.

Of course, a player may decide to invoke the dominant strategy, which potentially has the highest payoffs. Here the player takes advantage of the goodwill of other contributors and never contributes to the public good himself. Interestingly, even if one player defects every round and puts nothing in the shared account, if the three other players continue to contribute they will still be better off and make 240 points which is 20% more than if everyone played in a selfish way. Of course, the defector will make more money, but then has to face the psychological cost of his conduct. The defector has to balance economic benefit against the psychological costs incurred for not having cooperated.

Finally, think twice before you retaliate by playing selfishly following selfish actions by someone else. Civil rights leader Martin Luther King said the method of passive resistance is not weak and it takes strength to not retaliate. This method will affect the utility of your opponent.

If someone defects from the beginning consider sending this person a signal by still playing cooperatively. The defector will see that you still believe in him and in the value of cooperation in public good situations and may change. But if the defector does not change, you will still leave this lab knowing you served the common interest. And in the event that you are the only remaining contributor you can derive more utility knowing the challenge you faced all alone.

To conclude, it is clear that cooperation is the best option for all and it is that which should be brought to the fore. To avoid a tragedy of the commons maximize your psychological utility and make yourself feel good.