

Factors Influencing Perceived Legitimacy of Social Scoring Systems: Subjective Privacy Harms and the Moderating Role of Transparency

Supplementary File

Carmen Loefflad **Mo Chen** **Jens Grossklags**
 carmen.loefflad@tum.de mo.chen@tum.de jens.grossklags@in.tum.de
 Technical University of Munich
 Boltzmannstr. 3, 85748 Garching

Appendices

	b1	b3	pc2	t2	pc1	na1	na2	tr1	ob1	f1	f2	comp	α
Proc. Justice													
b1													0.79
b3	0.64***												0.81
pc2	0.54***	0.46***											0.78
t2	0.61***	0.53***	0.61***										0.79
pc1	0.40***	0.34***	0.57***	0.38***									0.83
Legitimacy													
na1	0.69***	0.63***	0.54***	0.65***	0.33***								0.65
na2	0.54***	0.46***	0.50***	0.59***	0.34***	0.59***							0.72
tr1	0.60***	0.47***	0.50***	0.65***	0.36***	0.72***	0.57***						0.65
ob1	0.22*	0.28**	0.25*	0.26**	0.27**	0.38***	0.24*	0.36***					0.83
Favorability													
f1	0.41***	0.26**	0.43***	0.34***	0.35***	0.32**	0.12	0.29**	0.15				0.51
f2	0.36***	0.38***	0.23*	0.19	0.26***	0.28**	0.03	0.18	0.08	0.52***			0.51
comp													
ctrl1	0.22*	0.16	0.13	0.21*	0.00	0.21*	0.04	0.18	0.04	0.15	0.12		
	-0.09	0.01	-0.10	-0.18	-0.18	-0.04	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.25*	-0.23*	-0.20*	

Table 4. Bivariate Correlations between Measured Scales (n=101)

Ab.	Question	Sources
	Perceived Procedural Justice	(Alessandro et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2019; Tyler & Jackson, 2013)
b1	I feel the institution acted for the well-being of the community.	
b2	The institution made decisions that were good for everyone in the community.	
b3	The institution did what is necessary to help the community.	
d1	I think the institution treated community members with dignity and respect.	
c1	I understood the rules and methods the institution used to decide on my standing.	
t1	I knew how my behavior would impact my standing.	
t2	I think the mechanism the institution used to assess my standing was fair.	
pc1	I was able to influence the data that the institution considered to evaluate my standing.	
pc2	I was able to influence my standing such that I am satisfied with it.	
	Perceived Legitimacy	(Jackson et al., 2023)
ob1	I felt a moral duty to do what the institution asked participants of the community to do.	
na1	I generally support how the institution acted.	
na2	The institution had the same sense of right and wrong as I do.	
tr1	I could trust the institution to make the right decisions.	
	Perceived Favorability	(Tyler & Jackson, 2013)
f1	Generally speaking, I am satisfied with how the experiment went for me.	
f2	I generally liked how I was treated by other community members.	
f3	Having the institution in the community was favorable to me.	
f4	I am satisfied with my final standing.	
	Subjective Privacy Harm	(Calo, 2011)
ctrl	I felt controlled by the institution.	
	Intention to Comply	
comp	Suppose you would participate in another session of this experiment, under the exact same conditions. Suppose in round 1 of the experiment, you are the second mover, and your interaction partner sends you 10 monetary units. You receive 20 monetary units. How much would you send back?	
Table 5. Constructs and Sources of the Survey (Ab.: Abbreviation)		

All Treatments	DF	AIC	BIC	Chisq.	Chisq. Diff.	DF Diff.	Pr (>Chisq)
Unconstrained path model	40	2660.93	2855.75	45.83			
Without path Fav → Leg	43	2659.61	2845.44	50.51	3.67	3	0.300
With invariant path PJ → Leg	45	2659.67	2839.50	54.57	5.82	2	0.054
With invariant path Fav → PJ	47	2664.57	2838.41	63.48	7.38	2	0.025
Scoring Treatments							
Unconstrained path model	88	2722.78	2895.38	118.35			
Without path Fav → Leg	93	2720.46	2879.98	126.03	7.35	5	0.196
With invariant path PJ → Leg	94	2732.03	2888.94	139.60	6.40	1	0.011
With invariant path Fav → PJ	94	2726.85	2883.75	134.43	5.56	1	0.018
Table 6. Comparison of Model Fits for the Core Model							