Do Two Eyes See More Generosity Than One?

Watching Eyes, Gender, and Giving

Vreemde ogen dwingen. (Dutch proverb)

1. Introduction

In his *Constitution* (Book II, 360b-c), Plato discusses the legendary behavior of Gyges, a shepherd who gained possession of a ring that made him invisible. According to the legend, he seduced the Queen of Lydia and with her help murdered the King. To Plato, this behavior was not surprising at all:

“No man would keep his hands off what was not his own when he could safely take what he liked out of the market, or go into houses and lie with any one at his pleasure, or kill or release from prison whom he would, and in all respects be like a God among men.”

The argument is that we need laws and punishment to prevent antisocial behavior – otherwise men revert to their ‘natural’ state of hedonism and aggression. Yet even in the absence of laws punishing egoistic behavior, many people in the modern world – even males – make an effort to observe norms that benefit the group of which they are a part, at a direct cost to themselves. Most strikingly, even in situations in which norm-conformity entails prosocial behavior that does not yield any material benefits for the actor, people often tend to choose the socially desirable option. This regularity is especially pronounced when people’s actions can be observed by others. Experiments in a wide variety of social dilemma situations show that the likelihood of prosocial behavior increases when it may be observed by others (Alpizar, Carlsson, & Johansson-Stenman, 2008; Barclay, 2004; Bateson, Nettle, & Roberts, 2006; Bereczkei, Birkas, & Kerekes, 2007; Bereczkei, Birkas, & Kerekes,

2010; Harris, Benson, & Hall, 1975; Elizabeth Hoffman, McCabe, Shachat, & Smith, 1994; E. Hoffman, McCabe, & Smith, 1996; Kurzban, DeScioli, & O'Brien, 2007; Long, 1976; Rege & Telle, 2004; Satow, 1975; Soetevent, 2005). Conversely, when people make decisions in anonymous settings, they tend to be more selfish when dividing a resource between themselves and others.

The behavior of Gyges fits the stereotype of the 'young selfish male' (List, 2004). Yet the empirical evidence on gender differences in generosity is mixed. While some experiments conducted among students find that females are more generous than males (Eckel & Grossman, 1998, 2003, 2006; Pradel, Euler, & Fetschenhauer, 2009), other experiments do not yield such gender differences (Ben-Ner, Kong, & Putterman, 2004; Cadsby, Servátka, & Song, 2010; Duncan, 2009; Rosenblat, 2008; Swope, Cadigan, Schmitt, & Shupp, 2008). Field studies on generosity (for a review, see Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007) tend to find that females are more likely to give, but that males give higher amounts.

A more consistent finding (yet see Cox & Deck (2006) for an exception) is that males are more sensitive to the price of giving (Andreoni, Brown, & Rischall, 2003; Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001; Eckel & Grossman, 1996b) and the context in which decisions about donations are made (Croson, Handy, & Shang, 2010; Jiobu & Knowles, 1974; Landry, Lange, List, Price, & Rupp, 2006). One study found increasing donations with age among males but not among females (List, 2004). Maturation among males goes along with more generosity, but not among females.

A powerful ingredient in public situations encouraging norm-conform behavior is the *physical cue of being watched*. When making decisions on moral behavior facing the eyes of others, people tend to conform more readily to the moral norm (Bateson et al., 2006; Bull & Gibson-Robinson, 1981; Haley & Fessler, 2005).

The present paper extends this line of research by testing for effects of being watched on charitable donations among a large, nationally representative sample and by testing for gender differences in effects of cues of being watched.

The reward from compliance with social norms has often been viewed as a social phenomenon. Yet the physical cue of being watched also leads to physical changes in the brain (Emery, 2000). In a recent neuro-imaging study, the reward that people get from the presence of observers was found to be processed in the ventral striatum, the same brain area that encodes material rewards (Izuma, Saito, & Sadato, 2009).

Gender differences

The first hypothesis that I test is that

H1. Females display more generosity than males.

This hypothesis is based on the nature of the task and the composition of the sample. The participants in the present experiment were adolescents. Previous research has found that gender differences in giving are more pronounced (favoring girls) at a younger age (Gummerum, Hanoch, Keller, Parsons, & Hummel, 2010; Pradel et al., 2009; Sutter et al., 2010), and decrease with age (List, 2004).

As will be explained in the data and methods section below, the decision to be made by participants in the experiment is whether or not to give away money to a charity in a real life situation. Previous research on charitable giving has found that females are more likely to give but tend to give lower amounts (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007).

Cues of being watched

The second hypothesis that I test is

H2. *Cues of being watched increase generosity.*

This hypothesis is based on the argument that it is helpful for the development of cooperation to be sensitive to cues of the presence of others, and especially to eyes facing in one's direction (Emery, 2000; Haley & Fessler, 2005). Previous research supports the hypothesis that cues of being watched increase generosity.

In a field experiment it was found that solicitors in a door-to-door fundraising campaign who looked potential donors in the eye raised more money than solicitors who looked at the collection tin (Bateson et al., 2006; Bull & Gibson-Robinson, 1981; Haley & Fessler, 2005). In another field experiment in which donations for a charitable cause were solicited door-to-door, people who faced two pairs of eyes of two solicitors instead of merely one pair of eyes of one solicitor were more likely to donate (Jackson & Latané, 1981).

Yet watching eyes need not be alive and bodily present to make our behavior more prosocial. A field experiment among UK university employees showed that the display of a picture of watching eyes increased contributions to a public good in a real life setting – an honesty box in a university coffee room (Bateson et al., 2006). An experiment among Japanese students that varied whether donations benefited in-group or out-group members found that watching eyes only promoted donations towards in-group members (Mifune, Hashimoto, & Yamagishi, 2010).

Even subtle cues that mimic watching eyes enhance prosocial tendencies. In a laboratory experiment with public goods games, participants who were watched by a robot contributed more than participants who were not watched (Burnham & Hare, 2007). In a laboratory dictator game among US students, in which participants

unexpectedly received \$5 and were given the opportunity to give some of this money away to an anonymous another participant, the display of eye-spots on the computer desktop from which decisions were made enhanced donations (Haley & Fessler, 2005). In another laboratory dictator game among US students, the display of three dots in a “watching eyes”-configuration enhanced donations by males, but not by females (Rigdon, Ishii, Watabe, & Kitayama, 2009).

Gender differences in effects of being watched

The third hypothesis that I test is that

H3. Males increase generosity more strongly when subjected to cues of being watched than females.

This hypothesis is based on costly signaling theory (CST; Hardy & Vugt, 2006). From a biological-evolutionary perspective, one may argue that males are keener on creating possibilities to procreate. Assuming that males want to create more offspring, they have an incentive to display costly generosity in the presence of females. Indeed females tend to value prosocial traits as more desirable in a long term mate (Buss, 1989; Schmitt, 2004). This is exactly what one would predict from a theory of sexual selection for moral virtues (Miller, 2007). If females desire altruistic partners, males have an incentive to display competitive altruism in public settings (Hardy & Vugt, 2006; Iredale, Van Vugt, & Dunbar, 2008).

Indeed several studies show that in face-to-face interaction situations, males are more likely to donate money to a charitable cause when accompanied by females (Goldberg, 1995; Iredale et al., 2008; Jiobu & Knowles, 1974) or when females solicit donations (Farrelly, Lazarus, & Roberts, 2007; Landry et al., 2006). In situations where no face-to-face interaction occurs, the female-asks-male effect does not emerge

(Bekkers, 2010). A previous study with dictator games in which donations benefited other participants also found that cues of being watched promote generosity by males but not by females (Rigdon et al., 2009). These findings are all in line with CST.

Innovations

The present paper is innovative in two respects: (1) by examining donations to charitable organizations rather than specific other individuals; (2) by examining effects of cues of being watched on generosity among a large, nationally representative sample of adolescents.

In previous studies using dictator games, donations benefited *specific other individuals*. Cues of being watched may very well have an influence because donations benefit specific individuals. The watching eyes remind us of the recipient. But would cues of being watched also enhance generosity when the beneficiaries are not specific individuals but more abstract charitable causes? In the present paper, I extend the evidence to dictator games in which charitable organizations are the recipients instead of individuals.

In anonymous situations, students tend to be more generous towards charitable causes than towards specific individuals (Eckel & Grossman, 1996a). Yet it is unknown whether cues of being watched enhance donations to charitable causes. Given the finding in the Japanese experiment that cues of being watched did not enhance donations to out-group members (Mifune et al., 2010) it is questionable whether cues of being watched affect donations to charitable causes, which mostly serve out-group members. While to date no research has been published in an academic journal showing that pictures of recipients enhances donations to charitable organizations, it is conventional wisdom among fundraisers that a picture says more

than a thousand words. Charitable organizations often use pictures of recipients in their fundraising materials that ‘look at the donor’. Fundraising materials are often tested quite extensively. One would expect that the fundraising practice of using pictures of recipients looking at the donor is based on a positive effect of being watched. In addition, I explore whether males react more strongly to cues of being watched than females. If cues of being watched have similar effects on donations to charitable causes as on donations to specific individuals, one would expect males to be more sensitive to the cues.

I present experiments with two types of cues of being watched among a large heterogeneous sample of young adolescents in the Netherlands. The large variance in socio-demographic characteristics in this sample allows for an examination of the effects of experimental conditions across different subpopulations. Previous experiments on anonymity and generosity have mostly been conducted among samples of university students, implicitly assuming that results obtained from these samples can be generalized to ‘human nature’ (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). It is important to know whether results obtained among higher educated individuals also generalize to lower educated strata of society. Without actually testing this assumption, the evidence from student samples can be generalized only to the university population from which they were drawn. The lack of variation in socio-demographic characteristics in samples of university students limits the possibilities to check the assumption that university students are like other people. Broader population samples are required to conduct such tests. The studies I present below are based on heterogeneous population samples. Here I analyze the effects of cues of being watched among subgroups of students enrolled at different levels of education. The level of education is a ubiquitous (positive) correlate of generosity (Bekkers &

Wiepking, 2007). But few studies have examined whether the level of education moderates the effect of social influence.

In the studies presented below, participants were presented with a chance of receiving an amount of €10 after they completed an online survey. The participants were asked whether they would keep the money, donate it to a charitable cause, or split the money equally between themselves and a charity. The prevalence of donating increased with the number of eyes displayed on the screen above the box where the participants made their donation decision. However, a more subtle stimulus – a ‘watching eyes’ configurations of dots – did not affect donations at all. Overall, females were more generous than males. Consistent with previous research, the effect of watching eyes was more pronounced among males. The results illustrate that males are more sensitive to cues of watching eyes than females, approaching (but not reaching) the female level of generosity towards abstract charitable causes.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants. The participants were respondents in a survey of service learning programs in the Netherlands conducted in the fall of 2008 (3-4 months after the beginning of the school year) and the spring of 2009 (1-2 months before the end of the school year). The total number of participants in the survey was 2,826. The participants were attending 31 different schools for all levels of secondary education from all over the Netherlands. The sample thus includes students from a wide range of socio-demographic backgrounds (for more details on sampling, see Bekkers, Spenkelink, Ooms, & Immerzeel, 2010). Participants were recruited for the study by their teachers, who had enlisted for an evaluation of service learning programs at their school. Typically, teachers had their students complete the survey during a regular

service learning class in a computer room at their school. Teachers were instructed not to let students talk during the survey. This instruction was also given explicitly to the students on the first screen of the survey. Participants were assured confidentiality.

For the present studies, the questionnaire software created random groups of 546 participants (Study 1) and 302 participants (Study 2). Participants were aged between 13 and 20 (mean age: 15.6 in Study 1 and 15.5 in Study 2). In both studies, about half of the participants indicated in the survey that they were male (45.3% in Study 1, 51.6% in Study 2). Participants were enrolled at all levels of secondary education, ranging from lower vocational education (called ‘VMBO’ in the Netherlands, 29.5% in Study 1, 24.4% in Study 2), in middle vocational education (‘HAVO’, 23.1% in Study 1, 34.4% in Study 2), and higher secondary education (‘VWO’, Atheneum and Gymnasium; 43.6% in Study 1, 41.2% in Study 2). Only individuals in the latter group are likely to be admitted to higher tertiary education – eventually becoming the typical participant in experiments conducted at universities. It will be examined whether the effects of cues of being watched are similar across groups of participants at different levels of education.

2.2. Survey. At the beginning of the survey, it was announced that one student from each class that participated in the survey would randomly be selected to receive €10. Class sizes in the Netherlands typically range between 20 and 30. The participants then completed the survey, including questions on socio-demographic characteristics, and prosocial values and behavior. At the end of the survey, the participants were presented with a list of options for receiving the €10 if their name would be selected. Three categories of options were given: receiving a voucher for a specific store, donating to a charitable cause, or splitting the amount in a €5 voucher and a €5 donation. Four types of vouchers were offered: for an online store, for a

games, movies and music store, for book stores, and a general voucher that can be used in most types of other stores in the Netherlands. To facilitate donation decisions, the twelve largest charitable organizations in the Netherlands were displayed and an option to donate to ‘another charitable organization, i.e.....’ where the participants could write the name of another organization, if desired.

2.3. Experimental Design. The experiment included a control condition in which participants were thanked for their participation in the survey, they were reminded of the chance of receiving the €10, and the three ways in which they could receive the €10 were mentioned. No pictures were shown. A transcript of the conditions appears in Appendix A.

In the *three dots watching eyes* condition (taken from Rigdon et al., 2009), participants saw three dots in a configuration mimicking watching eyes (see table 1). In the *triangle* condition (also taken from Rigdon et al., 2009), the same picture was shown as in the watching eyes configuration, but rotated by 180°. In the *one eye* condition, a black/white picture of a left, female eye was displayed. In the *two eyes* condition, a black/white picture of a pair of female eyes was displayed.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

3. Study 1

In this study the watching eyes configuration was tested against the triangle configuration and a control condition in which no graphics were shown. Table 2 shows the proportion of participants donating €5 or €10 in the three conditions by gender.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In the control condition, 38% of the boys donated, and 49% of the girls. Though the difference is not significant ($\chi^2_{1,173} = 1.980, p < .159$), it is in line with hypothesis 1. Additional analyses (not shown in table) revealed that girls were especially more likely to donate €5 than boys. 30.2% of the girls donated €5 while only 15.9% of the boys donated €5 ($\chi^2_{1,546} = 15.225, p < .000$). Girls and boys were about equally likely to donate €10 (18.7% vs 16.6% ($\chi^2_{1,546} = 0.419, p < .518$)). The sex difference in donating (collapsing donations of €5 and €10) was most pronounced in the watching eyes condition ($\chi^2_{1,181} = 6.155; p < .013$; differences in the other conditions were not significant).

Hypothesis 2, that cues of being watched enhance generosity, received no support in this study. The distribution of donations in the experimental conditions did not differ from the expected values ($\chi^2_{2,546} = 1.009, p = .604$).

Hypothesis 3, that cues of being watched enhance generosity among males more strongly than among females, also received no support in this study. Among girls, there were no meaningful differences between the conditions ($\chi^2_{2,295} = .341, p = .843$). Among boys, in contrast, donations were somewhat *less* likely to occur in the watching eyes condition. Though the difference with the control condition failed to reach significance ($\chi^2_{1,164} = 1.610, p < .205$), it runs counter to the prediction.

The effects of the watching eyes and triangle configurations were examined separately for students enrolled at different levels of education (see figure 1). The analyses revealed that the lower level of generosity in the watching eyes configuration condition is located almost exclusively among students at the middle level of secondary education. The triangle configuration yielded lower donations by students at lower vocational education (though not significantly so, $F_{1,101} = 2.417, p = .123$).

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Students in higher secondary education – the group from which future university students are recruited almost exclusively – were not affected at all by the experimental conditions.

4. Study 2

The subtle cues of being watched employed in Study 1 did not yield the hypothesized results. Real eyes are a stronger cue of being watched than the three dots configuration. Therefore in this study a picture showing one real eye was tested against a picture showing two eyes and a control condition in which no graphics were shown. Table 3 shows the proportion of participants donating €5 or €10 in the three conditions by gender. The results are quite different from the results in Study 1, reinforcing the insight that generosity is strongly dependent on the situational context (Levitt & List, 2007).

Hypothesis 1 received good support in this study. In the control condition, only 13% of the boys donated, and 40% of the girls ($\chi^2_{1,74} = 7.141; p < .008$).

In line with hypothesis 2, donations were more likely to occur when eyes were displayed. However, two eyes did not see more generosity than one. Differences in the proportion of participants making donations and the amount donated were not significant between the one eye and the two eyes condition, neither among girls and boys separately, nor collapsing both genders (all p 's $> .323$).

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Hypothesis 3 received support as the increase in generosity was most pronounced among boys. Seeing one eye, 33% of the boys donated; confronted with two eyes, 25% of the boys donated. The distribution differs from chance ($\chi^2_{2,156} = 4.953; p < .084$). The display of eyes also promoted generosity by girls, but less

strongly so, increasing from 40% in the control condition to 52% in the two eyes condition ($\chi^2_{2,146} = 1.242; p < .537$).

Interestingly, the display of two eyes most strongly increased the likelihood of donating €10. Among boys this proportion increased from 5.5% in the control condition to 18.6%; among girls the proportion donating €10 increased from 8.6% in the control condition to 21.7%. As a result, the mean amount donated increased from €0.90 in the control condition through €2.41 in the one eye condition to €2.21 in the two eyes condition among boys ($F_{2,153} = 2.301, p = .103$). Among girls, the amount donated increased from €2.43 in the control condition through €3.33 in the one eye condition to €3.67 in the two eyes condition ($F_{2,143} = 1.202, p = .304$).

Despite the more pronounced effect of eyes on boys, girls remained more likely to donate than boys in all conditions. The difference was most pronounced in the two eyes condition ($\chi^2_{1,119} = 8.640; p < .003$), but also the differences in the other conditions were sizeable.

An examination of generosity in experimental conditions among participants enrolled in different levels of education yielded a striking pattern (see figure 2). The effects of cues of being watched were much more pronounced among students at lower levels of education than among students at higher levels of education. When confronted with one eye, students in lower vocational education – the lowest level of secondary education in the Netherlands – gave more than double the amount they gave in the control condition. When confronted with a pair of eyes their donations went up further to almost three times the amount donated in the control condition. Among students enrolled in lower vocational education, the correlation between the number of eyes displayed and the amount donated is .215 ($p = .073$). Donations by students enrolled in higher levels of education also tended to increase as cues of being

watched were introduced, but less strongly so. Among students enrolled in middle and higher secondary education, the correlation between the number of eyes displayed and the amount donated is .065 ($p = .508$) and .114 ($p = .214$), respectively.

[FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

5. General Discussion

In two studies, the effects of gender, cues of being watched and their interaction on charitable donations were examined among a national sample of male and female adolescents in the Netherlands. In both studies, I find that females are more generous than males when no cues of being watched are presented. These results support hypothesis 1.

The hypothesis that cues of being watched enhance generosity towards charitable causes was not supported in Study 1, in which a subtle cue was employed. If anything, boys seemed to be *less* likely to donate money to a charitable cause when they were exposed to a subtle cue of being watched, a ‘watching eyes’ configuration of three dots. Using a stronger and more realistic set of cues – black/white pictures of one real eye and one pair of real eyes – Study 2 found good support for the hypothesis that cues of being watched enhance generosity towards charitable causes. Taken together, the studies suggest that subtle cues of being watched are not strong enough to promote generosity towards absent strangers. Explicit cues of being watched, however, do enhance the display of generosity.

The result of Study 2 calls into question the claim by Mifune et al. (2010) that “monitoring makes people behave in a more altruistic manner unless such behavior is irrelevant, that is, when such behavior is directed to outsiders of the community.” Clearly, the charitable causes identified as recipients in the decision making task

benefit large groups of people in need, and they are mostly strangers. The difference between the present results and the results of Mifune et al. (2010) may be due to cultural differences (the Netherlands vs Japan), the use of different samples (a heterogeneous sample vs a homogeneous student sample), and the identification of different recipients (charitable causes vs specific individuals).

Though Study 1 did not support the hypothesis that males are more strongly affected by cues of being watched than females, Study 2 did support this prediction. When confronted with two eyes, generosity among boys more than doubled and generosity among girls increased by almost 50%. The display of one or two eyes did not make much of a difference, though girls seemed to be slightly more generous when confronted with a pair of eyes instead of with only one. When exposed to the eyes, boys came closer to the generosity displayed by girls, but still did not reach their level of generosity.

The gender differences in the effect of being watched on generosity give further support to costly signaling theory (CST). The explanation of effects of watching eyes from CST is an ultimate explanation: it identifies a mechanism in a distant past that may have generated the sensitivity to cues of being watched over the course of a long period of time. The explanation may seem far-fetched as the decision making situation for the participants in the present experiment – watching a picture on a computer screen sitting in a class room – did not create possibilities for interaction with the people whose eyes were observed. One would expect that cues of being watched have an even more pronounced effect when interaction opportunities are available. Though it is difficult to compare the effect sizes of different experiments, the effects of being watched in Study 2 seem to be weaker than the effects of the presence of real female observers on male generosity in a previous experiment

(Iredale et al., 2008). Another interesting implication of CST worth testing is that the display of female eyes should enhance male generosity more strongly than the display of male eyes. In Study 2 female eyes were used, which may have enhanced their effect on males.

Finally, CST predicts generosity to increase with the costs involved in public settings, a finding that recently emerged from a study on volunteering intentions among students in Hungary (Bereczkei et al., 2010). Yet the findings in that experiment on sex differences in the effect of anonymity do diverge from the finding in Study 2 in which males were found to be more strongly affected by cues of being watched than females. Again, differences may be due to culture, sample composition, and protocols.

An important conclusion from Study 2 is that cues of being watched have different effects on participants with different levels of education. Specifically, cues of being watched influenced students enrolled at the lowest level of education most strongly. Students at the highest level of education were least affected. This finding calls for caution in interpreting results from previous experiments on generosity, which are typically conducted among university students. The present results indicate that cues of being watched are less powerful influences on those who are most likely to continue education into university. When using only university students in experiments, the effects of cues of being watched on ‘people’ in general may thus be underestimated. When seeking knowledge about ‘people’ or ‘humans’, experimentalists are well-advised to conduct studies among heterogeneous samples. In the current paper only the level of education was examined as a moderator of experimentally induced stimuli. Other characteristics may also interact with stimuli.

The results of the present studies also have practical implications. Charitable organizations raising funds among the general public are likely to be more successful when using cues of being watched. While the optimal design of such cues is a matter for further testing, the results from Study 1 suggest that watching eyes configurations of dots are too subtle to influence generosity. The results from Study 2 suggest that real eyes do enhance generosity, especially among males and lower educated individuals. While two eyes did not see more generosity than one, the findings mirror the behavior described in Plato's quotation. When they were not looked at, boys tended to behave like Gyges: they were much more selfish. Also remember that Gyges was a shepherd, a profession for which no formal education was required. We have seen that the level of generosity among the lower educated increased most strongly when exposed to cues of being watched. When they were looked at, the boys and the lower educated increased their generosity. The visibility of our actions not only reduces hedonism and aggression, it seems; visibility also enhances altruism and helping.

Acknowledgements

The data collection for this study was financed by the Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Sciences. I thank Tim Immerzeel and Merel Ooms for their invaluable research assistance. I thank Mark van Vugt and Susanne Rebers for helpful comments on an earlier version.

References

- Alpizar, F., Carlsson, F., & Johansson-Stenman, O. (2008). Anonymity, Reciprocity and Conformity: Evidence from Voluntary Contributions to a Natural Park in Costa Rica. *Journal Of Public Economics*, 92(5-6), 1047-1060.
- Andreoni, J., Brown, E., & Rischall, I. (2003). Charitable Giving by Married Couples. Who Decides and Why Does it Matter? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 38(1), 111-133.
- Andreoni, J., & Vesterlund, L. (2001). Which is the Fair Sex? Gender Differences in Altruism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February, 293-312.
- Barclay, P. (2004). Trustworthiness and competitive altruism can also solve the tragedy of the commons. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 25, 209-220.
- Bateson, M., Nettle, D., & Roberts, G. (2006). Cues of being watched enhance cooperation in a real world setting. *Biology Letters*, 2, 412-414.
- Bekkers, R. (2010). George Gives to Geology Jane: The Name Letter Effect and Incidental Similarity Cues in Fundraising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15, 172-180.
- Bekkers, R., Spenkelink, S., Ooms, M., & Immerzeel, I. (2010). *Maatschappelijke Stage en Burgerschap: Rapportage Schooljaar 2008-2009*: Department of Sociology, Utrecht University.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007). Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review. Report commissioned by the John Templeton Foundation. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1015507>.
- Ben-Ner, A., Kong, F., & Putterman, L. (2004). Share and Share Alike? Gender-pairing, Personality, and Cognitive Ability as Determinants of Giving. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 25, 581-589.

- Bereczkei, T., Birkas, B., & Kerekes, Z. (2007). Public charity offer as a proximate factor of evolved reputation-building strategy: an experimental analysis of a real-life situation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 277–284.
- Bereczkei, T., Birkas, B., & Kerekes, Z. (2010). Altruism towards strangers in need: costly signaling in an industrial society. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 95-103.
- Bull, R., & Gibson-Robinson, E. (1981). The Influences of Eye-Gaze, Style of Dress, and Locality on the Amounts of Money Donated to a Charity. *Human Relations*, 34(10), 895-905.
- Burnham, T. C., & Hare, B. (2007). Engineering Human Cooperation: Does Involuntary Neural Activation Increase Public Goods Contributions? *Human Nature*, 18, 88-108.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-14.
- Cadsby, C. B., Servátka, M., & Song, F. (2010). Gender and generosity: does degree of anonymity or group gender composition matter? *Experimental Economics*.
- Cox, J. C., & Deck, C. A. (2006). When Are Women More Generous Than Men? *Economic Inquiry*, 44(4), 587-598.
- Croson, R. T. A., Handy, F., & Shang, J. (2010). Gendered giving: the influence of social norms on the donation behavior of men and women. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15, 199-213.
- Duncan, B. (2009). Secret Santa Reveals the Secret Side of Giving. *Economic Inquiry*, 47(1), 165-181.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1996a). Altruism in Anonymous Dictator Games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 16, 181-191.

- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1996b). The relative price of fairness: Gender differences in a punishment game. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 30, 143-158.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men? Evidence from dictator experiments. *The Economic Journal*, 108(448), 726-735.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2003). Rebate versus matching: does how we subsidize charitable contributions matter? *Journal Of Public Economics*, 87(3-4), 681-701.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2006). Subsidizing Charitable Giving with Rebates or Matching: Further Laboratory Evidence. *Southern Economic Journal*, 72(4), 794-807.
- Emery, N. J. (2000). The eyes have it: the neuroethology, function and evolution of social gaze. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24, 581-604.
- Farrelly, D., Lazarus, J., & Roberts, G. (2007). Altruists Attract. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 5(2), 313-329.
- Goldberg, T. L. (1995). Altruism towards panhandlers: Who gives? *Human Nature*, 6, 79-89.
- Gummerum, M., Hanoch, Y., Keller, M., Parsons, K., & Hummel, A. (2010). Preschoolers' allocations in the dictator game: The role of moral emotions. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 31, 25-34.
- Haley, K. J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2005). Nobody's watching? Subtle cues affect generosity in an anonymous economic game. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 245-256.

- Hardy, C. L., & Vugt, M. V. (2006). Nice Guys Finish First: The Competitive Altruism Hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(10), 1402-1413.
- Harris, M. B., Benson, S. M., & Hall, C. L. (1975). The Effects of Confession on Altruism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 96, 187-192.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 66-135.
- Hoffman, E., McCabe, K., Shachat, K., & Smith, V. (1994). Preferences, Property Rights, and Anonymity in Bargaining Games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 7, 346-380.
- Hoffman, E., McCabe, K., & Smith, V. L. (1996). Social Distance and Other-Regarding Behavior in Dictator Games. *American Economic Review*, 86, 653-660.
- Iredale, W., Van Vugt, M., & Dunbar, R. (2008). Showing Off in Humans: Male Generosity as a Mating Signal. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6(3), 386-392.
- Jackson, J. M., & Latané, B. (1981). Strength and Number of Solicitors and the Urge Toward Altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7(3), 415-422.
- Jiobu, R. M., & Knowles, E. S. (1974). Norm Strength and Alms Giving: An Observational Study. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 94, 205-211.
- Kurzban, R., DeScioli, P., & O'Brien, E. (2007). Audience effects on moralistic punishment. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 75-84.
- Landry, C. E., Lange, A., List, J. A., Price, M. K., & Rupp, N. G. (2006). Toward an Understanding of the Economics of Charity: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 747-782.

- Levitt, S. D., & List, J. A. (2007). What Do Laboratory Experiments Measuring Social Preferences Reveal About the Real World? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2), 153-174.
- List, J. A. (2004). Young, selfish, and male: Field evidence of social preferences. *Economic Journal*, 114(1), 121-149.
- Long, S. H. (1976). Social pressure and contributions to health charities. *Public Choice*, 28, 55-66.
- Mifune, N., Hashimoto, H., & Yamagishi, T. (2010). Altruism toward in-group members as a reputation mechanism. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 109-117.
- Miller, G. F. (2007). Sexual Selection for Moral Virtues. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 82(2), 97-125.
- Pradel, J., Euler, H. A., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2009). Spotting altruistic dictator game players and mingling with them: the elective assortment of classmates. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30(2), 103-113.
- Rege, M., & Telle, K. (2004). The impact of social approval and framing on cooperation in public good situations. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1625-1644.
- Rigdon, M., Ishii, K., Watabe, M., & Kitayama, S. (2009). Minimal social cues in the dictator game. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30, 358-367.
- Rosenblat, T. S. (2008). The Beauty Premium: Physical Attractiveness and Gender in Dictator Games. *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4), 465-481.
- Satow, K. L. (1975). Social Approval and Helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 501-509.

- Schmitt, D. P. (2004). Patterns and universals of mate poaching across 53 nations: the effects of sex, culture, and personality on romantically attracting another person's partner. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 560-584.
- Soetevent, A. R. (2005). Anonymity in giving in a natural context - a field experiment in 30 churches. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 2301-2323.
- Sutter, M., Feri, F., Kocher, M. G., Martinsson, P., Nordblom, K., & Rützler, D. (2010). Social Preferences in Childhood and Adolescence: A Large-Scale Experiment. IZA Discussion Paper No. 5016, June 2010.
- Swope, K. J., Cadigan, J., Schmitt, P. M., & Shupp, R. (2008). Personality preferences in laboratory economics experiments. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37, 998-1009.

Appendix

Instructions for the donation decision were given on three screens after the survey was completed. The first screen contained the instructions, and read as follows: “Thank you for completing the questionnaire! When all the questionnaires are completed, we are going to have a lottery in each class for a voucher of 10 euro. You have a chance of winning this voucher as well. If your name is drawn, you can spend the voucher in several ways. You can have the voucher for yourself, donate it to a charitable cause, or both. For yourself, you can have the voucher as an Iris-cheque, a cheque for books, a bol.com gift cheque, or a National Entertainment cheque (music, films, games).

As charitable causes you can choose from:

- Amnesty International
- Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières
- Animal Protection Society
- Greenpeace
- The Netherlands Heart Organization
- Church in Action
- KWF Cancer Fund
- Oxfam Novib
- Stop Aids Now!
- Unicef
- War Child
- The World Wildlife Fund
- Or another charitable cause, if you prefer that”

The second screen read: “Now make your choice below.

- I would like to keep the voucher of €10 for myself

- I would like to split the voucher: keep €5 for myself and donate €5 to a charity.
- I would like to donate the voucher of €10 completely to a charity.”

The third screen asked what form the voucher should take and/or what charitable organization the voucher should benefit, listing the options from the instruction screen again.

Table 1. 'Watching eyes' stimuli in Study 1 and Study 2

Control	Study 1		Study 2	
	Watching eyes configuration	Triangle configuration	One eye	Two eyes
No picture
n=173	n=181	n=192		
n=74			n=109	n=119

Table 2. Donations by gender in Study 1 (numbers of observations in each cell in brackets)

		Boys	Girls	Total
Control		38.3	48.9	43.9
condition		(n=81)	(n=92)	(n=173)
Watching eyes	• •	28.9	46.9	38.7
	•	(n=83)	(n=98)	(n=181)
Triangle	•	36.8	44.8	41.1
	• •	(n=87)	(n=105)	(n=192)
Total		34.7	46.8	41.2
		(n=251)	(n=295)	(n=546)

Table 3. Donations by gender in Study 2 (numbers of observations in each cell in brackets)

		Boys	Girls	Total
Control		12.8	40.0	25.7
condition		(n=39)	(n=35)	(n=74)
One eye		32.8	49.0	40.4
		(n=58)	(n=51)	(n=109)
Two eyes		25.4	51.7	38.7
		(n=59)	(n=60)	(n=119)
Total		25.0	47.9	36.1
		(n=156)	(n=146)	(n=302)

Figure 1. Mean amount donated in experimental conditions by level of education in Study 1

Figure 2. Mean amount donated in experimental conditions by level of education