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**Abstract**

A challenge faced by researchers and the philanthropic community is the understanding of how and why donors give. In this study, we experimentally investigate the impact of personality traits (e.g. self-esteem) on charitable giving decisions in order to delineate donors’ profiles. Our experimental design allows us to classify donors by motivation (altruism, warm glow, and impure altruism): we implement first a dictator game in which participants are given an opportunity to donate in an environment where donations are fully crowded out (Crumpler and Grossman, 2008). Second, we use another dictator game where participants are given another opportunity to donate to the same charity without a crowding out scenario (Gandadharan et al., 2015). Moreover, we measure personality traits by using psychological scales. Results suggest that altruistic behaviour not only depends on private preference either for others’ well-being or for personal satisfaction as such. The act of giving to a specific charity is correlated to the donor’s level of self-esteem and empathy: warm glow givers have significantly lower self-esteem levels and higher empathy levels compared to pure altruists and non-donors and hence they are more likely to make a donation.
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1. Introduction

Donations and voluntary giving gained increasingly interests among economists. A challenge faced by researchers and the philanthropic community is the understanding of how and why donors give. The motivation for giving has significant implications for private fund-raising, intergenerational transfers, state support for charities, and funding of public goods in general. For example, researchers investigates whether third-party contributions may crowd out private giving to charities. Understanding what motivates individual’s giving would help to create a relevant impact of the role of foundations by suggesting solutions for example for effective fund-raising policies, for effective framing used in campaign fund, etc. What motivates people to donate? It is established in the literature to distinguish between extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2000; Benabou and Tirole, 2003). Extrinsic motivation can derive for example from tax breaks, thank-you gifts, and various material rewards obtained from acting generously. The intrinsic motivation refers in economics mainly to altruism occurring when there are private preference for others’ well-being. Specifically, an individual is considered as a pure altruist if she gives to a recipient without being interested in how and by whom the care is provided. For a pure altruist, a dollar of charitable contribution is completely crowded out by giving by any other third party. On the contrary, an individual is considered as a pure warm glow giver if her act of giving provides her pleasure and satisfaction. Warm Glow givers do not care about the well-being of the recipient, they only care about how the act of giving makes them feel about themselves (Andreoni 1989, 1990). Warm-glow giving is therefore purely egotistical - whether that be a desire to win prestige or acclaim, to avoid the guilt associated with not giving, to be reciprocal, to satisfy some moral imperative, or to comply with social norms (Vesterlund 2006). Pure warm-glow givers are indeed intimately selfish individuals: although their donations may have a certain external impact, they actually do not care about it. Recently, various papers have argued that warm glow encompasses the signaling benefits of altruistic actions, including concerns for self-image, social-image, and self-esteem (Benabou and Tirole 2006; Ellingsen and Johannesson 2008, 2011; Andreoni and Bernheim 2009; Grossman 2015).

The role of self-esteem in the donation decision has not been explored so far in the economic research. In a psychological perspective an altruistic behaviour can be motivated by self-enhancement. For example, it can be the means to improve one's social and professional image, to increase one's self-esteem, to get a positive feeling and to feel intimately satisfied with oneself and in peace with one's conscience. Therefore, level of self-esteem and altruistic behaviour are related, and the motivation for donation can be closely related to donor types.

2. Behavioural Hypotheses

This research project aims at investigating the relationship between the giving motivation and the self-esteem level of the donor types. Pure altruists do not gain any subjective utility from their donation. Therefore, the role of their self-esteem should not be determinant in their decision to donate. On the contrary, (pure) warm glow givers may decide to make a donation because of their need to increase their self-esteem. That is, their decision
to donate may be a function of their self-esteem level. Therefore, in this work we test the following research hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** warm glow givers have significantly lower self-esteem levels compared to pure altruists;

**Hypothesis 2:** the difference between the self-esteem levels of warm glow givers and pure altruists is significant and consistent: warm glow givers have always on average a significantly lower self-esteem than pure altruists;

**Hypothesis 3:** higher donation are related to lower levels of self-esteem.

We look to find out whether the self-esteem measure can be a predictor of the donation decision and how it correlates to the donor types.

### 3. Experimental design and procedure

To distinguish between different giving motivations, altruistic or warm glow, and to investigate their relationship with donors’ self-esteem, we use an experimental methodology. We conduct an online experiment which consists mainly of two experimental tasks on a within-subject basis. Both tasks will be real donations that participants can make to a charity of their choice selected within a list of five international charities. Table 1 shows the international charities of this online experiment with a short description. Charities have been chosen within the most popular international ones and in order to cover a discrete range of possible causes: poverty, environment, children and women in need, disasters relief, etc.

**Table 1. List of charities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Invests privately raised funds and technical expertise in local organization around the world that hold promise in their effort to help poor move out of poverty; committed to long term relationship in search of lasting solutions to hunger, poverty, and social inequities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>Offers blood donation information and services, disaster relief, many helpful educational classes, as well as HIV/AIDS support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Promotes children's rights, provides relief and helps support children in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund addresses global environmental issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors without Borders</td>
<td>Doctors and nurses volunteer to provide urgent medical care in some 70 countries to civilian victims of war and disaster regardless of race, religion, or politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants are given a 50 cents endowment, they are asked to select a charity and whether they would like to make a donation up to their endowment both in Task 1 and in Task 2. Participants are informed about the type of Task 2 after they complete Task 1. Task 1 follows the methodology by Crumpler and Grossman (2008): it is the “Warm-Glow” task. In this task, a participant knows that whatever donation amount she chooses, the designated charity will receive 50 cents in total. This means that the experimenter will donate the difference between 50 cents and the donation made by the participant. These experimental instructions: “the amount donated by us to the charity of your choice will be reduced by the amount you choose to donate to the charity. That is, the amount the charity will receive will be no more or no less than 50c. How much of the 50c is donated by you, and how much is donated by us is up to you. For example, suppose you choose to keep 20c for yourself and to donate 30c to the charity of your choice. Your earnings will be 20c (50c minus your 30c donation). The charity of your choice will receive 50c: 20c from us (the original 50c less 30c in response to your donation) plus 30c from you.”

In task 2, called the “Altruism” task, the participant is given an additional opportunity to donate to her designated charity from what is left from her endowment after the decision in task 1. In task 2 there is no crowding-out: the participant is informed that 100 percent of any donation goes to the matched charity. Any donation in task 2 will capture altruistic giving. The design of both tasks and the procedures implemented follow part of the experimental design by Gangadharan et al (2015). Table 2 summarizes our experimental tasks.

**Table 2. Experimental tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Warm-Glow task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example of decision question:</td>
<td>You have 50c. How much do you wish to pass to your selected charity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount contributed by the experimenter to your selected charity will be reduced by however much you pass to your selected charity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Altruism task (Standard dictator game)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example of decision question:</td>
<td>You have 50c. How much do you wish to pass to your selected charity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our experimental sample is drawn from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk is an online labour market and has become an important platform for conducting social science research, including economics experiments (Paolacci, Chandler et al. 2010; Horton, Rand et al. 2011; Rand 2012; Crump, McDonnell et al. 2013).

We are going to recruit a total of 400 MTurk workers to participate in our experiment. Respondents will receive an invitation email where they can find and follow a hyperlink to our experiment, housed on Qualtrics. Subjects will be informed on the type of the experiment, the average time that the experiment will take, and the expected payment. They will be free to drop out at any time during the experiment but they will be paid only upon completion. On average, a subject should take approximately 15 minutes to complete the experiment and will
be paid 50 cents as participation fee. Moreover, participants can earn an additional 50 cents, depending on their decisions at the donation tasks.

The use of an online subject pool will allow us to get a broader spectrum of participants as opposite to the student university pool typically used in the laboratory. Moreover, it reduces the possibility that participants are biased in their decisions by the physical proximity of the experimenter.

A criticism that can be argued on the use of online experiment might come from the possibility that it can create some confusion or misunder-standing about the instructions of the experiment. In order avoid such a possibility, we are going to use a couple of questions of comprehension of the rule of the experiment. Participants have two possibilities to select the right answer to the questions. If the wrong answer is selected twice, participants will be automatically drop out. Participants will receive reminders on this type of rule, which will hopefully increases participants’ attention to the experimental instructions. Moreover, the understanding is amplified by the fact that we will select only native English speakers and that participants will have decide their own pace to complete the experiment (there will be no time constraint).

Finally, we will implement many validation procedures: we will ask participants their Amazon ID and we will assign them a random-generated code in order to prevent them to take part to the experiment more than once.

The experiment consists of two donation tasks and some questionnaires. The first questionnaire that participants are asked to fill in is the Self-Esteem Questionnaire (Rosenberg, 1965) which consists of ten statements. Participants are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement. The second questionnaire is thought to collect some socio-demographic information about each participant. Once completed these first two questionnaires, subjects receive instruction for the warm glow task and they are asked to make their decision. Thereafter, participants read the instructions of the second donation task, the altruism task, and they are asked to make their decision. At the end of the donation tasks, they are asked to rate from strongly disagree to strongly agree their opinion on four causes of poverty. Their answers provide us a measure of their attitude towards poverty. We collect some responses about their personal life values and empathy. Finally, we allow participants to briefly write down their motives for giving/not giving. A final screen show to each participant her final earnings, including the participation fee, and their random code to be claimed in MTurk1.

4. Results

The total sample consists of 354 participants. They received a participation fee of £0.50. On average, the individual total earnings were £0.83. Participants completed all the tasks of the survey answering correctly to the control questions. On average participants are between 25 and 44 years old; 60% of participants are men and 73% are American. On average, participants have a 2-year degree, 42% moderately believe in the existence of God, and 68% declare to have sometimes donated to charities. 68% of the participants indicate to have a

1 See Appendix A for experimental instructions.
full time job, to be in a neither extremely poor nor extremely wealthy economic situation, and 25% of them declare to live in a wealthy family. On average, participants identify themselves more democratic oriented.

Approximately 67 percent of subjects donated in one or both of the two giving tasks, with the remaining subjects exhibiting strong non-giving preferences. Thirty-nine percent (139) exhibited revealed-impure-altruism giving, donating in both tasks; 20 percent (69) exhibited revealed-warm-glows giving, donating in task 1 but not task 2; and 8 percent (30) exhibited revealed-altruism giving, donating in task 2 only. Table 1 presents the identification of participants by donation behaviour.

Table 1. Participants Classified by Donation Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warm Glow Task</th>
<th>Altruism Task</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving = 0</td>
<td>Giving &gt;0</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving = 0</td>
<td>116 (33%)</td>
<td>30 (8%)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving &gt; 0</td>
<td>69 (20%)</td>
<td>139 (39%)</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, participants donated 17.11 cents, 34% of their endowment. In the warm glow task, donors made an average donation of 11.96 cents, while in the altruism task they donated on average 5.15 cents. Specifically, warm glow givers donated nearly 54% of their endowment and pure altruists donated 44% of their endowment. Impure-altruist givers made on average a donation equal to 50% of their endowment.

Table 2. Average Donation by Donors’ Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving Behaviour</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average Donation (Std. Dev)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Warm Glow Task</td>
<td>Altruism Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>17.11 (18.06)</td>
<td>11.96 (15.46)</td>
<td>5.15 (9.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm glow givers (pure egoists)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.98 (19.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Altruists</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.93 (18.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impure altruism</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>25.44 (14.06)</td>
<td>17.06 (11.27)</td>
<td>8.38 (6.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test (p-value = 0.08) shows that there is a significant difference between the average donation of Pure Altruists (21.93) and the average donation of the Impure Altruists (25.44). There is no significant difference between the average donation of Warm Glow givers and Pure Altruists, and between Warm Glow givers and Impure Altruists.

Individual self-esteem score was calculated per each participants. The self-esteem scale has a range between 0 and 30. A score lower than 15 indicate a low self-esteem level while a score between 15 and 20 is considered normal. On average, self-esteem level is 20.16 (std. dev 6.40); the median score is 20. 24% of participants have low self-esteem (score<=15); 30% of participants have a self-esteem score between 16 and
20. Cronbach’s alpha, equal to 0.91, indicates an excellent reliability of the test scores\(^2\). Table 3 shows the average self-esteem levels by donor type. T-tests and the two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) tests have been performed. There is significant difference between the self-esteem scores of non-donors and the self-esteem scores of pure altruists (ttest p-value = 0.041, Wilcoxon rank-sum p-value = 0.073). Moreover, there is significant difference between the self-esteem scores of impure altruists and the self-esteem scores of pure altruists (ttest p-value = 0.041, Wilcoxon rank-sum p-value = 0.099) as well.

There is a positive correlation between gender and the self-esteem level (spearman coefficient = 0.101, p-value = 0.057), and between age and the self-esteem score (spearman coefficient = 0.186, p-value = 0.000).

| Table 3. Average Self-esteem Levels by Donor Type |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                               | N     | Mean   | Std. Dev. | Min | Max   |
| Non-donors                    | 116   | 20.66  | 6.62     | 3   | 30    |
| Warm glow givers (pure egoists) | 69    | 19.48  | 6.72     | 5   | 30    |
| Pure Altruists                | 30    | 18.33  | 6.15     | 4   | 30    |
| Impure altruism               | 139   | 20.47  | 6.08     | 0   | 30    |

Table 4 shows the OLS regression estimates on the total donation.

| Table 4. OLS regression on Total donation |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|
|                                          | Total Donation |
| Self-esteem score                       | 0.264 (0.43) |
| Warm glow givers                        | 32.88*** (4.46) |
| Pure Altruists                          | 21.52*** (6.98) |
| Impure Altruists                        | 29.89*** (4.88) |
| Male                                    | 0.425 (0.24) |
| Age                                     | -0.861 (-1.05) |
| Nation                                  | -4.260* (-2.17) |
| Religion                                | -0.151 (-0.38) |
| Employed                                | -1.800 (-1.47) |
| Altruism                                | -3.019 (-1.88) |
| Income                                  | 0.867 (0.81) |
| Fam_income                              | 0.363 (0.35) |
| Political Orientation                   | -0.243 (-0.45) |
| Attitude towards Poverty score          | -0.284 (-0.91) |
| Dependance score                        | -0.213 (-0.94) |
| Empathy score                           | 1.178 (1.60) |
| Individualism                           | 0.292 (0.31) |
| Materialism                             | -0.556 (-0.64) |
| Social desirability score 1             | -0.891 (-1.01) |
| Social desirability score 2             | 1.110 (1.11) |
| paternalism                             | -1.609** (-2.88) |
| Empathy x Self-esteem score             | -0.0178 (-0.53) |

\(^2\) See Figure 1 in Appendix B for the distribution of participants’ self-esteem scores.
Self-esteem score × Warm glow givers -0.408 (-1.18)
Self-esteem score × Impure Altruists -0.333 (-1.16)
Constant 6.328 (0.39)

5. Discussion and Conclusions

In this work we aim at investigating the impact of personality traits (e.g. self-esteem) on charitable giving decisions in order to delineate donors’ profiles. We ran an experiment that consists of two dictator games. In the first one participants are given an opportunity to donate in an environment where donations are fully crowded out whereas in the second one participants are given another opportunity to donate to the same charity without a crowding out scenario. Participants could donate from their own unique endowment. This experimental design allows us to classify donors by motivation (altruism, warm glow, and impure altruism). At the beginning of each sessions, participants were asked to fill in the Self-Esteem Scale by Rosenberg (1965) that provides a measure of the individual self-esteem level. Results of our preliminary data show how donors’ types are correlated to self-esteem levels: warm-glow givers have significantly lower level of self-esteem compared to impure altruists givers and non-donors. Low levels of self-esteem are associated with higher donation justified by an improvement of social image and a positive feeling of satisfaction.
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Appendix A. Experimental Instructions

Invitation Email (used in Amazon Mechanical Turk)

Hello,

My colleagues and I are conducting a study on individual decision-making at the University of Genova (Italy). We would like to invite you to participate in our study.

In this study, you will be asked to fill in some short questionnaires and to make two decisions (HITs). You will receive instructions for each HIT.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are required to make both decisions and to complete the questionnaires in order to receive the payment.

Completing the HITs of this study would take approximately 15 minutes of your time. If you decide to participate, you will be paid a participation fee of $0.50 plus an additional compensation that will depend on your decisions.

Once you have filled in the questionnaires and provided us with your answers, you will be given a numerical survey code to enter in the string below.

If you wish to participate, please click the link below.

For any question about the study, please contact emanuela.lezzi@edu.unige.it.

(Qualtrics survey)
Welcome to our study!

In this study you will be asked to fill in two short initial questionnaires, to make two decisions, and to answer two final questions. You will receive specific instructions.

There will be TWO questions to ascertain that you understand the instructions before making your decisions (two questions per each decision). Please note that you have to answer BOTH these questions correctly in order to get the survey code. If you fail any of them, the survey will automatically end and you will not get any payment.

Moreover, you are required to make both decisions, to complete the questionnaires, and to answer the final questions in order to receive the payment.

If you decide to participate, you will be paid a participation fee of 50 cents plus an additional compensation that will depend on your decisions.

With this in mind, do you wish to continue?

- Continue
- Exit the study

Self-esteem questionnaire

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement. (4-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times I think I am not good at all.
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Socio-Demographic Information questionnaire

Please provide us with the following information:

1. Gender [Female, Male]
2. Age [a drop list will appear here]
3. Nationality [a drop list will appear here]
4. Highest level of education completed [Less than high school, High school graduate, College, 2-year Degree, 4-year Degree, Professional Degree, Doctorate]

5. How strongly do you believe in the existence of a God or Gods? (1-7 from very little to very much)

6. Are you employed? (No, I am unemployed; Yes, part time; Yes, full time)

7. Do you usually give to charities? (Often, Sometimes, Never)

8. Please indicate what you consider YOUR economic situation to be (1-7 from extremely poor to extremely wealthy)

9. Please indicate what you consider your FAMILY’s economic situation to be (1-7 from extremely poor to extremely wealthy)

10. Which US political party do you identify with more strongly? (1-7 from strongly republican to strongly democratic)

***next screen***

(Instructions for HIT 1)

Below the instructions for the first HIT.

You will be given 50c to use in this HIT.

You will be paired with an international charity of your choice. A list of FIVE charities with a short description will appear on the screen.

You will asked to select ONE charity you wish to be paired with.

You are going to be given an opportunity to donate all, some or none of the 50c that you have been allocated to the charity. You have to decide how much of your 50c to keep for yourself and how much to donate. You can choose to donate any amount from 0c to the entire 50c.

These charities are REAL and will really receive your donation (if any). No deception is used in this study. You can contact us at emanuela.lezzi@edu.unige.it for statistics of our study and for a copy of the receipts of the donations to the designated charities.

Important note: the amount donated by us to the charity of your choice will be reduced by the amount you choose to donate. That is, the amount the charity will receive will be no more or no less than 50c. How much of the 50c is donated by you, and how much is donated by us is up to you.

For example, suppose you choose to keep 30c for yourself and to donate 20c to the charity of your choice. Your earnings for this HIT will be 30c (50c minus your 20 donation). The charity of your choice will receive 50c: 30c from us (the original 50c less 20c in response to your donation) plus 20c from you.

As a reminder: your responses are completely anonymous. Nobody will be able to match your donation to your name or your face. As your decision is anonymous, the charity of your choice will not know whether the donation was made by you or by us.

Remember: whatever donation amount you choose the total amount received by the charity will be 50c.

(Check for understanding questions)
Below there is a question to ascertain that you understand our instructions. Remember that you have to answer the question correctly in order to get the survey code. If you fail it, the survey will automatically end and you will not get any payment.

For the next HIT, you will be asked to answer correctly another question.

***next screen***

HIT 1
Congratulations, you have answered the question correctly! It is now time to make your choice.

Please select ONE charity you wish to be paired with from the list below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfam</strong></td>
<td>Invests privately raised funds and technical expertise in local organization around the world that hold promise in their effort to help poor move out of poverty; committed to long term relationship in search of lasting solutions to hunger, poverty, and social inequities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red Cross</strong></td>
<td>Offers blood donation information and services, disaster relief, many helpful educational classes, as well as HIV/AIDS support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Save the Children</strong></td>
<td>Promotes children's rights, provides relief and helps support children in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWF</strong></td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund addresses global environmental issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors without Borders</strong></td>
<td>Doctors and nurses volunteer to provide urgent medical care in some 70 countries to civilian victims of war and disaster regardless of race, religion, or politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have 50c. How much do you wish to donate?

You can choose to donate any amount from 0 to the entire 50c. The amount donated by us to the charity of your choice will be reduced by the amount you choose to donate. That is, the amount the charity will receive will be no more or no less than 50c. How much of the 50c is donated by you, and how much is donated by us is up to you. The amount contributed by us to your selected charity will be reduced by however much you pass to your selected charity.

***next screen***

(Instructions for HIT 2)
Below the instructions for the second HIT.

You are now given another opportunity to donate to the same charity from what remains of your money from HIT 1.
In this HIT, you are paired with the same charity you are paired with in the first HIT. However, unlike in HIT 1, any additional amount you donate will increase the amount received by the charity.

Your donation will be added to the amount donated in HIT 1, such that the amount the charity receives will be equal to the amount you choose to donate in this HIT in addition to the amount received in HIT 1. In this HIT, we will NOT make any additional donation.

You can choose to donate any amount from 0 to the total amount you had left after HIT 1. The computer will remind you how much you have available to donate.

For example, suppose that you have 15c left after your decision in HIT 1. Suppose in this HIT you choose to keep 10c for yourself and to donate an additional 5c to the charity you are paired with. Your earnings will be 10c. The charity will now receive a total of 55c (50c received in HIT 1 plus the additional 5c you donated in this HIT).

Instead, suppose you had 20c left after your decision in HIT 1. Suppose in this HIT you choose to keep 6c for yourself and to donate 14c to the charity you are paired with. Your earnings will be 6c. The charity will now receive a total of 64c (50c received in HIT 1 plus the additional 14c you donated in this HIT).

Please note that you will not be asked whether you would like to make any additional donations after this HIT.

Remember: whatever donation amount you choose, that amount will directly increase the donation received by the charity you have been paired with. In this HIT we will NOT make any additional donation to the charity you are paired with.

(Check for understanding questions)

Below there is a question to ascertain that you understand our instructions. Remember that you have to answer the question correctly in order to get the survey code. If you fail it, the survey will automatically end and you will not get any payment.

***next screen***

HIT 2

Congratulations, you have answered the question correctly! It is now time to make your choice.

You are paired with the same charity you are paired with in the first HIT. However, unlike in HIT 1, any additional amount you donate will increase the amount received by the charity. Your donation will be added to the amount donated in HIT 1, such that the amount the charity receives will be equal to the amount you choose to donate in this HIT in addition to the amount received in HIT 1. In this HIT, we will NOT make any additional donation.

In HIT 1 you have donated: xxx.
You have xxx left.

How much do you wish to donate?

***next screen***
(Attitude towards poverty questions)
The causes of poverty can be attributed to many things. Please rate these attributes from strongly agree to strongly disagree (5-point Likert scale):
  - Lack of effort by the poor
  - Loose morals among the poor
  - Fate, bad luck
  - Being born into poverty

(Final open-ended question)
Please write down why you have decided to donate/to not donate.

(white box here for short text)

End of survey screen
You have completed our survey. Your earnings are xxx + 50c as participation fee = xxx
Please click the Submit button to submit your answers. Your survey code is xxxx
Thank you for participating in our study.
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Figure 1. Self-esteem score distribution