Abstract

Can subtle nuances in the way aid is provided negatively impact recipient psychology and behavior? The present research explores the practice of making salient to the aid recipient the existence of their individual giver, what we term giver spotlighting. To test how giver spotlighting during aid delivery impacts recipients’ reactions to the aid, we ran seven preregistered experiments ($N = 4,808$)—a series of online experiments and a Kenya-based field study. We find that giver spotlighting threatens recipient’s feeling of agency and, subsequently, decreases recipients’ willingness to return for more aid in the future and to recommend the aid organization to others in similar need-states. Our results suggest that a deeper understanding into the recipients’ psychology is crucial to improve not only recipients’ experiences when receiving help, but may also influence the continued uptake of and utilization of aid globally.

Introduction

What factors might impede global humanitarian efforts? Humans have made incredible advancements in developing interventions for some of the world’s most pressing problems, such as extreme poverty and life-threatening health conditions. Despite this progress, we continue to observe inordinate levels of poverty and preventable disease and death. There is reason to believe that aid take-up failure poses a serious threat to the effectiveness of humanitarian efforts worldwide. For example, historical take-up rates of welfare programs and humanitarian efforts, both within and outside the U.S., have been surprisingly low (45-60%, on average), even for cash programs like Supplemental Security Income\(^1,2\). More recently, eligible individuals have failed to take-up government aid (referred to as the “benefits participation gap”), like the Economic Impact Payment (the “stimulus check”) and Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) in the U.S.\(^3\). In 2020 alone, this take-up failure resulted in almost 20 billion dollars of unclaimed government assistance\(^4\), government assistance that could have helped to reduce poverty, childhood hunger, educational gaps, and physical and mental illness\(^5,6,7\).

Previous scholars have identified four factors that are likely perpetuating high rates of take-up failure: 1. Costs, both economic and psychological, loom larger than benefits, 2. Recipients have insufficient knowledge of the aid opportunity, 3. Structural barriers that create hassle for recipients, and 4. Procrastination in take-up of aid opportunities\(^8\). Since Bertrand et al. (2006)’s call to action, development economists have developed sizable literatures to explore the structural, procrastination, and economic cost barriers (see\(^9\) for a review). Unfortunately, fewer scholars have explored the psychological costs of aid and the psychology of aid recipients in general. Most of the limited literature on recipient psychology was conducted nearly half a century ago by Nadler and colleagues, who document a variety of factors that threaten recipients’ self-esteem—such as giver-receiver similarity\(^10\) and whether the giver was perceived as a foe\(^11\), high-status\(^12\), or an outgroup member\(^13\)—and, subsequently, create relatively negative reactions to the aid experience\(^14\). While offering valuable general insights, these studies were not conducted in the context of the very poor.

More recently, in response to growing evidence of aid utilization failure, behavioral development economists have begun to explore aspects of the aid recipient’s perspective in the context of the very poor. Studies in this area have explored how psychological biases (e.g., reference points, present bias\(^15\)) and barriers (e.g., depression, stress\(^16\), sleep deprivation\(^17\), cognitive function potential\(^18\), and scarcity mindsets\(^19\)) might influence the effectiveness of aid interventions. Moreover, research on the psychological lives of the poor has investigated how receiving aid impacts recipients’ psychological states (e.g., aspirations\(^20,21,22,23,24\), hope\(^25,26,27\), self-efficacy\(^28\), felt dependency\(^29\), happiness\(^30\)), and how baseline differences in these psychological states might also impact aid effectiveness. Despite this budding behavioral development economics literature, which identifies the importance of recipient psychology for aid success, very few scholars have investigated how
nuances in *how we give* impacts recipients’ psychology and behaviors,\(^{31,32,33,34}\) even fewer have identified how such nuances impact aid utilization failure\(^{3,35}\), and scholars have yet to explore how such nuances impact interpersonal communications that facilitate knowledge spread of the aid opportunity (i.e., word-of-mouth recommendations).

Why is it important to study how psychological costs associated with aid might inhibit both individual take-up of the aid and word-of-mouth recommendations to others in a similar need-state? Marketing researchers laud word-of-mouth communication as one of the most influential channels of knowledge spread and product success in the marketplace\(^{36}\). This form of interpersonal communication has been described as, “informal communications directed at other consumers about ownership, usage, or characteristics of particular goods and services or their sellers.”\(^{37}\) Word-of-mouth can also be a powerful determinant of product knowledge and success in the public sector, and is likely to also be a driving force behind aid success (or failure). In fact, word-of-mouth has been linked to increased adoption of a mobile payments service in a developing country, mediated by increased trust and decreased perceptions of risk.\(^{38}\)

The present research aims to further shed light on what we call the *psychology of charitable receiving*, and to document how a deeper understanding of aid recipient psychology can inform why aid take-up and knowledge spread failure occurs. Specifically, bringing together extant work on giver-receiver dynamics from psychology and welfare take-up failure from economics, we examine whether calling attention to the existence of one’s individual giver during the aid delivery process (i.e., through sharing of personal information about the giver—name, age, and brief bio—and/or sharing a message from one’s giver; henceforth “giver spotlighting”) impacts recipients’ (i) psychological reactions to the aid opportunity, (ii) willingness to continuously take-up the aid (“return behaviors”), and (iii) willingness to engage in positive word-of-mouth communications to spread awareness of the aid opportunity to others experiencing a similar hardship (“recommendation behaviors”).

Our manipulations of giver spotlighting pull from techniques used by giver-receiver matching charities, where individual givers are matched with a specific recipient. Since the charitable sphere has increasingly prioritized transparency\(^{1}\), such matching charities have proliferated. Matching charities are attractive not only because they provide the giver an opportunity to see whom they are helping (fostering increased transparency), but many also offer givers the chance to engage in light-touch contact with the recipient. Based on our observations of these matching charities, we define light-touch giver spotlighting as a brief interaction between givers and receivers where the contact is minimal and, often, one-sided (i.e., givers reach out to recipients, but recipients are not able to respond to or initiate contact with givers).

Previous work has asserted that, in most giving contexts, the need to belong and the need for independence are at odds\(^{39}\). Thus, when one’s giver is (vs. is not) spotlighted, it may increase feelings of social connectivity and belongingness, but it might also make more salient that one’s outcomes are contingent on someone else’s behaviors (givers), which would subsequently threaten one’s self-esteem, sense of agency, and feelings of self-reliance\(^{39,40,41,42,43}\). Inherent to how we define giver spotlighting, this giver-receiver contact often does not allow for a meaningful connection to form between givers and receivers. As such, we predict that giver spotlighting will make the aid experience more *negative* for recipients because thinking about, but not meaningfully connecting with, the giver will only threaten the recipient’s sense of agency and fail to foster a sense of belongingness.

Specifically, we hypothesize that giver spotlighting will decrease recipients’ willingness to return for future aid and recommend the aid organization to others in similar need-states. We further hypothesize that the predicted negative effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions and behaviors will be explained by agency threat. We base this on the theory of moral typecasting, which posits that for every (im)moral encounter, there is always an active agent and a feeling patient, where the agent is a capable and competent actor and the patient is an emotionally feeling target of the agent’s (im)moral behavior\(^{44,45,46,47,48,49}\). Drawing on this literature, we expect that calling to mind the existence of one’s individual giver (the ‘agent’) via giver spotlighting (with or without giver identification) will make the recipient feel more like the ‘patient’ in

\(^{1}\) CharityNavigator, a popular meta-charity watchdog, holds transparency as one of the two core pillars of a ‘good’ charitable organization: [https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=content.view&cpid=5593#rating](https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=content.view&cpid=5593#rating)
this dyad. In other words, we expect giver spotlighting will cause recipients to explicitly compare themselves to their giver; a comparison recipients’ likely do not partake in when the giver is not spotlighted. We further predict that this interpersonal comparison elicited by giver spotlighting will lead recipients to feel relatively less agentic and capable (i.e., like a “moral patient”), as they compare themselves to their now-salient giver (i.e., the “moral agent”), subsequently triggering agency threat.

Ultimately, our goal is to explore how giver spotlighting might be contributing to aid utilization and recommendation failure and, more broadly, to inform our understanding of how providing the same aid in different ways can materially impact the psychological experiences and behaviors of aid recipients.

Experiments.

We conducted a series of seven preregistered experiments (N = 4,808) to test the following question: When one’s giver is (vs. is not) spotlighted during the aid delivery process, will recipients differ in intentions to return to and recommend the charity helping them? We operationalize giver spotlighting by sharing with recipients the giver’s name, age, and basic biographic information (i.e., the giver’s location, occupation, and some hobbies) and/or by sharing with the recipient a brief message from the giver, wishing the recipient well. When identified, the giver’s demographic information (gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status) was always unidentified. Additionally, across Experiments 1-4, the giver’s name was gender neutral (“Adrian Lee Smithe”) and details about the giver (age, occupation, degree of affiliation) varied slightly across studies. Section A of the Online Supplement displays the wording of the giver spotlighting manipulations.

Experiments 1-4: Behavioral Intention Experiments.

Generalizability. Experiment 1 (N = 1,028; described in ‘Experiment 1’ in the Methods) tested our main effect of giver spotlighting on recipient reactions to aid featuring a homelessness and struggling alumni scenario. Experiments 2a-c (Ns = 810, 821, and 815, respectively; Described in ‘Experiments 2a-c) tested the generalizability of the giver spotlighting effect. Experiment 3 (N = 806, Described in Experiment 3 in the Methods) tested multiple manipulations of giver spotlighting, with and without giver identification. Experiment 4 (N = 462; Described in ‘Experiment 4’ in the Methods) investigated the underlying psychological process. A series of two-way ANOVAs on return and recommend intentions suggest a consistent and reliable effect of giver spotlighting: we found no significant interactions between giver spotlighting and (i) type of scenario (Experiment 1; ps = .961), (ii) presence vs. absence of aid solicitation (Experiment 2a; p = .105), (iii) high vs. low need (Experiment 2b; ps = .837); (iv) whether recipients themselves were identified vs. anonymous to their giver (Experiment 2c; p = .307), and (v) we found no interaction between spotlighting by identifying one’s giver and/or by providing a message from the giver (Experiment 3; p = .379). Thus, most remaining analyses reflect a comparison between giver spotlighting vs. no spotlighting, collapsed across all other manipulations. We report the manipulations, full results, and results on exploratory outcome variables for each experiment in the Online Supplement.

Ecological Validity. To verify that participants in our online experiments were able to take on the mindset of an aid recipient, across Experiments 1-4, we asked participants to always report whether they (i) could imagine being in the need-state described in the scenario and (ii) thought they could experience similar need in their own life, in the future. Across all studies 86.6%-95.0% of participants responded yes to at least one of the two questions and 69.7%-81.4% of participants responded yes to both questions. Socioeconomic status (SES) measures of income, education, and social class identification also reveal that the majority of our U.S.
participants can be identified as lower-middle or middle-class (see Methods section for results on SES in Experiments 1-2c).

**Meta-analyses on Return & Recommendation Intentions.** Since Experiments 1-4 included the same measure of return and recommend intentions, we pooled data across these experiments and conducted an internal meta-analysis\(^5\) (cumulative \(N = 4,742\); Figure 1 displays the results). The tests of heterogeneity on return and recommend intentions \((Q(5) = 5.66, p = .341)\) revealed a good homogeneity suggesting that the six experiments were consistent. The estimation of the cumulative effect size\(^6\) revealed a significant condition effect on return and recommend intentions \((d = .24, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.18, 0.31], p < .001)\), such that giver spotlighting (vs. no spotlighting) decreased participants’ intentions to return for more aid in the future and recommend the aid organization to others in similar need-states. Results from Experiments 1-4 individually support this hypothesis, and we include individual experiment results in Sections C-I through C-V of the Online Supplement.

**Figure 1.** Forest plot of the Effect of Giver Spotlighting on Return & Recommend Intentions from an Internal Meta-analysis of Experiments 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Return &amp; Recommendation Intentions</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>95%-CI</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>[-0.31; -0.06]</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>[-0.35; -0.07]</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>[-0.35; -0.08]</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>[-0.32; -0.05]</td>
<td>18.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>[-0.48; -0.16]</td>
<td>13.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>[-0.52; -0.15]</td>
<td>10.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-0.23</strong></td>
<td>[-0.29; -0.17]</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. This figure displays a forest plot documenting the effect size \((d)\) with 95\% CIs of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions for each individual study and the overall effect across studies. The dots represent the effect size for each individual study and the diamond represent the overall effect size for return & recommend intentions.

**Testing Multiple Giver Spotlighting Manipulations.** In all prior experiments, giver spotlighting was manipulated in the same way: by identifying the giver’s name, age, and a brief bio. Even though we do not identify the giver’s demographic information (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status), it is possible certain details identified about the giver led to demographic presumptions and this, in turn, could explain the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions identified thus far. To rule out this alternative explanation, Experiment 3 manipulated giver spotlighting in two ways: by identifying information about the giver (as we have done in prior studies) and/or by sending a brief note from the giver. Section A-III of the Online Supplement displays the wording of the manipulations.

If the effect of giver spotlighting is driven by negative responses to specific pieces of identified information, we should see that only the Moderate Spotlighting via Identification Only and High Spotlighting conditions (but not the Moderate Spotlighting via Contact Only) elicits significantly lower return and recommendation intentions, compared to the No Spotlighting condition. Alternatively, if, as predicted, giver

---

\(^5\) We used the R package \textit{meta}\(^50\) and a random-effects model by using the inverse variance method. In most cases, a random-effects model should be preferred to a fixed-effect model\(^51\).

\(^6\) We report the raw mean difference \(d\), since all of the studies in the meta-analysis use the same scale to assess the outcome measure\(^52\).
spotlighting backfires because calling to mind the existence of the individual giver leads to interpersonal comparison and agency threat, all spotlighting conditions (including the Moderate Spotlighting via Contact Only condition) should elicit significantly lower return and recommendation intentions, compared to the No Spotlighting condition.

Overall, the results from Experiment 3 support our predictions: participants in the No Spotlighting condition were significantly more likely to return to and recommend the aid organization compared to all giver spotlighting conditions ($p$s ≤ .029). Figure 2 displays the visualized results, and we report the full results from Experiments 3 in Section C-V of the Online Supplement.

**Figure 2. Results on Return and Recommendation Intentions in Experiment 3**

![Graph showing results](image)

*Note.* $^*$ $p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$, $^{***} p < .001$. The error bars for the Recommendation Intentions variable represent standard errors. The four conditions are as follows: (1) No Spotlighting (i.e., not identifying one’s giver nor sharing a message from one’s giver), (2) Moderate Spotlighting via Identification Only (i.e., identifying one’s giver, but not sharing a message from one’s giver), (3) Moderate Spotlighting via Contact Only (i.e., sharing a message from one’s giver, but not identifying one’s giver), and (4) High Spotlighting (i.e., both identifying one’s giver and sharing a message from one’s giver).

**Process: Mediation by Agency Threat.** In Experiment 4, we test our theoretically motivated mechanism: agency threat. Specifically, we measure agency threat using an adapted version of the Mind Attribution Scale. If giver spotlighting leads to agency threat specifically—rather than overall self-dehumanization—participants in our giver spotlighting (vs. no spotlighting) condition in Experiment 4 would report no change in capacity to feel emotion, but would report a decrease in capacity to act agentically. Indeed, participants whose giver was spotlighted ($M = 5.85, SD = 1.11$)—versus was not spotlighted ($M = 6.04, SD = 0.89$)—report feeling significantly less agency ($F(1,462) = 4.27, p = .039$), but report no difference in their ability to feel emotions (Spotlighted: $M = 5.79, SD = 1.20$; Not Spotlighted: $M = 5.87, SD = 0.95$; $F(1,462) = 0.75, p = .389$). Mediation analyses reveal that agency threat (the agency-sub scale) does in fact partially mediate the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommend intentions ($a = 0.05, 95\% CI [0.003, 0.094]$). Figure 4 displays the visualized results from this mediation analysis.

**Figure 3. Mediation by Agency Threat in Experiment 4**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Return &amp; Recommend Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Agency-threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>a = 0.10* (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b = 0.48*** (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c' = 0.13** (0.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Experiment 5: Field Experiment in Kenya.

Experiment 5 (N = 476; Described in ‘Experiments 5’ in the Methods) tested the effect of giver spotlighting on recommendation intentions and behaviors among extremely poor aid recipients (i.e., they reported lacking basic amenities such as clean water for drinking, food, have poor sanitation, and poor housing) in rural Kenya, in collaboration with the Busara Center and their charitable payments platform, Spare. The experiment followed a between-subjects, two condition design. All individuals received a Ksh 500 direct-cash-transfer, and we randomly assigned participants to either (i) learn about their giver’s name, age, and basic biographic information and receive a brief message from their giver or (ii) receive no such information about or from their giver when they received their cash-transfer (Figure 4 displays the text messages sent to participants in Experiment 5, translated from Swahili).

Figure 4. Experimental Manipulation from Field Experiment 5 (in the English Translation)

Hello [recipient Name], you have received a donation of Ksh 500 from the Busara Spare platform.

Below is some information about the giver responsible for funding your Ksh 500 donation from the Busara Spare platform:

- **Name:** [NAME]
- **Age:** 39
- **Description:** [NAME] is a Professor of Management at [U.S. UNIVERSITY]. [NAME] grew up in [CITY, COUNTRY], and currently lives in [CITY, STATE], U.S.A. [NAME] enjoys cooking, jogging, and spending time with her husband, [NAME].

[NAME] sent you a brief message with your Ksh 500 cash-transfer. See [NAME’S] message below:

*Hello, I hope that this money will help you during these difficult times – best of luck with all of your future endeavors. Best regards, [NAME]*

Notes. The red text was delivered to participants in both the giver spotlighting and no spotlighting conditions. All other text was only sent to participants in the giver spotlighting condition. All identifying information of the giver is masked for double blind review.

Figure 5 displays the results. First, we see that recipients texted back to the Busara Center that they intended to recommend the charity (Spare) to significantly more individuals they know when their giver was not spotlighted (M = 12.72, SD = 21.90), as compared to when their giver was spotlighted (M = 7.57, SD = 13.30; F(1,447) = 8.87, p = .003). Additionally, after a logarithmic transformation\(^7\), we still find that participants in the

---

\(^7\) We ran this analysis with log transformation since the relationship between the dependent variable (giver spotlighting condition) and the independent variable (number of individuals they’d recommend the charity to) is non-linear and right skewed. We first added 1 to all responses prior to the log transformation, to account for those who entered “0”.

\(\ast p < .05, \ast\ast p < .01, \ast\ast\ast p < .001.\)
no giver spotlighting condition \((M = 0.90, SD = 0.39)\) intend to recommend Spare to significantly more individuals than those in the giver spotlighting condition \((M = 0.77, SD = 0.31; F(1,447) = 14.30, p < .001)\). In line with these recommendation intentions, we also see that significantly more recipients in our no spotlighting condition (99.6%; 238/239)—compared to those in our giver spotlighted condition (91.6%; 217/237)—chose to recommend Spare to others by providing a testimonial on how the cash-transfer impacted them \((X^2(1,476) = 18.15, p < .001)\).

**Figure 5.** Results on Recommendation Intentions and Behavior in Experiment 5

Notes. The error bars for the Recommendation Intentions variable represent 95% CIs.

Additionally, we collected exploratory qualitative data from responses to the following open-ended measure: “I would like to learn more about how receiving the Ksh 500 cash-transfer from [Spare / Researcher's Name] made you feel. Different experiences and interactions can make people feel different emotions. Please share with us the first 10 words that come to mind, when thinking about how receiving Ksh 500 from [Spare / Researcher's Name] made you feel.” We then used linguistic analysis software (LIWC 2015) to code for agency and patiency-related words to further explore our hypothesized mechanism of agency threat. If recipients are less likely to recommend the aid organization when the giver is spotlighted (vs. not spotlighted) due to a decrease in felt agency, we should see significantly more agency-related words in the no spotlighting condition and significantly more patiency-related words in the giver spotlighted condition.

To determine the prevalence of agency-related language (i.e., the capacity to shape one’s own life), we used LIWC 2015’s achievement (i.e., references to success and failure, achievement striving) and reward focus (i.e., references to rewards, incentives, positive goals, approach) sub-dictionaries of “core drives and needs” dictionary. To extract the prevalence of patiency-related language (i.e., the capacity to feel), we used LIWC 2015’s feeling sub-dictionary of the “perpetual processes” (i.e., our tools for experiencing the external world: the ability to see, hear, and feel) dictionary. First, the two measures of agency-language (achievement and reward focus) were positively correlated \((r = .139, p = .002)\). Additionally, the presence of patiency-language...
was weakly negatively correlated with the presence of agency-language (corr with “achieve”: $r = -0.089, p = 0.052$; corr with “reward”: $r = -0.097, p = 0.035$), suggesting that recipients who used more agency-words were less likely to use patiency-words (and vice versa).

Moreover, in line with our hypothesized mechanism of agency threat, participants in our giver spotlighting condition (Achievement: $M = 1.98, SD = 4.64$; Reward: $M = 8.41, SD = 8.32$) were far less likely to use agency words than participants in the no spotlighting condition (Achievement: $M = 3.23, SD = 6.22$; $F(1,474) = 6.15, p = 0.013$; Reward: $M = 14.48, SD = 10.02$; $F(1,474) = 51.74, p < 0.001$). Participants in our giver spotlighted condition (Feeling: $M = 1.04, SD = 3.68$) were also significantly more likely to use patiency words than participants in our no giver spotlighted condition (Feeling: $M = 0.19, SD = 1.54$; $F(1,474) = 10.81, p = 0.001$). Thus, when recipients were asked to share with us the first 10 words that came to mind when thinking about how receiving the cash-transfer made them feel, the presence vs. absence of giver spotlighting significantly changed how recipients describe the experience, such that participants in our no spotlighting condition used significantly more agency-related words and significantly fewer patiency-related words when sharing how receiving the aid made them feel. Consistent with findings from Experiment 4, exploratory mediation analyses suggest that having one’s giver spotlighted significantly decreases recipients’ felt agency (i.e., participants used fewer “achievement” words, “reward-focus” words, and verbs) and, as a consequence, participants are significantly less willing to provide a recommendation for the aid organization (see Figure S3 in Section C-VII of the Online Supplement for details). We report all other exploratory results from this experiment in Section C-VII of the Online Supplement.

Discussion

Aid has the potential to motivate people in need to rise out of their difficult situation and can give the people who need it the most the hope to persevere, regardless of how daunting their future may seem. Unfortunately, aid also holds the potential to make recipients feel ashamed and embarrassed, helpless, and dependent on charity. Social scientists have not yet focused much on what we call the psychology of charitable receiving and, subsequently, cannot yet explain how nuances in the aid delivery process impact recipients.

The present research begins to address this question by shedding light on how differences in the way we deliver aid (i.e., by spotlighting or not spotlighting the giver)—holding constant the aid itself—influences recipients’ psychology and behaviors. Across seven preregistered experiments ($N = 4,808$), we show that spotlighting (vs. not spotlighting) one’s individual giver during the aid delivery process (with or without giver identification) negatively impacts recipient psychology and behaviors. Results from Experiments 1-4 suggest that giver spotlighting decreases both recipients’ willingness to return for more aid and recommend the aid organization to others in a similar need-state. Though, one limitation of our work is that, in Experiment 5, we were only able to measure the effect of giver spotlighting on recommendation behaviors, and were unable to track return behaviors due to feasibility constraints in our field context. Although we expect giver spotlighting would decrease return behaviors in such field contexts, based on our consistent findings on return intentions in Studies 1-4, we encourage non-profit organizations with matching or sponsorship models to track their recipients’ return rates and explore whether light touch giver spotlighting may be accidentally harming continued take-up rates.

Additionally, although recent work on the identified giver effect\(^{32}\) suggests that disclosing the giver’s name (vs. spotlighting the giver without name disclosure) elicits positive consequences on utilization by fostering feelings of obligation and a desire to reciprocate with one’s identified giver, which may also work to increase recipients’ willingness to return to and recommend the aid organization, we find no such effect. We expect that this is because participants in these experiments are exposed to a giver spotlighting manipulation both when their individual giver is and is not identified via a name disclosure. Thus, no prior scholars have explored how calling to mind (vs. not calling to mind) the existence of the giver impacts recipients of aid. Study 3 explicitly manipulates both giver identification via name disclosure and giver contact without name disclosure, and finds main effects of giver spotlighting regardless of how we spotlight (i.e., via identification only, contact only, or both identification and contact). This suggests that calling attention to one’s individual giver with and without identification (vs. no spotlighting) decreases recipients’ return and recommend intentions (see section C-V of
the Online Supplement for details). As noted, there is a rising trend amongst matching charities where individual givers are spotlighted (both with and without identification) to individual recipients; to make sure our manipulations of giver spotlighting capture the different instantiations of this charitable trend, we compare giver spotlighting (with or without giver identification) to a condition with no giver spotlighting. Future research in the charitable sphere—especially those focusing on charities that use giver-receiver matching or sponsorship models—should further explore the many different ramifications of allowing for different kinds of light-touch contact between givers and receivers, and how this contact might help or harm both the recipients, aid utilization, and knowledge spread.

More broadly, we encourage researchers to shift their attention towards the psychology of charitable receiving, as an effort to both improve recipients’ experiences when receiving aid and help to decrease the frequency of aid utilization failure. Our results suggest that giver spotlighting backfires because shining a light on the existence of the individual giver threatens recipients’ sense of agency by eliciting the giver’s role as the moral agent, subsequently casting recipients in the role of the moral patient. Future research could further explore the different antecedents to and consequences of agency threat in helping contexts. Additionally, although the present research identifies agency-threat as a mechanism behind the effects of giver spotlighting on recipients’ psychology and behaviors, additional hidden mechanisms could still exist. We do find preliminary evidence for our hypothesized mechanism of agency-threat in the both the US and Kenya (Studies 4 and 5, respectively), we encourage future scholars to continue exploring how giver spotlighting and giver-receiver interactions influence recipient psychology.

It’s not easy to experience hardship, to experience plights like poverty and joblessness. It takes a great deal of motivation and perseverance to make it through such a hardship, let alone rise above it. Those who are trying to help—givers, researchers, policymakers, and charities alike—ought to be cognizant of the ways in which the help they are providing could lessen that psychological burden, or unintentionally add to it.

Online content

Any methods, additional references, Nature Research reporting summaries, source data, extended data, supplementary information, acknowledgements, peer review information, details of author contributions and competing interests, and statements of data and code availability are or will be made available at OSF (https://osf.io/wxzam/?view_only=9fc34511bdc34cc79e75030657b0c7bf).

Methods

We report all experiments, conditions, measures, and data exclusions. Table 1 describes the methods and measures included in Experiments 1-5. The Online Supplement provides detailed dropout information for all studies. Research protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Northwestern University and the Kenyan IRB for our experiment with the Busara Center for Experiment 5. Participants consented to participate in all studies. No deception was used.

Table 1. Description of Independent Variables, Dependent Variables, and Exploratory Measures from Experiments 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment #</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Exploratory Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimen...</td>
<td>2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) x 2(scenario: homeless aid, alumni aid)</td>
<td>Return &amp; Recommendation Intentions</td>
<td>DVs: Gratitude, Motivation, Dependency, Hope, Helplessness, Shame, Temporary Need, Perceived Merit, Perceived Need, Self-Attribution, Situational-Attribution, Others-Attribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experiments 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4, 5

Experimen
t 2a
2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) x 2(solicitation-type: solicited, unsolicited) Return & Recommendation Intentions DVs: Gratitude & Motivation

Experimen
t 2b
2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) x 2(need-type: high need, low need) Return & Recommendation Intentions DVs: Gratitude, Motivation, Dependency, Hope, Helplessness, Shame, Deservingness, Giver Sympathy, Giver Pity

Experimen
t 2c
2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) x 2(recipient identification: yes, no) Return & Recommendation Intentions DVs: Gratitude, Motivation, Exposure, Privacy

Experimen
t 3
2(giver identified: yes, no) x 2(giver contact: yes, no) Return & Recommendation Intentions DVs: Gratitude & Motivation

Experimen
t 4
2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) Return & Recommendation Intentions; Agency & Patiency IVs: Collectivism, Individualism, Horizontal & Vertical Independence & Interdependence

Experimen
t 5
2(giver spotlighted: yes, no) Recommendation Intentions & Behavior; Agency (from text-analysis) Text-analyses on Open-ended Response: Gratitude & Patiency DVs: Satisfaction and Return Intentions IVs: Horizontal Collectivism & Horizontal Individualism

Notes. Experiments 1-2c spotlight the giver by identifying the giver's name, age, and providing a brief bio. Experiment 3 spotlights the giver by either identifying the giver and/or via giver contact. Experiments 4 and 5 spotlight the giver via both identification and contact. Across all studies, conditions with no giver spotlighting do not mention the giver in any way.

Sample size determination and randomization
For all of our experiments, sample sizes were preregistered and predetermined (i.e., no data were collected for any experiment after analysis began). For Experiment 1 and Experiment 5, sample size was pre-determined by informal rules-of-thumb to determine a target sample size of 250 participants per condition. For Experiment 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, and 4, sample size was predetermined to attain around 200 participants per condition. For all experiments, we aimed to recruit participants from separate samples using appropriate identifiers (for example, participant identification number, Amazon Mechanical Turk identification number or IP address) to avoid duplicated responses. In all online experiments, we used the randomization feature present in the survey software of Qualtrics and ran our experiments on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) using the CloudResearch platform. For Experiment 5, the Busara Center used a random number generator in excel to randomize participants into one of our two conditions.

Data analysis and reporting
Data analysis was conducted in R and SPSS (v.27 and v.28). All reported p-values are two-sided, all measures for each experiment were taken from distinct samples, and all analyses were run without the inclusion of covariates. We preregistered analyses with and without exclusions. For a conservative test, in the main text, we report the data without exclusions for all studies. We report the results with strict exclusions (i.e., participants passed both manipulation checks) and lenient exclusions (i.e., participants passed either one or both manipulation checks) in Section D of the Online Supplement. Additionally, we report all additional preregistered (exploratory) analyses in Section E of the Online Supplement.
Experimental samples and procedures

**Experiment 1.** 1028 participants ($N_{\text{spotlighted}} = 586, N_{\text{not spotlighted}} = 592; N_{\text{homeless}} = 588, N_{\text{alumni}} = 590$) completed the experiment for a payment of 75c ($M_{\text{age}} = 38.4, SD_{\text{age}} = 12.5; 55.0\%$ female). 11.3% of participants reported identifying as lower class, the majority of participants reported identifying as lower-middle class (30.9%) and middle class (37.2%), and 7.0% of participants reported identifying as upper-middle class. Additionally, 46% of the sample were not college educated (i.e., Associates Degree or lower) and 47.1% of the sample had a household income of $50,000 or less per year. Experiment 1 followed a 2(giver spotlighting: yes, no) x 2(scenario: homeless aid, alumni aid) between-subjects experimental design. Participants were first asked to imagine being in a need-state, where they either are a recent university graduate and have been unable to find a job (alumni aid scenario) or that they lost their job, home, and support system and ended up having to live in government-funded public housing (homeless aid scenario; see Section A-I in the Online Supplement for full vignette wording). Participants then were asked to take a moment to write about what this would be like. After spending at least one-minute writing about what this life change would be like, participants responded to a series of questions (i.e., feelings of dependency, hope, and helplessness) to determine how our thought-experiment impacted participants’ mindsets before the key manipulation of giver spotlighting. After answering these questions, participants were then told about the aid opportunity with Job Finders (a made-up aid organization). We simply manipulated whether Job Finders made their giver salient when providing the aid (i.e., identified their giver’s name, age, and shared a brief bio) or did not mention their giver.

Participants went on to answer a series of questions about what receiving help from Job Finders would be like for them. Specifically, participants reported their intentions to return to and recommend the aid organization (“Would you return to Job Finders for help in the future, if you needed it?”; 1=absolutely not, 7=absolutely, yes; “Would you recommend Job Finders to [other recent graduates from your university who are struggling to find a job / other individuals living in government-funded public housing or on the streets]?”; 1=absolutely not, 7=absolutely, yes; $a = .871$). We used a two-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) and scenario (homeless, struggling alumni) as independent variables, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. We collected additional, exploratory measures (i.e., gratitude, motivation), recipients felt shame in being in their need-state and needed help, perception of their need-state as being temporary or chronic, their aid being given due to merit or need, internal and external attribution of need-state blame, self-esteem, and both subjective and objective SES), which we report in Section C-I of the Online Supplement.

**Experiments 2a-c.** Experiments 2a-c were close replications of Experiment 1. Each experiment aimed to extend upon Experiment 1 by testing the generalizability of the main effect, where spotlighting one’s giver (vs. not spotlighting one’s giver) decreased recipients’ return and recommend intentions. Section A-II of the Online Supplement displays the different manipulations across Experiments 2a-c. Experiments 2a-c used the “Struggling Alumni” scenario. We also collected additional, exploratory measures (i.e., gratitude and motivation) across these experiments, which we report in Section B-I of the Online Supplement.

**Experiment 2a.** 810 participants ($N_{\text{spotlighted}} = 402, N_{\text{not spotlighted}} = 408; N_{\text{solicited}} = 410, N_{\text{unsolicited}} = 400$) completed the experiment for a payment of 43c ($M_{\text{age}} = 37.3, SD_{\text{age}} = 12.4; 56.0\%$ female). 10.6% of participants reported identifying as lower class, the majority of participants reported identifying as lower-middle class (30.6%) and middle class (39.6%), and 7.8% of participants reported identifying as upper-middle class. Additionally, 44% of the sample are not college educated (i.e., Associates Degree or lower) and 45.3% of the sample have a household income of $50,000 or less per year. Experiment 2a employed a 2(giver spotlighting: yes, no) x 2(scenario: homeless aid, alumni aid) between-subjects experimental design. Participants were first asked to imagine being in a need-state, where they either are a recent university graduate and have been unable to find a job (alumni aid scenario) or that they lost their job, home, and support system and ended up having to live in government-funded public housing (homeless aid scenario; see Section A-I in the Online Supplement for full vignette wording). Participants then were asked to take a moment to write about what this would be like. After spending at least one-minute writing about what this life change would be like, participants responded to a series of questions (i.e., feelings of dependency, hope, and helplessness) to determine how our thought-experiment impacted participants’ mindsets before the key manipulation of giver spotlighting. After answering these questions, participants were then told about the aid opportunity with Job Finders (a made-up aid organization). We simply manipulated whether Job Finders made their giver salient when providing the aid (i.e., identified their giver’s name, age, and shared a brief bio) or did not mention their giver.

Participants went on to answer a series of questions about what receiving help from Job Finders would be like for them. Specifically, participants reported their intentions to return to and recommend the aid organization (“Would you return to Job Finders for help in the future, if you needed it?”; 1=absolutely not, 7=absolutely, yes; “Would you recommend Job Finders to [other recent graduates from your university who are struggling to find a job / other individuals living in government-funded public housing or on the streets]?”; 1=absolutely not, 7=absolutely, yes; $a = .871$). We used a two-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) and scenario (homeless, struggling alumni) as independent variables, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. We collected additional, exploratory measures (i.e., gratitude, motivation), recipients felt shame in being in their need-state and needed help, perception of their need-state as being temporary or chronic, their aid being given due to merit or need, internal and external attribution of need-state blame, self-esteem, and both subjective and objective SES), which we report in Section C-I of the Online Supplement.

---

8 We collected additional data on SES in Experiments 1-2c (i.e., SES ladder and parents’ education); our data is posted on OSF for anyone interested in further exploring participants’ objective and subjective SES.

9 The homelessness scenario led to higher feelings of dependency, lower feelings of hope, and higher feelings of helplessness, compared to the struggling alumni scenario. We report full details on these questions and the results in Section C-I of the Online Supplement.
Supplement.

We report full details on these questions and the results in Section C-III of the Online Supplement.

Experiment 2b. 821 participants (Nspotlighted = 409, Nnot spotlighted = 412; Nhigh need = 418, Nlow need = 403) completed the experiment for a payment of 57c (Mage = 37.5, SDage = 12.7; 61.5% female). 10.5% of participants reported identifying as lower class, the majority of participants reported identifying as lower-middle class (35.3%) and middle class (42.8%), and 10.6% of participants reported identifying as upper-middle class. Additionally, 45.5% of the sample are not college educated (i.e., Associates Degree or lower) and 47.2% of the sample have a household income of $50,000 or less per year. Experiment 2b employed a 2(giver spotlighting: yes, no) x 2(need-state: high, low) between-subjects experimental design. Thus, the giver was either not mentioned or made salient by sharing the giver’s name, age, and a brief bio, and participants read that their case was either in a high or low-need state. Since we manipulated high vs. low need, we measured a series of manipulation checks (i.e., participants feelings of dependence, hope, and helplessness), similar to those measured in Experiment 2, before participants read about the aid opportunity with Job Finders and saw the key manipulation of giver spotlighting. Afterwards, participants reported how likely they would be to return to and recommend Job Finders (α = .891). We used a two-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) and need-state (high, low) as independent variables, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. Additionally, for exploratory purposes, we asked participants to report their felt shame, deservingness for receiving aid, and how pitied they felt by their giver. We report the findings on these manipulation checks and exploratory measures in Section C-III of the Online Supplement.

Experiment 2c. 815 participants (Nspotlighted = 411, Nnot spotlighted = 404; Nrecipient identified = 407, Nrecipient not identified = 408) completed the experiment for a payment of 47c (Mage = 36.6, SDage = 12.1; 62.3% female). 12.9% of participants reported identifying as lower class, the majority of participants reported identifying as lower-middle class (37.8%) and middle class (40.0%), and 8.8% of participants reported identifying as upper-middle class. Additionally, 51.2% of the sample are not college educated (i.e., Associates Degree or lower) and 47.3% of the sample have a household income of $50,000 or less per year. Experiment 2c employed a 2(giver spotlighting: yes, no) x 2(recipient identification: identified, not identified) between-subjects experimental design. Thus, the giver was either not mentioned or made salient by sharing the giver’s name, age, and a brief bio, and participants read that their case was either in a high or low-need state. Since we manipulated high vs. low need, we measured a series of manipulation checks (i.e., participants feelings of dependence, hope, and helplessness), similar to those measured in Experiment 2, before participants read about the aid opportunity with Job Finders and saw the key manipulation of giver spotlighting. Afterwards, participants reported how likely they would be to return to and recommend Job Finders (α = .891). We used a two-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) and need-state (high, low) as independent variables, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. Additionally, for exploratory purposes, we asked participants to report their felt shame, deservingness for receiving aid, and how pitied they felt by their giver. We report the findings on these manipulation checks and exploratory measures in Section C-III of the Online Supplement.

Experiment 3. Experiments 3 was a close replications of Experiments 1-2c. Here, we manipulated how we spotlighted the giver: via identification and/or via contact. Experiment 3 used the “Homelessness” scenario. 806 participants (Nidentified = 393, Nnot identified = 413; Nmessage = 413, Nno message = 393) completed the experiment for a payment of 50c (Mage = 36.8, SDage = 11.4; 58.6% female). Participants were randomly assigned to a 2(giver identified: yes, no) x 2(giver message: shared, not shared) between-subjects design. In addition to the giver spotlighting manipulation we used thus far (i.e., referred to in this experiment as “giver identification”), we also

10 The participants in the high (vs. low) need conditions reported feeling significantly more dependent on others, lower feelings of hope, and higher feelings of helplessness. We report full details on these questions and the results in Section C-III of the Online Supplement.
manipulated whether the participant received a message from their giver, as an alternative form of giver spotlighting. This way, we were also able to explore whether recipients react increasingly negatively as their giver is made (i.e., both identifying one’s giver and sharing a message from one’s giver) vs. less (i.e., only identifying one’s giver or sharing a message from one’s giver) salient, or if the amount of spotlighting does not matter to recipients. First, similar to the giver spotlighting manipulation from our previous studies, the “giver identification” content included the following information about the giver:

Name: Adrian Lee Smithe  
Age: 42  
Description: Adrian graduated from university in 2005 and has been working in the business world since then. Adrian grew up in New York City and enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family.

Additionally, the message from the giver read:

“Hello, I hope that the application materials I am compiling to send over will help you with your job search - best of luck with all of your future applications! Best regards, [Adrian Smithe / Your Job Finders Volunteer].”

The messages were signed by “Adrian Smithe” or “Your Job Finders Volunteer” depending on the giver identification condition (see Section A-III of the Online Supplement for full scenario details). In the message, we purposely did not include any information about the giver’s intentions or reasons for helping, as we wanted the message to merely draw attention to one’s giver (i.e., light touch contact). After learning about the opportunity with Job Finders, having their giver (not) identified, and after (not) receiving a message from their giver, participants reported how likely they would be to return to and recommend Job Finders ($a = .889$).

Our main analyses compare the no spotlighting condition (not identified + no message; $N = 198$) to a composite of the three spotlighting conditions (1. not identified + message, 2. identified + no message, 3. identified + message; $N = 608$). We used a one-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) as the independent variable, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. We report the full results in Section C-V of the Online Supplement.

**Experiment 4.** Experiment 4 tested whether agency threat mediates the effect of giver spotlighting on recipients’ willingness to return for additional aid and recommend the aid organization to others experiencing similar need. We sampled from 600 participants for Part 1 and, for Part 2, we gave all participants 48 hours to respond to our survey. 462 participants ($N_{spotlighted} = 228, N_{not\, spotlighted} = 234$) completed both parts of our experiment ($M_{age} = 36.7, SD_{age} = 11.4; 51.9\%$ female). Participants completed the experiment for a payment of 40c for completing Part 1 and $1.00 for completing Part 2. Experiment 4 followed a two-part experimental design, where participants took Parts 1 and 2 a week apart and were not informed that this was a two-part survey. In Part 1, participants answered a series of questions about their cultural individualism and collectivism by responding to Triandis & Gelfand's Horizontal & Vertical Individualism/Collectivism Scale. We report exploratory results with cultural interdependence and independence variables as moderators in Section C-VI of the Online Supplement. Part 2 followed a two-condition between-subjects design, where participants were asked to reflect on the struggling alumni scenario (see Section A-IV of the Online Supplement for scenario wording) and were randomly assigned to imagine receiving aid where their giver was made highly salient (i.e., identification + message) or not at all salient (i.e., no identification + no message; see Experiment 3 for details). After being assigned to one of our two conditions and reading about the aid opportunity, participants reported their likelihood to return to and recommend the aid organization ($a = .864$). We used a one-way ANOVA, with giver spotlighting (present, absent) as the independent variable, to test the effect on return and recommendation intentions. Additionally, participants responded to an agency threat measure, where they

---

11 The identifying information about the giver (i.e., the name, age, and description) were identical to the information from Studies 2a-2c. Additionally, the giver message was identical to the message from Experiment 3.
reported how capable they would feel of acting intentionally, making plans, and doing things on purpose (the agency sub-scale; \( a = .840 \)) as well as their capability to experience emotions, have desires, and experience feelings (the emotion sub-scale; \( a = .889 \)) while working with Job Finders (the aid-organization). Mediation analyses from Experiment 4 use Hayes’ PROCESS macro in SPSS (Model 4).

Experiment 5. With this field experiment, we test whether real recipients of aid in a low-income country will differ in willingness to recommend the charity helping them when their giver is spotlighted vs. not spotlighted. We collaborated with the Busara Center and their charitable payments platform, Spare. With Busara and Spare, we surveyed 500 individuals living in poor, rural parts of Kenya. Each participant reported living in a low-income area (such as Kibera), where they lack basic amenities such as clean water for drinking and food, and have poor sanitation and poor housing. Qualifying participants had a working phone with a registered Mpesa phone number (to receive the cash-transfer and surveys), could read in the local language, were between the ages of 18 and 55, and reported having at least one child.

The field experiment consisted of three parts: (1) the consenting, demographic, and individual differences survey, (2) the Ksh 500 (about 5 USD) cash-transfer and key dependent variable of recommendation intentions, and (3) the exit phone-survey. All survey materials were translated into the local language, Swahili, by translators at the Busara Center. A total of 476 participants (\( N_{\text{spotlighted}} = 237, N_{\text{not spotlighted}} = 239 \)) completed all three parts of our experiment (\( M_{\text{age}} = 36.37, SD_{\text{age}} = 6.98; 49.8\% \text{ female} \); total weekly household income: \( M = \text{Ksh 2,474.52 ($21.80 USD)}, SD = \text{Ksh 2,518.94 ($22.19 USD)} \)). Participants completed the exit survey for a set payment of Ksh 50 (about $0.50 USD).

In Part 1, participants responded to measures of interdependence and self-reliance, and also provided a qualitative response to their cultural independence/interdependence by responding to the following question: “Who are you? Share 5 answers to the question of “who are you”. Please share adjectives and descriptions that you think best capture who you are, not things like your name or age. Share the first thing that comes to your mind.” Since we did not know the level and distribution of interdependence among Kenyans, the moderation by cultural interdependence was exploratory, as outlined in our preregistration.

Part 2 contained our experimental manipulation, which followed a between subjects, two-condition design: giver spotlighting (through identification of the giver’s name, age, etc. and a brief message from the giver) vs. no giver spotlighting. All participants received Ksh 500 cash-transfer, and the cash-transfer either included both a brief message from the giver and identifying information about the giver, or the cash-transfer did not include any such information about the giver. The identifying information was about the principal investigator on this project, who wrote the message sent to the recipients. Immediately after receiving the cash-transfer, participants were asked to text back the number of individuals they would recommend the charity to, where 0=wouldn’t recommend. We used a one-way ANOVA to test the effect of giver spotlighting (present, absent) on recommendation intentions (both looking at condition means and log transformed condition means).

Lastly, in Part 3, we measured our behavioral recommendation measure and a series of exploratory quantitative and qualitative questions. Trained enumerators called the 500 recipients of the cash-transfer a day after the transfer went through, to ask if they would participate in a five-minute survey about their experience with Spare. Specifically, participants were told that we would like to learn more about how receiving the cash-transfer made them feel. First, participants were asked to share with us the first 10 words that came to mind, when thinking about how receiving Ksh 500 made them feel. This was our exploratory, qualitative measure of agency, patience, and gratitude. We used a series of one-way ANOVAs to test the effect of giver spotlighting (present, absent) on the presence of agency-language (“achieve” and “reward” words; \( r = .139, p = .002 \); an exploratory factor analysis also reveals that these two items load on the same factor) and patience-language (“feel” words). See Section B-II and C-VII of the Online Supplement for results from text analyses on gratitude and exploratory mediation results by agency. Exploratory mediation analyses from Experiment 5 use Hayes’ PROCESS macro in SPSS (Model 4) and test the effect of giver spotlighting (present, absent; X) on recommendation behaviors (Y) with agency-language (the “achieve” and “reward” variables) as independent mediators (M). For the behavioral recommendation measure, we told participants that we were gathering testimonials from individuals who had received cash-transfers from the charity, to share their
experience with others. We then asked them if they were willing to provide us with a brief testimonial on how receiving a cash-transfer from Spare has impacted their life, where participants could respond either yes or no, and all testimonials were transcribed. We used a chi-square test of independence to test the effect of giver spotlighting (present, absent) on recommendation behavior.

Finally, we collected a few additional exploratory measures. We asked participants to tell us how satisfied they were with their experience receiving help from the charity, from 0% satisfied to 100% satisfied. For those who did not say that they were 100% satisfied, we also asked them to share with us how we could improve their experience with the charity moving forward (i.e., what changes would make them 100% satisfied after receiving help?). Finally, we told participants that Spare’s umbrella organization, the Busara Center, regularly tries out new ways to help Kenyans struggling with financial hardship. We then asked participants if they would like to receive text messages whenever the organization has a new venture, to see if they qualify to participate (optional responses: “Yes, I would like to opt-in to these texts” vs. “No, I would not like to receive texts”). We report the results for these exploratory measures in Section C-VII of the Online Supplement.
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A. Thought-experiment and Manipulation Wording from Experiments 1-4

I. Table S1. Thought-experiment and manipulation wording in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need-state Thought Experiment (All participants)</th>
<th>Homelessness Scenario</th>
<th>Struggling Alumni Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine that, 5 years from now, you ended up losing your job, home, and support system. Because of this, you ended up having to live on the streets for a few weeks, and eventually, in government-funded public housing. You cannot figure out how this happened to you and don’t know how to get out of this bad place. You have been trying to get your life back on track, but seem to be unable to and, no matter what you do, nothing seems to be getting any better. Below, please take a moment to write about what this would be like for you:</td>
<td>Imagine that you recently graduated from university and have been applying for jobs for a few months. You haven’t gotten any job offers, you haven’t even gotten any call-backs. If you do not find a job within the next month or two, you will have to move back home and live with your parents, who have made it clear that they do not want you to move back in with them. You cannot figure out how this happened to you and don’t know how to get out of this bad place. You have been trying to get your job hunt back on track, but seem to be unable to and, no matter what you do, nothing seems to be getting any better. Below, please take a moment to write about what this would be like for you:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Aid Opportunity (All participants)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now, imagine that, after living in a government-funded public housing unit for about a year, you were chosen as a recipient of an aid program called Job Finders that would help you get back on your feet by helping you with your resume, interview skills, and referrals for jobs. Job Finders has a 75% success rate of helping individuals in need find and get good, long-term jobs.</td>
<td>Now imagine that, at the university you graduated from, all graduates submit updates to the university’s alumni office when they land a job. For graduates who do not send updates within a few months, the university automatically contacts them with an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job. Job Finders is a university program that assigns a university alumnus to aid in your job hunt. The alumni assigned to your case sends you examples of successful candidates (i.e., impressive resumes, cover letters, etc.) and provides you with insider tips from the hiring perspective. About 75% of alumni who work with Job Finders are able to land a job within a month or two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giver Spotlighting Manipulation (Participants in giver spotlighting condition)</th>
<th>Below is some information about the giver responsible for funding your opportunity with Job Finders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Adrian Lee Smithe</td>
<td>Name: Adrian Lee Smithe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 55</td>
<td>Age: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: Adrian is an Entertainment Lawyer. Adrian grew up in the Bronx in New York City and currently lives in Los Angeles, California. Adrian enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family.</td>
<td>Description: Adrian graduated from your university in 2008. Adrian grew up in the Bronx in New York City and currently lives in Los Angeles, California. Adrian enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Participants were randomly assigned to either read about the Homelessness or Struggling Alumni scenario and were also randomly assigned to receive aid with or without their giver made salient to them through identifying the giver. Participants in the giver salient conditions were randomly assigned to receive the information about their giver, displayed in the “Giver Spotlighting Manipulation” row, whereas participants in our conditions where the giver was not made salient did not see this additional information.

II. Table S2. Thought-experiment and manipulation wording in Experiments 2a-2c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment 2a – (Un)Solicited Aid</th>
<th>Experiment 2b – High (Low) Need</th>
<th>Experiment 2c – Recipient (Not) Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need-state Thought Experiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine that you recently graduated from university and have been applying for jobs for a few months. You haven’t gotten any job offers, you haven’t even gotten any call-backs. If you do not find a job within the next month or two, you will have to move back home and live with your parents, who have made it clear that they do not want you to move back in with them. You cannot figure out how this happened to you and don’t know how to get out of this bad place. You have been trying to get your job hunt back on track, but seem to be unable to, no matter what you do, nothing seems to be getting any better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine that you recently graduated from university and have been applying for jobs for a few months. You haven’t gotten any job offers, you haven’t even gotten any call-backs. If you do not find a job within the next month or two, you will have to move back home and live with your parents, who have made it clear that they do not want you to move back in with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine that you recently graduated from university and have been applying for jobs for a few months. You haven’t gotten any job offers, you haven’t even gotten any call-backs. If you do not find a job within the next month or two, you will have to move back home and live with your parents, who have made it clear that they do not want you to move back in with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Aid Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unsolicited Aid) Now imagine that, at the university you graduated from, all graduates submit updates to the university’s alumni office when they land a job. For graduates who do not send updates within a few months, the university automatically contacts them with an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Solicited Aid) Now imagine that you sent a request to your university’s alumni office to ask for help with your job search. The university got back to you and enrolled you in an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Finders is a university program that assigns a university alumnus to aid in your job hunt. The alumni assigned to your case sends you examples of successful candidates (i.e., impressive resumes, cover letters, etc.) and provides you with insider tips from the hiring perspective. About 75% of alumni who work with Job Finders are able to land a job within a month or two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now imagine that, at the university you graduated from, all graduates submit updates to the university’s alumni office when they land a job. For graduates who do not send updates within a few months, the university automatically contacts them with an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Finders is a university program that assigns a university alumnus to aid in your job hunt. The alumni assigned to your case sends you examples of successful candidates (i.e., impressive resumes, cover letters, etc.) and provides you with insider tips from the hiring perspective. About 75% of alumni who work with Job Finders are able to land a job within a month or two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now imagine that, at the university you graduated from, all graduates submit updates to the university’s alumni office when they land a job. For graduates who do not send updates within a few months, the university automatically contacts them with an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Finders is a university program that assigns a university alumnus to aid in your job hunt. The alumni assigned to your case sends you examples of successful candidates (i.e., impressive resumes, cover letters, etc.) and provides you with insider tips from the hiring perspective. About 75% of alumni who work with Job Finders are able to land a job within a month or two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giver Spotlightting Manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participants in giver spotlighting condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below is some information about the alumni Job Finders assigned to your case, who will aid you in your job hunt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Adrian Lee Smithe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: Adrian graduated from your university in 2005. Adrian grew up in the Bronx in New York City and currently lives in Los Angeles, California. Adrian enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes. Bolded text represents the manipulation of aid being (un)solicited, need-states being high (low), and recipients (not) being identified, respectively. Participants in the giver salient conditions were randomly assigned to receive the information about their giver, displayed in the “Giver Spotlighting Manipulation” row, whereas participants in our conditions where the giver was not made salient did not see this additional information.

III. Table S3. Thought-experiment and manipulation wording in Experiment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need-state Thought Experiment</th>
<th>Homelessness Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All participants)</td>
<td>Imagine that, 5 years from now, you ended up losing your job, home, and support system. Because of this, you ended up having to live on the streets for a few weeks, and eventually, in government-funded public housing. You cannot figure out how this happened to you and don’t know how to get out of this bad place. You have been trying to get your life back on track, but seem to be unable to and, no matter what you do, nothing seems to be getting any better. Below, please take a moment to write about what this would be like for you:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Description of Aid Opportunity | Now, imagine that, after living in a government-funded public housing unit for about a year, you receive an aid opportunity. For all tenants who have not found a job within a year of living in public housing, the public housing office automatically contacts them with an aid opportunity called Job Finders, to assist with finding a job. Job Finders is a government program that assigns a volunteer, who has knowledge of the business world, to aid in your job hunt. The volunteer assigned to your case sends you examples of successful candidates (i.e., impressive resumes, cover letters, etc.) and provides you with insider tips from the hiring perspective. About 75% of individuals who work with Job Finders are able to land a job within a month or two. |

| Giver Spotlighting Manipulations | Below is [some information about and] a message from the volunteer Job Finders assigned to your case, who will aid you in your job hunt: |
| (Participants in giver spotlighting condition) | (Giver Identification) Name: Adrian Lee Smithe Age: 42 Description: Adrian graduated from university in 2005 and has been working in the business world since then. Adrian grew up in New York City and enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family. (Giver Message) [The volunteer assigned to your case / Adrian] sent you a brief message. See [the / Adrian's] message below: Hello, I hope that the application materials I am compiling to send over will help you with your job search - best of luck with all of your future applications! Best regards, Adrian Smithe [Your Job Finders Volunteer] |

Notes. Participants were randomly assigned to receive aid with or without their giver spotlighted. Participants in our three giver spotlighting conditions either (a) just saw the identifying information about the giver, (b) just saw the anonymous message from the giver, or (c) saw both the identifying information about the giver and the message from the giver. Participants in our no spotlighting condition did not see any of this information about or from the giver.

IV. Table S4. Thought-experiment and manipulation wording in Experiment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need-state Thought Experiment</th>
<th>Struggling Alumni Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All participants)</td>
<td>Imagine that you recently graduated from university and have been applying for jobs for a few months. You haven’t gotten any job offers, you haven’t even gotten any call-backs. If you do not find a job within the next month or two, you will have to move back home and live with your parents, who have made it clear that they do not want you to move back in with them. You cannot figure out how this happened to you and don’t know how to get out of this bad place. You have been trying to get your job hunt back on track, but seem to be unable to and, no matter what you do, nothing seems to be getting any better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below, please take a moment to write about what this would be like for you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Aid Opportunity</th>
<th>Below is some information about and a message from the alumnus Job Finders assigned to your case, who will aid you in your job hunt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (All participants) | Name: Adrian Lee Smithe  
Age: 42  
Description: Adrian graduated from your university in 2005. Adrian grew up in the Bronx in New York City and currently lives in Los Angeles, California. Adrian enjoys playing guitar, bicycle riding, and spending time with family.  
Adrian sent you a brief message. See Adrian's message below:  
Hello,  
I hope that the application materials I am compiling to send over will help you with your job search - best of luck with all of your future applications!  
Best regards,  
Adrian Smithe |

Notes. Participants were randomly assigned to receive aid with or without their giver spotlighted. In the giver spotlighting condition, recipients both received identifying information about their giver and a brief message from the giver. Participants in our no spotlighting condition did not see any of this information about or from the giver.

B. Experiment 1-5 Exploratory Results on Gratitude and Motivation

I. Experiments 1-4: Meta-analysis on Gratitude and Motivation.

Throughout Experiments 1-4, in addition to measuring our key variable of return and recommend intentions, we also included exploratory measures of recipient gratitude and motivation to utilize the aid opportunity. We included the measure of gratitude (scale adapted from Tsang, 2006), since we anticipated recipients with comparatively worse aid experiences were less likely to feel grateful for the experience. Additionally, we anticipated that significant differences in how recipients experienced the aid opportunity could influence recipients' motivation (scale adapted from Deci et al., 1994) to take advantage of the aid opportunity given to them. Since Experiments 2-4 included the same measures of gratitude and motivation, we pooled data across these experiments and conducted an internal meta-analysis of Experiments 1-4 (cumulative \( N = 4,742 \)) for each of these two exploratory measures. As in the main paper, we used the R package *meta* (Schwarzer, 2007, v. 4.19-1) and a random-effects model by using the inverse variance method. Additionally, in Table S5 we display the results on these exploratory variables and return & recommend intentions across each experiment, individually.

**Generalizability.** Moreover, as in the main paper, we first examined whether there were any interactions between our giver spotlighting manipulation and our other independent variable (when relevant), to justify collapsing across all other independent variables in our meta-analysis. A series of two-way ANOVAs on variables of interest (gratitude and motivation) found no significant interactions between giver spotlighting and (i) type of scenario (Experiment 1; all \( ps \geq .668 \)), (ii) presence vs. absence of aid solicitation (Experiment 2a; all \( ps \geq .579 \)), (iii) high vs. low need (Experiment 2b; all \( ps \geq .762 \)); (iv) whether recipients themselves were identified vs. anonymous to their giver (Experiment 2c; all \( ps \geq .367 \)), and (v) we found no interaction between

---

12 In most cases, a random-effects model should be preferred to a simple-effect model (Cumming, 2014).
spotlighting by identifying one’s giver and/or by providing a message from the giver (Experiment 3; all \( p s \geq .097 \)). Thus, all remaining analyses reflect a comparison between giver spotlighting vs. no spotlighting, collapsed across all other manipulations\(^{13}\).

**Meta-analyses on Gratitude & Motivation.** The tests of heterogeneity on gratitude (\( Q(5) = 6.87, p = .230 \)) and motivation (\( Q(5) = 2.43, p = .787 \)) revealed a good homogeneity suggesting that the six experiments were consistent. The estimation of the cumulative effect size\(^{14}\) revealed a significant condition effect on gratitude (\( d = .23, 95\% \) CI [0.16, 0.30], \( p < .001 \)) and motivation (\( d = .13, 95\% \) CI [0.07, 0.19], \( p < .001 \)) such that giver spotlighting (vs. no spotlighting) decreased feelings of gratitude and decreased motivation to utilize the aid opportunity.

Figure S1 displays the results of the meta-analysis. We should note that these analyses suggest that the effect of giver spotlighting on gratitude are robust and comparable in magnitude (the effect was significant in each of these six experiments). However, the magnitude of the effect on motivation differed across experiments. Specifically, the effect of giver spotlighting on motivation was not significant in Experiments 2b, 2c, and 4 (while the overall effect was significant when pooling data across these six experiments).

**Figure S1.** Forest Plot of the Effect of Giver Spotlighting on Gratitude and Motivation from an Internal Meta-analysis of Experiments 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Gratitude</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>95%-CI</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>[-.33; -.09]</td>
<td>22.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>[-.35; -.08]</td>
<td>17.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>[-.26; .01]</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>[-.34; -.06]</td>
<td>17.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>[-.48; -.16]</td>
<td>13.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>[-.53; -.16]</td>
<td>10.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>95%-CI</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>[-.27; -.02]</td>
<td>22.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>[-.29; -.02]</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>[-.22; .05]</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>[-.20; .08]</td>
<td>18.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>[-.34; -.02]</td>
<td>13.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>[-.33; .03]</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S5.** Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting on Return & Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, and Motivation in Experiments 1-4

\(^{13}\) Experiment 3 compares the no spotlighting condition (no identification + no message) to the pooled spotlighting conditions (identification + message, identification + no message, and no identification + message).

\(^{14}\) We report the raw mean difference \( d \), since all of the studies in the meta-analysis use the same scale to assess each of the three outcome measures (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009)
II. Experiment 5: Qualitative Measure of Gratitude (Text Analysis)

We collected exploratory qualitative data from responses to the following open-ended measure: “I would like to learn more about how receiving the Ksh 500 cash-transfer from [Spare / Researcher's Name] made you feel. Different experiences and interactions can make people feel different emotions. Please share with us the first 10 words that come to mind, when thinking about how receiving Ksh 500 from [Spare / Researcher's Name] made you feel.” We used an independent coder to identify the presence of gratitude-related words. We ran a one-way ANOVA on the presence vs. absence of gratitude words, as coded by an independent coder. These results reveal that recipients expressed significantly more gratitude when the giver was not spotlighted (\(M = 1.67, SD = 1.07\)), compared to when the giver was spotlighted (\(M = 1.24, SD = 0.92; F(474) = 21.62, p < .001\)).

C. Experiment 1-5 Full Results and Drop-out Information

I. Experiment 1: Giver Spotlighting Across Different Need Contexts

We aimed to recruit 1,000 participants from CloudResearch (an online participant-sourcing platform). 1178 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 149 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Additionally, 1 participant exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation (they were assigned to the no giver spotlighting condition), but

\[F(1,1024) = 8.52, p = .004\]

\[\begin{array}{lrrrr}
\text{Experiment 1} & 6.24 & 1.08 & 6.42 & 0.90 \\
\text{Experiment 2a} & 6.15 & 1.04 & 6.36 & 0.96 \\
\text{Experiment 2b} & 6.10 & 1.12 & 6.32 & 0.93 \\
\text{Experiment 2c} & 6.07 & 1.15 & 6.28 & 1.07 \\
\text{Experiment 3} & 6.02 & 1.21 & 6.20 & 1.19 \\
\text{Experiment 4} & 5.97 & 1.17 & 6.32 & 0.87 \\
\end{array}\]

\[F(1,1024) = 11.02, p < .001\]

\[\begin{array}{lrrrr}
\text{Gratitude} & 5.99 & 1.08 & 6.19 & 0.90 \\
\text{Experiment 2a} & 5.86 & 1.05 & 6.07 & 0.93 \\
\text{Experiment 2b} & 5.93 & 1.04 & 6.06 & 0.98 \\
\text{Experiment 2c} & 5.78 & 1.06 & 5.99 & 1.01 \\
\text{Experiment 3} & 5.76 & 1.24 & 5.95 & 1.13 \\
\text{Experiment 4} & 5.73 & 1.20 & 6.08 & 0.83 \\
\end{array}\]

\[F(1,1024) = 5.13, p = .024\]

\[\begin{array}{lrrrr}
\text{Motivation} & 6.13 & 1.10 & 6.28 & 1.00 \\
\text{Experiment 2a} & 6.18 & 1.00 & 6.34 & 0.96 \\
\text{Experiment 2b} & 6.08 & 1.05 & 6.16 & 1.01 \\
\text{Experiment 2c} & 6.19 & 1.00 & 6.25 & 0.94 \\
\text{Experiment 3} & 6.12 & 1.16 & 6.22 & 1.07 \\
\text{Experiment 4} & 5.95 & 1.19 & 6.12 & 1.01 \\
\end{array}\]

\[F(1,1024) = 5.08, p = .025\]

Notes: The results for Experiment 1 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and scenario as the independent variables. The results from Experiments 2a – 3 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and solicitation, need, recipient identifiability, or giver contact (respectively) as the independent variables. The results for Experiment 4 results come from conducting one-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting as the independent variable. These data are presented with no exclusions.
prior to answering our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of \( N = 1,028 \) participants.

To examine the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting (salient vs. not salient) and scenario (homelessness vs. struggling alumni) as the independent variables. There were no significant main effects of scenario on our three key variables (all \( ps \geq .055 \)) and no significant interactions between giver spotlighting and scenario (all \( ps \geq .668 \)). Table S6 displays the full results from the two-way ANOVAs in Experiment 2, including the main effect of scenario (homelessness vs. struggling alumni) and the interaction between giver spotlighting and scenario. Lastly, we also collected a series of exploratory variables, which we display in Table S7, below.

**Table S6.** The Effect of Giver Spotlighting and Scenario on Return & Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, & Motivation in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighted</th>
<th>Giver Not Spotlighted</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Main Effect of Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting x Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 8.52, p = .004 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return and Recommendation Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 4.32, p = .038 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 4.20, p = .041 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 5.09, p = .024 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 5.96, p = .015 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 5.13, p = .024 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 3.69, p = .055 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1024) = 0.18, p = .668 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Notes. The results for Experiment 1 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and scenario as the independent variables. These data are presented with no exclusions.

**Table S7.** The Effect of Giver Spotlighting and Scenario on Supplemental Measures in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Giver Not Spotlighted</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Main Effect of Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting x Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 2.93, p = .087 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 2.07, p = .151 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 0.24, p = .627 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 47.16, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 0.11, p = .742 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling Alumni</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 19.92, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>( F(1,1029) = 0.31, p = .580 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shameful: Need State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Experiment 2a: Testing Generalizability Across Solicitation-type

We aimed to recruit 800 participants from CloudResearch. 927 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 114 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Additionally, 3 participants exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation (2 were exposed to the no giver spotlighting condition and 1 was assigned exposed to the giver spotlighting condition; the drop-out rate did not significantly differ across conditions, \( p = .556 \), but prior to answering our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of \( N = 810 \) participants.

To examine the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting (salient vs. not salient) and solicitation-type (solicited vs. unsolicited) as the independent variables. There were no significant main effects of solicitation-type on variables (all \( ps \geq .116 \)) and no significant interactions between giver spotlighting and scenario (all \( ps \geq .105 \)). Table S8 displays the full results from the two-way ANOVAs in Experiment 2a, including the main effect of solicitation-type (solicited vs. unsolicited aid) and the interaction between giver spotlighting and solicitation-type.

Table S8. The Effect of Giver Spotlighting & Solicitation-type on Return & Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, & Motivation in Experiment 2a

Notes. The results from Experiment 1 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and scenario as the independent variables. The Dependency, Hope, and Helplessness measures come before the giver spotlighting manipulation (after the need-state thought-experiment). All other variables came after the giver spotlighting manipulation. These data are presented with no exclusions.
III. Experiment 2b Results: Testing Generalizability Across High vs. Low Need-level

We aimed to recruit 800 participants from CloudResearch. 884 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 59 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Additionally, 4 participants exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation (3 were exposed to the no giver spotlighting condition and 1 was assigned exposed to the giver spotlighting condition; the drop-out rate did not significantly differ across conditions, $p = .322$), but prior to answering our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of $N = 821$ participants.

To examine the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting (spotlighted vs. not spotlighted) and need-level (high vs. low need) as the independent variables. There were no significant main effects of need-level on our return and recommendation intentions ($p = .455$) or gratitude ($p = .683$), and only a marginally significant effect on motivation (all $p = .063$). Importantly, we also see no significant interactions between giver spotlighting and need-level (all $ps \geq .762$). Table S9 display the full results from the two-way ANOVAs in Experiment 2b, including the main effect of need-level (high vs. low need) and the interaction between giver spotlighting and need-level. Additionally, for Experiment 2b, we report details on all exploratory measures and findings in Table S10.

Table S9. The Effect of Giver Spotlighting & Need-level on Return & Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, & Motivation in Experiment 2b
815 participants responding to our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of 364. Additionally, 2 participants exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Among these workers, 115 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Variables. The Dependency, Hope, and Helplessness measures come before the giver spotlighting manipulation (after the thought-experiment).

Table S10. The Effect of Giver Spotlighting & Need-level on Supplemental Measures in Experiment 2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Giver Not Spotlighted</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Main Effect of Need-level</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting x Need-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F(1,817) = .70, p = .402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 3.28, p = .071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 1.54, p = .215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 1.74, p = .187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hope</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 4.37, p = .037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 2.56, p = .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 1.83, p = .176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helplessness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 0.93, p = .335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 2.56, p = .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>F(1,817) = 2.04, p = .154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shameful: Needing Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.31, p = .578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.26, p = .613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 2.94, p = .087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deservingness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>F(1,814) = 0.00, p = .984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>F(1,814) = 0.00, p = .983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>F(1,814) = 0.00, p = .994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giver Sympathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 1.88, p = .171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 1.01, p = .316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.87, p = .351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giver Pity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.58, p = .445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Need</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.79, p = .375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>F(1,813) = 0.04, p = .852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The results for Experiment 2b come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and need-level as the independent variables. These data are presented with no exclusions.

IV. Experiment 2c: Testing Generalizability When the Recipient Is vs. Isn’t Identified to Their Giver

We aimed to recruit 800 participants from CloudResearch. 932 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 115 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Additionally, 2 participants exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation (1 was exposed to the no giver spotlighting condition and 1 was assigned exposed to the giver spotlighting condition; the drop-out rate did not significantly differ across conditions, p = .990), but prior to answering our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of N = 815 participants.
To examine the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting (salient vs. not salient) and recipient identification (recipient identified vs. not identified to giver) as the independent variables. The results from the two-way ANOVAs reveal significant main effects of giver spotlighting on return and recommend intentions and gratitude (ps ≤ .006), but not on motivation (p = .356). Additionally, we see a significant effect of recipient identification on all three variables (all ps ≤ .016), suggesting that when recipients are (vs. are not) identified, they are significantly more likely to return to and recommend the charity, they feel more grateful, and they feel more motivated. Importantly, though, we see no significant interactions between giver contact and recipient identification across all three key variables (all ps ≥ .307). This suggests that both giver spotlighting and recipient identification significantly impact recipients’ reactions to the aid experience. We do not further explore the effect of recipient identification in this paper and encourage future scholars to investigate this finding. Table S11 displays the main effect of recipient identification (identified vs. not identified to the giver) and the interaction between giver spotlighting and recipient identification. Additionally, for Experiment 2c, we report details on all exploratory measures and findings in Table S12.

Table S11. The Effect of Giver Spotlighting & Recipient Identification on Return & Recommendation, Gratitude, & Motivation in Experiment 2c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Giver Not Spotlighted</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Main Effect of Recipient Identification (vs. Anonymity)</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting x Recipient Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return and Recommendation Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 7.60, p = .006</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 10.01, p = .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Identified</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 7.14, p = .008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Anonymous</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 1.51, p = .220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 8.68, p = .003</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 9.51, p = .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Identified</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 3.40, p = .066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Anonymous</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 5.39, p = .020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 0.85, p = .356</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 5.78, p = .016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Identified</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 0.00, p = .988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Anonymous</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 1.67, p = .197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The results for Experiment 2c come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and recipient identification as the independent variables. These data are presented with no exclusions.

Table S12. The Effect of Giver Spotlighting and Recipient Identification on Supplemental Measures in Experiment 2c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Giver Not Spotlighted</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>Main Effect of Recipient Identification (vs. Anonymity)</th>
<th>Giver Spotlighting x Recipient Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>F(1,809) = 0.95, p = .331</td>
<td>F(1,809) = 58.94, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Identified</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>F(1,809) = 0.36, p = .549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Anonymous</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>F(1,809) = 0.61, p = .437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 0.06, p = .813</td>
<td>F(1,811) = 46.52, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Experiment 3: Testing Multiple Manipulations of Giver Spotlighting

We aimed to recruit 800 participants from CloudResearch. 916 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 108 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation. Additionally, 2 participants exited the survey after being exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation (1 was exposed to the no giver spotlighting condition and 1 was assigned exposed to the giver spotlighting condition; the drop-out rate did not significantly differ across conditions, $p = .972$), but prior to answering our focal dependent variable (return and recommendation intentions), yielding a final sample of $N = 806$ participants.

To examine the effect of giver identification and giver contact on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs with giver identification (identified vs. not identified) and giver message (message vs. no message) as the independent variables. Specifically, in the Experiment 3, we had the following four conditions: (1) No Spotlighting (i.e., not identifying one’s giver nor sharing a message from one’s giver), (2) Moderate Spotlighting via identification only (i.e., identifying one’s giver, but not sharing a message from one’s giver), (3) Moderate Spotlighting via contact only (i.e., sharing a message from one’s giver, but not identifying one’s giver), and (4) High Spotlighting (i.e., both identifying one’s giver and sharing a message from one’s giver). Table S13 displays these results. Below, we also report the pairwise comparisons for each of the condition combinations.

**Return & recommendation intentions.** The two-way ANOVA reveals both significant main effects of giver identification ($p = .025$) and of giver contact ($p < .001$), where both forms of giver spotlighting decrease return and recommendation intentions. However, we found no interaction between identification and message ($p = .379$), suggesting that there is not an additive effect of the two forms of spotlighting. Pairwise comparisons reveal that participants in the No Spotlighting condition report significantly higher return and recommendation intentions, compared to participants in the High Spotlighting condition ($p < .001$). Additionally, significant differences between the Moderate Spotlighting via identification only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .029$) and the Moderate Spotlighting via contact only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .001$) emerged. Across both condition comparisons, participants in the No Spotlighting condition report significantly higher return and recommendation intentions. Moreover, we also see significant differences between the High Spotlighting (via identification and contact) vs. Moderate Spotlighting via identification only conditions ($p = .045$), where participants report higher return and recommendation intentions when the giver is only moderately vs. highly salient (i.e., the giver is identified but does not send a message to the recipient). However, there were no significant differences between the High Spotlighting vs. Moderate Spotlighting via contact conditions ($p = .329$).

**Gratitude.** The two-way ANOVA reveals both significant main effects of giver identification ($p = .015$) and of giver contact ($p = .008$), where both forms of giver spotlighting decrease reported feelings of gratitude. We again found no interaction between identification and contact ($p = .097$). Pairwise comparisons reveal that participants in the No Spotlighting condition report significantly more gratitude, compared to participants in the High Spotlighting condition ($p < .001$). Additionally, significant differences between the Moderate Spotlighting via identification only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .004$) and the Moderate Spotlighting via contact only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .002$) emerged. Across both comparisons, participants in the No Spotlighting condition report significantly more gratitude. Finally, there were no significant differences between both the High Spotlighting vs. Moderate Spotlighting via identification only ($p = .486$) and the High Spotlighting vs. Moderate Spotlighting via contact only ($p = .580$).

**Motivation.** The two-way ANOVA reveals no significant main effects of giver identification ($p = .211$) nor of giver contact ($p = .141$) on motivation. Additionally, we found no interaction between identification and
contact ($p = .359$). Pairwise comparisons reveal that participants in the No Spotlighting condition report marginally higher feelings of motivation to utilize the aid opportunity, compared to participants in the High Spotlighting condition ($p = .056$). Additionally, there were no significant differences between the Moderate Spotlighting via identification only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .130$) and marginally significant differences between the Moderate Spotlighting via contact only vs. No Spotlighting conditions ($p = .087$). Finally, there were no significant differences between both the High Spotlighting vs. Moderate Spotlighting via identification only conditions ($p = .698$) and the High Spotlighting vs. Moderate Spotlighting via contact only conditions ($p = .811$).

Table S13. The Effect of Giver Identification and Giver Contact on Return & Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, and Motivation in Experiment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Giver Identified</th>
<th>Giver Not Identified</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Identification</th>
<th>Main Effect of Giver Contact</th>
<th>Giver Identified x Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return and Recommendation Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 5.04, $p = .025$</td>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 14.13, $p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.78, $p = .379$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.95, $p = .329$</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 4.05, $p = .045$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 4.77, $p = .029$</td>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 11.03, $p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 5.93, $p = .015$</td>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 7.08, $p = .008$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(1,802) = 2.76, $p = .097$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.31, $p = .580$</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.49, $p = .486$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 8.20, $p = .004$</td>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 9.57, $p = .002$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 1.57, $p = .211$</td>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 2.17, $p = .141$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.84, $p = .359$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.06, $p = .811$</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 0.15, $p = .698$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 2.30, $p = .130$</td>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>F(1,802) = 2.93, $p = .087$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The results for Experiment 3 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver identification and giver contact as the independent variables. These data are presented with no exclusions.

VI. Experiment 4: Testing Process

For Part 1, we aimed to recruit 600 participants from CloudResearch. 616 workers accessed our survey link. Among these workers, 61 individuals did not complete the survey, yielding a sample of 555 qualifying participants (there was no random assignment in Part 1). Next, for Part 2, we reached out to all 555 qualifying participants (i.e., those who completed Part 1) through the CloudResearch platform and invited them to complete our survey. 508 of these participants accessed our survey link for Part 2. Among these workers, 46 individuals exited the survey early and were not exposed to the giver spotlighting manipulation, yielding a final sample of $N = 462$ participants (i.e., those who completed both Parts 1 and 2).

Self-dehumanization. First, one-way ANOVAs testing the effect of high giver spotlighting versus no giver spotlighting on self-dehumanization reveals a significant effect of giver spotlighting on agency-based self-dehumanization (Agency: $M_{\text{high spotlighting}} = 5.85, SD = 1.11$ vs. $M_{\text{no spotlighting}} = 6.04, SD = .89$; $F(1,462) = 4.27, p = .039$), but not on emotion-based self-dehumanization (Emotion: $M_{\text{high spotlighting}} = 5.79, SD = 1.20$ vs. $M_{\text{no spotlighting}} = 5.87, SD = 0.95$; $F(1,462) = 0.75, p = .389$).

Return & recommend intentions. Additionally, replicating results from Experiments 1-3, we once again find that participants in the High Spotlighting (vs. No Spotlighting) condition reported lower return and recommendation intentions ($M_{\text{high spotlighting}} = 5.97, SD = 1.17$ vs. $M_{\text{no spotlighting}} = 6.32, SD = 0.87$; $F(1,460) = 13.28, p < .001$).
Gratitude. Participants in the High Spotlighting (vs. No Spotlighting) condition also report lower feelings of gratitude ($M_{\text{high spotlighting}} = 5.73, SD = 1.20$ vs. $M_{\text{no spotlighting}} = 6.08, SD = 0.83$; $F(1,460) = 13.79, p < .001$).

Motivation. Moreover, participants in the High Spotlighting (vs. No Spotlighting) condition report directionally lower feelings of motivation ($M_{\text{high spotlighting}} = 5.95, SD = 1.19$; $M_{\text{no spotlighting}} = 6.12, SD = 1.01$; $F(1,460) = 2.67, p = .103$).

Mediation by Agency Threat. Mediation analyses using Hayes’ PROCESS (Model 4; see Hayes, 2017) reveal that agency threat mediates the effect of giver spotlighting on return and recommend intentions (.05(.02), 95% CI [.003, .094]), gratitude (.05(.02), 95% CI [.004, .091]), and motivation (.05(.02), 95% CI [.003, .093]).

Moderation by Cultural Interdependence and Independence. We tested for the moderating role of interdependence$^{16}$ (the Horizontal Collectivism sub-scale from Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) using the bootstrapping approach (Model 1, Hayes, 2018) with 10,000 iterations. This analysis reveals significant interactions between Giver spotlighting and Interdependence on return and recommendation intentions ($B = -.113, SE = .048, p = .019$, 95% CI [-.207, -.019]), gratitude ($B = -.106, SE = .048, p = .027$, 95% CI [-.199, -.012]), and motivation to utilize the aid-opportunity ($B = -.121, SE = .052, p = .021$, 95% CI [-.224, -.019]). More interdependent recipients (one standard deviation above the mean, i.e., at a mean at or above $M = 6.15$; i.e., individuals comfortable relying on others) do not significantly differ on any of our focal outcomes when their giver is made salient vs. not made salient (Return & Recommend: $B = .07, SE = .07, p = .297$; Gratitude: $B = .08, SE = .07, p = .222$; Motivation: $B = -.03, SE = .07, p = .661$). In contrast, there were significant, negative effects of giver spotlighting on each of our focal measures for moderately interdependent recipients (individuals at the mean, $M = 5.16$) (Return & Recommend: $B = .18, SE = .05, p < .001$; Gratitude: $B = .19, SE = .05, p < .001$; Motivation: $B = .09, SE = .05, p = .086$) and for less interdependent recipients (one standard deviation below the mean, i.e., a mean at or below $M = 4.18$; i.e., individuals uncomfortable relying on others) (Return & Recommend: $B = .29, SE = .07, p < .001$; Gratitude: $B = .29, SE = .07, p < .001$; Motivation: $B = .21, SE = .07, p = .005$). Figures S2 shows visualized results of the interaction between Giver Spotlighting and Interdependence on all three focal measures. Additionally, Table S14 displays the results from interactions between Giver Spotlighting and each interdependence/collectivism and independence/individualism measure included in Experiment 4 on all three focal measures.

Figure S2. Interaction between Giver Spotlighting and Interdependence in Experiment 4

---

$^{16}$ We report all moderation analyses with all cultural Individualism and Collectivism measures in Table S14
### Table 3.4. Supplemental Moderation Results for Study 4

#### Return & Recommend Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(1) Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>(2) Self-Reliance (Hi)</th>
<th>(3) Competition (VI)</th>
<th>(4) In-group Integrity (VC)</th>
<th>(5) Collectivism</th>
<th>(6) Individualism</th>
<th>(7) Interaction between (1) and (2)</th>
<th>(8) Interaction between (1) and (3)</th>
<th>(9) Interaction between (1) and (4)</th>
<th>(10) Interaction between (1) and (5)</th>
<th>(11) Interaction between (1) and (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>$b = -0.391, SE = 0.300, p = .192$</td>
<td>$b = 0.091, SE = 0.166, p = .582$</td>
<td>$b = 0.307, SE = 0.225, p = .111$</td>
<td>$b = 0.293, SE = 0.202, p = .104$</td>
<td>$b = 0.102, SE = 0.337, p = .669$</td>
<td>$b = 0.064, SE = 0.038, p = .023$</td>
<td>$b = 0.125, SE = 0.042, p = .003$</td>
<td>$b = 0.026, SE = 0.045, p = .561$</td>
<td>$b = 0.062, SE = 0.053, p = .420$</td>
<td>$b = 0.098, SE = 0.052, p = .059$</td>
<td>$b = 0.200, SE = 0.038, p = .009$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gratitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(1) Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>(2) Self-Reliance (Hi)</th>
<th>(3) Competition (VI)</th>
<th>(4) In-group Integrity (VC)</th>
<th>(5) Collectivism</th>
<th>(6) Individualism</th>
<th>(7) Interaction between (1) and (2)</th>
<th>(8) Interaction between (1) and (3)</th>
<th>(9) Interaction between (1) and (4)</th>
<th>(10) Interaction between (1) and (5)</th>
<th>(11) Interaction between (1) and (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>$b = -0.391, SE = 0.301, p = .165$</td>
<td>$b = 0.155, SE = 0.164, p = .450$</td>
<td>$b = 0.207, SE = 0.222, p = .023$</td>
<td>$b = 0.370, SE = 0.201, p = .066$</td>
<td>$b = 0.176, SE = 0.277, p = .459$</td>
<td>$b = 0.037, SE = 0.038, p = .488$</td>
<td>$b = 0.191, SE = 0.041, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$b = 0.114, SE = 0.044, p = .011$</td>
<td>$b = 0.174, SE = 0.052, p = .158$</td>
<td>$b = 0.006, SE = 0.038, p = .885$</td>
<td>$b = 0.000, SE = 0.041, p = .151$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(1) Giver Spotlighting</th>
<th>(2) Self-Reliance (Hi)</th>
<th>(3) Competition (VI)</th>
<th>(4) In-group Integrity (VC)</th>
<th>(5) Collectivism</th>
<th>(6) Individualism</th>
<th>(7) Interaction between (1) and (2)</th>
<th>(8) Interaction between (1) and (3)</th>
<th>(9) Interaction between (1) and (4)</th>
<th>(10) Interaction between (1) and (5)</th>
<th>(11) Interaction between (1) and (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>$b = -0.404, SE = 0.321, p = .209$</td>
<td>$b = 0.195, SE = 0.174, p = .264$</td>
<td>$b = 0.395, SE = 0.245, p = .105$</td>
<td>$b = 0.381, SE = 0.215, p = .077$</td>
<td>$b = 0.145, SE = 0.350, p = .562$</td>
<td>$b = 0.207, SE = 0.055, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$b = 0.191, SE = 0.040, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$b = 0.079, SE = 0.045, p = .083$</td>
<td>$b = 0.113, SE = 0.048, p = 0.005$</td>
<td>$b = 0.243, SE = 0.055, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$b = 0.084, SE = 0.055, p = .120$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The results come from five different regressions on Return & Recommend Intention, Gratitude, and Motivation on (1) the Giver Spotlighting (contrast coded where 1 = no giver spotlighting, -1 = giver spotlighted), (2) Self-Reliance, (3) Competition, (4) In-group Integrity, (5) Collectivism, or (6) Individualism and (7-11) their interaction. The Self-Reliance, Competition, and In-group Integrity variables come from the Horizontal Collectivism subscale of Triandis & Gudykunst's 1993 Individualistic/Collectivistic Scale. The Collectivism and Individualism measures come from Oyserman's 1993 Individualistic/Collectivistic Scale. These data are presented without exclusions.
VII. Experiment 5: Field Experiment

We recruited 500 individuals in Kenya through our partnership with the Busara Center. All participants were low-income, had a working phone to receive the cash-transfer and surveys, could read in the local language, and were parents at the time of the data collection. Among the recruited individuals, 24 eventually did not complete the follow-up survey, yielding a final sample of $N = 476$ participants. Out of 24 who dropped out, 13 were from the giver spotlighting condition and 11 were from the no giver spotlighting condition (the drop-out rate did not significantly differ across conditions, $p = .676$).

**Exploratory Moderation Analyses: Independence/Interdependence.** We ran a series of moderation analyses, to explore whether cultural interdependence attenuated the effect of giver spotlighting on recommendation intentions. As noted in our pre-registration, we did not know the level and distribution of interdependence among Kenyans. We thus employed both interdependence and self-reliance scales as well as an open-ended question to be coded. Our coding of interdependence (from the open-ended measure) did not moderate our effect of giver spotlighting on recommendation intentions ($b = 1.87, SE = 2.34, p = .425, 95\% CI [-2.729, 6.459]$). Similarly, the horizontal collectivism/interdependence ($b = -2.42, SE = 2.94, p = .411, 95\% CI [-8.206, 3.363]$) and horizontal individualism/self-reliance ($b = 2.95, SE = 1.10, p = .272, 95\% CI [-2.322, 8.229]$) adapted sub-scales also did not moderate this effect.

**Exploratory Measure: Text Analyses on Gratitude, Agency, and Patiency.** We collected exploratory qualitative data from responses to the following open-ended measure: “I would like to learn more about how receiving the Ksh 500 cash-transfer from [Spare / Researcher’s Name] made you feel. Different experiences and interactions can make people feel different emotions. Please share with us the first 10 words that come to mind, when thinking about how receiving Ksh 500 from [Spare / Researcher’s Name] made you feel.” We used an independent coder to identify the presence of gratitude-related words and linguistic analysis software (using LIWC 2015) to identify the presence of agency-related and patiency-related words. We report the results on agency and patiency in the main paper.

**Gratitude.** First, for our analyses on gratitude, we ran a one-way ANOVA on the presence vs. absence of gratitude words, as coded by an independent coder. These results reveal that recipients expressed significantly more gratitude when the giver was not spotlighted ($M = 1.67, SD = 1.07$), compared to when the giver was spotlighted ($M = 1.24, SD = 0.92; F(474) = 21.62, p < .001$).

**Mediation by Agency.** A simultaneous mediation analysis, using Hayes’ Process (Model 4), testing the effect of giver spotlighting (1=spotlighted, 0=no spotlighting) on recommendation behaviors (i.e., presence vs. absence of a testimonial) through agency words (achievement and reward focus) reveals significant indirect effects through both agency words. Figures S3 displays visualized results from this mediation analysis.

**Figure S3.** Mediation by Agency Language (“Achievement” Words, “Reward-focus” Words, and Verbs) in Experiment 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIWC Dictionary</th>
<th>Example Words from Dictionary</th>
<th>Example Words Used by Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Sub-dictionary (Drives)</td>
<td>Win, success, better</td>
<td>Motivated, victorious, excited, confident, able, responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Sub-dictionary (Drives)</td>
<td>Take, prize, benefit</td>
<td>Excited, overjoyed, victorious, advantaged, appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remembered, helped, considered, surprised, blessed, humbled, committed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
a = -1.25\, ^* \, (.50)
\]

**indirect effect = -1.84**\(*\, .72\)**

\[
c_1’ = -2.18\, ^* \, (1.04)
\]

\[
b = 1.47\, (23.89)
\]
Additional Exploratory Measures: Satisfaction and Return Intentions. A one-way ANOVA using condition (giver spotlighted: yes, no) as a factor on felt satisfaction (where 1=0% satisfaction and 10=100% satisfied) revealed that participants reported being significantly more satisfied when the giver was spotlighted ($M = 9.15$, $SD = 1.62$) as compared to when the giver was not spotlighted ($M = 8.69$, $SD = 1.88$; $F(1,474) = 8.39$, $p = .004$). It is possible that this difference in reported satisfaction signifies a demand effect (i.e., since participants in the giver spotlighting condition might have felt more indebted and observed than those in the no spotlighting condition). Additionally, all but one participant reported being interested in receiving texts messages from the Busara Center about future aid opportunities.

D. Experiments 1-4: Results on Return and Recommendation Intentions, Gratitude, and Motivation with Strict and Lenient Exclusions

Table S15 presents the results on return and recommendation intentions, gratitude, and motivation across Experiments 1-4 with no exclusions, lenient exclusions (i.e., participants passed either one or both of our manipulation checks), and strict exclusions (i.e., they passed both of our manipulation checks). The manipulation checks asked participants if they could imagine experiencing the need-state described in the thought experiment and if they thought they could experience that need-state in their lifetime (yes, no).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table S15. Results from Experiments 1-4 with No Exclusions, Lenient Exclusions, and Strict Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** The results for Experiment 1 come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and scenario as the independent variables. The results for Experiments 2a – 2c come from conducting two-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting and solicitation, need, or recipient identifiability (respectively) as the independent variables. The results for Experiment 3 come from conducting a one-way ANOVA with no giver spotlighting and composite giver spotlighting (a composite of all three spotlighting conditions: giver identification, giver contact, and giver identification + contact) as the independent variable. The results for Experiment 4 come from conducting one-way ANOVAs with giver spotlighting as the independent variable. We present data with no exclusions, lenient exclusions (i.e., they passed either one or both of our manipulation checks), and strict exclusions (i.e., they passed both of our manipulation checks).

**E. Additional Preregistered (Exploratory) Analyses**

**I. Experiments 1**

In Experiment 1, we preregistered that the effect of condition on dependency, hope, and helplessness is a key analysis; however, due to word limitations in the main text, we chose to report this in the supplement. Moreover, we preregistered extensive moderation analyses with these variables, we did not ultimately choose to include these analyses in the paper or in this supplement because we found no such moderation. Specifically, we preregistered that our analyses would consist of exploratory moderation analyses, testing the effect of X (condition: giver spotlighted vs. giver not spotlighted) on Y (return and recommend intentions, gratitude, or motivation) moderated by W (dependency, hope, and/or helplessness). Additionally, we preregistered exploratory moderation analyses with subjective social class, objective social class, and trait level self-esteem as moderators. We did not include these analyses in the paper or in this supplement. All data is available on OSF, allowing interested readers to conduct these additional analyses.

**II. Experiments 2a – 2c**

We preregistered exploratory moderation analyses with subjective social class and objective social class as moderators, but we did not include these analyses in the paper or in this supplement. All data is available on OSF, allowing interested readers to conduct these preregistered analyses.
III. Experiment 4

In Experiment 4, we preregistered gratitude as a key dependent variable, but ultimately decided to report return and recommendations as our focal variable throughout the paper, since this was our focal variable in Experiments 1-3. We report the full results on gratitude in this supplement. Moreover, we planned to test whether individualism / collectivism scales would moderate our effect and whether independence / self-reliance and self-dehumanization would mediate our effect. Specifically, we preregistered that we would explore moderation analyses looking at individualism / collectivism scales (Oyserman, 1993; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) as exploratory moderators to the effect of condition (X) on return and recommend intentions or gratitude (Y); additionally, we preregistered that we would run both independence / self-reliance and self-dehumanization as mediators (M) to the effect of condition (X) on return and recommend intentions or gratitude (Y); we preregistered that we would also run moderated mediations on the effect of condition (X) on return and recommend intentions or gratitude (Y), looking at self-reliance and individualism / collectivism as the moderator (W) and independence / self-reliance and self-dehumanization as mediators (M). We preregistered that all other comparisons were exploratory. These results can be found in Table S14 and all data is available on OSF, allowing interested readers to conduct these preregistered analyses.

IV. Experiment 5

In Experiment 5, we preregistered interdependence and self-reliance as key variables, and moderation analyses with these variables as key analyses. However, we later decided to not include any of these cultural moderation analyses in the main paper since the results were mixed. Additionally, we preregistered the recommendation behavior outcome variable (where participants could choose to provide a testimonial about their experience with Spare) and the exploratory qualitative measure (which we used for text analyses measuring agency and patience-related language) from Part 3 as secondary variables. We later chose to present both of these results in the main paper as key outcome variables. We believe that these variables are central to our argument that giver spotlighting negatively leads to agency-treat and, hence, decreases return and recommendation intentions and behaviors.