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In the main text we report the result of an ANOVA that found significant differences in mean giving between conditions. To address the non-normal distribution of the data (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z=5.063, p<0.001), we conduct two different reanalyses: bootstrapping the sample, and non-parametric tests. Both reanalyses support the conclusions in the main text. We also separately analyze whether the differences in mean giving are due to higher likelihood of donating or due to higher amounts given by those who did donate. Finally, we compare whether mean donations in each condition are different from the effective ceiling of a $5 fair split.

*Bootstrapping*

We bootstrapped each sample 5000 times, and re-ran our analyses using these means, where the standard error of the mean is the standard deviation of the bootstrapped sample means (this is literally what a standard error is supposed to represent). This bootstrapping procedure produced results that were nearly identical to the results in the Main Text: donations were higher in the *Sudden Eyespots* condition (M = $4.95, s.e.m. = $0.223) than in the *Constant Eyespots* condition (M = $3.96, s.e.m. = $0.233, *t131* = 3.07, *p* = .0026) or in the *No Eyes* condition (M = $4.43, s.e.m. = $0.211, one-tailed *t122* = 1.662, *p* = .0495); the latter two conditions were not significantly different (*t117* = 1.476, *p* = .1427). Once again, a one-tailed t-test is justified between the *Sudden Eyespots* and *No Eyespots* because previous studies give us a strong a priori directional prediction.

*Non-Parametric Tests*

We also tested for differences between the giving distributions in the three conditions (*No eyes, Sudden Eyespots, Constant Eyespots*) using an independent samples Kruskal-Wallis test, and used independent samples Mann-Whitney U test for paired comparisons. The distributions of amount given were significantly different (p=0.043) among the three conditions. Pairwise comparisons revealed a significant difference between the two eyes conditions (p=0.017), and a marginally significant difference between *No Eyespots* and *Sudden Eyespots* (p=0.096); this latter difference was in the direction predicted by past results (see Table 1 of Main Text), so it would be significant if a one-tailed test were used. There was no significant difference between *No Eyespots* and *Constant Eyespots* (p=0.431).

*Likelihood of Donating vs. Amount Given*

We tested for effects of experimental condition on likelihood of donating (0 = nothing, 1 = something) and on likelihood of a fair split (0 = donated less than $5, 1 = donated $5 or more) using a binary logistic Generalized Linear Model. Probability of donating anything was higher in the *Sudden Eyespots* condition (97.1%) than those in *No eyes* (92.7%) or *Constant eyespots* (87.5%), though these differences were not statistically significant (likely due to a ceiling effect). Among those who donated anything, there was a borderline significant effect of condition (F2,171=2.68, p=0.071) on average donation: *Sudden Eyespots* participants who gave something donated an average of $5.10, which was significantly more than in *Constant Eyespots* ($4.54, T118=2.19, p=0.03). The mean donation of *No eyes* participants who gave anything was $4.78, which was not significantly different than either eyespots condition. Thus, the significant differences between conditions on mean giving appear to be the result of two trends: *Sudden Eyes* participants tended to give something rather than nothing, and those who gave something tended to give more; neither trend was significant on its own, but together they combined to a significant difference between conditions. Similar results are produced if we analyze the likelihood of unfair splits instead of fair splits.

*Comparison to Ceiling*

Giving half of the $10 allocation is effectively the ceiling in Dictator Games, as participants rarely give more than a “fair split” of half. We conducted post-hoc one-tailed t tests comparing mean giving in each condition to $5. Giving was significantly less than this $5ceiling in *No Eyes* (T55=2.60, p=0.006) and *Constant Eyespots* (T64=4.40, p<0.001), but not in *Sudden Eyespots* (T69=0.19, p=0.42). As such, participants in the *Sudden Eyespots* condition were essentially giving the maximum, which means that the effects of this condition could have been even greater had it not been for the ceiling. This ceiling effect works against our hypotheses, so it becomes more impressive that contributions are significantly highest in the *Sudden Eyes* condition despite running into this ceiling.