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Abstract

Altruism is all good, or at least so goes the common wisdom: altruists help others, cooperate with others, and support the common good. This paper discusses these and other socially desirable consequences of altruism but also highlights its dark side: strong altruism towards in-group members is often accompanied by discrimination against and antagonism towards out-group members, with many undesirable social consequences. The paper raises policy issues concerning encouragement of altruism. The paper suggests that in contemporary society in much of the world, parochial altruism is short sighted and universal altruism should be encouraged. We evaluate altruism relative to its effects on broad aspects of social welfare: poverty alleviation, reduction of polarization among groups, social stability and integration, and economic efficiency.
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The Bright and Dark Sides of Altruism

1. Introduction

Altruism is defined as “disinterested and selfless concern for the well-being of others” (Oxford Dictionary) or the willingness to give away resources to benefit others without expectation of a return (Fehr and Schmidt 2006). Altruism is the sentiment of individual A towards a target B that leads to helpful actions. Target B is an individual or a group; the strength A’s altruistic feelings varies across different targets. Altruism is commonly viewed as being on a one dimensional scale that ranges from extreme selfishness to extreme altruism. In the context of the dictator game, the scale is bounded by giving nothing to giving away the entire endowment.

Scholars and members of the public in general have recognized the essential role of altruism in supporting cooperation and reducing free riding in the workplace, promoting social welfare through voluntary transfers of income and volunteering, and contributing to market efficiency through voluntary blood and organ donation, among other things. This bright side of altruism has stimulated much public and private support for altruistic sentiments and acts through education, tax policy and other measures.¹

However, altruism has also a dark side, although negative aspects of altruism have received less scholarly and public attention. Altruistic actions, especially if sustained over time, may cause dependence and inhibit self-improvement and initiative among recipients of unconditional gifts. Altruistic feelings are often directed at one’s own group, however the group is defined, to the exclusion and sometimes at the expense of others, possibly fomenting conflicts

¹ Few have argued directly against altruism. Ayn Rand, a novelist and philosopher, has argued in favor of unbridled selfishness and against altruism (Rand 1964). Her work appears to have had only minor influence on economists (Hausman and McPherson 1993).
between groups in the workplace, in communities and among countries, to the detriment of the wellbeing of some and at the expense of economic efficiency. In terms of the dictator game, the degree of altruism not only varies in how much individuals give to different targets, but in some cases, if they can, they take away others’ endowments (List 2007).

This paper reviews arguments concerning both sides of altruism; since the bright side is more familiar, the paper emphasizes possible negative outcomes of altruism. By recognizing that altruism is not always desirable, we challenge the common wisdom that altruism should be unconditionally advocated and supported. We assess the effects of altruism on social welfare relative to the goals of poverty alleviation, reduction of polarization among groups, social stability and integration, and economic efficiency.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents an overview of the bright side of altruism in different contexts. Section 3 reviews arguments and evidence illustrating the dark side of altruism. Section 4 discusses the implications of the two sides of altruism for policies that encourage or discourage altruistic attitudes and behaviors. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. The Bright Side of Altruism

Caring about others is good – this is a statement of what appears to reflect a broad consensus in social and behavioral sciences, among educators, politicians and the broad citizenry. This section summarizes the principal arguments that support this statement.

2.1 Altruism in the workplace

Altruism has been linked positively to cooperation in the workplace and therefore to better economic outcomes. First, altruism towards coworkers leads to reduced free-riding in teams. The free-rider problem arises because of the discrepancy between the cost of effort, which is born by each employee alone, and the results of that effort, which are shared by all members of the team;
however, the gains made by other team members are not valued by selfish employees. In contrast, altruistic employees who care about their coworkers value the benefits that accrue to them (even if less than those that accrue to themselves), and are therefore less likely to free-ride because their personal costs may generate (if they are altruistic enough) sufficient benefits to exceed their costs. Second, unconditional altruism may trigger favorable reactions by those who benefit from it and subsequently reciprocate, which contributes to organizational productivity (Akerlof 1982). Third, helping others in an altruistic fashion, not part of one’s job duties or observable and compensated activities by sharing expertise and experience and helping with work-related problems has been found to promote organizational productivity (O’Reilly and Pfeffer 1995). This is especially important for jobs that require high levels of coordination and cooperation.2

2.2 Altruism in families
Families are vehicles for social stability and investments that enhance economic efficiency. Parents take care of, give gifts to, and leave bequests to their children out of altruism. Children rely on such altruistic gifts of time and money to accumulate financial and human capital. Economists recognize the role of altruism in inter-generational mobility. Becker (1991) suggests that the more altruistic parents are, the more they invest in their children’s human capital accumulation. The “Rotten Parent Theorem” argues that parents invest in children’s human capital to change their preferences to make them more altruistic so that they will be more likely to support their elderly parents in need (Becker, Murphy, and Spenkuch 2016).

More generally, evolution leans towards favorable treatment not only of one’s own children but also of kin who are substantially genetically related. This is referred to as inclusive

---

2 For example, at Southwest Airlines, employees are recruited carefully for what we term altruistic inclinations to routinely help each other out.
or kin altruism (Hamilton 1964). Altruism, in this respect, is essential for the reproduction and sustainability of humans (and other species).

2.3 Altruism in the public sphere

Charitable giving and volunteering motivated by altruism have positive impacts on many aspects of social welfare: aid for the poor, college scholarships for students in need, donations to medical institutions, donations for research, donations to organizations that work for social justice, and blood and organ donations, to name just a few examples. Reliance on altruism promotes efficiency and a corrective for market failure that arise from severe asymmetric information in favor of providers over consumers (e.g., Thorne 2006). Titmuss (1970) has famously shown that altruistically donated blood is better than blood sold for profit, influencing legislation that prohibits blood and organ sales.

2.4 Benefits that accrue to altruistic givers

The obvious beneficiaries of altruism are its targets. Altruistic acts generate benefits also to givers. Post (2005) shows that altruistic emotions and behaviors are positively associated with well-being, health, and longevity, as long as people are not overwhelmed by helping tasks. In addition, individuals who are in negative mood are more likely to help others (Cialdini and Kenrick 1976) as a way to ease tension and stress, and experience the feelings of satisfaction and gratitude (Glomb et al. 2011).

In a series of observational and experimental studies, Dunn, Aknin, and Norton (2008) found that giving money to others enhances happiness more than keeping the money to oneself; this finding holds also for young children (Aknin, Hamlin, and Dunn 2012). Research suggests that volunteers who donate their time, like those who give money, benefit in various psychological, physical health and social domains (Tang, Choi and Morrow-Howell 2010;
Morrow-Howell 2010; Piliavin and Siegl 2007; Van Willigen 2000). Andreoni (1990, 1995) suggests that the utility received by the giver from the act of giving – the “warm glow” – may in fact motivate donations more than the benefits that accrue to recipients. He thus contrasts impure with pure altruism.

3. The Dark Side of Altruism

The bright side of altruism is that it is good for recipients and givers. However, altruistic sentiments and acts can also have deleterious effects on both givers and recipients, as well as can generate negative externalities for others and the broader society. Frequently, the same altruistic act may have dual effects, positive for one group and negative for another, or even positive and negative for the same group.

3.1 Self-serving altruism and oversupply of donations

Giving may be motivated by the desire to help others or to satisfy the giver’s needs. The motivation does not, in and of itself, make altruism good or bad, although as we argue below, in some instances self-serving altruism has a dark side.

Pure altruism, which leads to acts that are done only for the benefits of others, may be compared to impure or self-serving altruism, motivated by the enjoyment of acting good. This is the “warm glow” egoistic motivation for giving noted earlier (Andreoni 1990, 1995). Self-serving altruism may also be motivated by donors’ desire to gain social approval for their giving and improve their social status (Harbaugh 1998). Furthermore, as noted in section 2.4, people may act altruistically to relieve their own negative emotions.

From a libertarian perspective, no judgment can be passed on impure altruism, which may be regarded as a form of consumption. However, from a broader perspective that permits the passing of judgment on how people satisfy their social and psychological needs when the
welfare of others is involved, impure altruism may result in oversupply of donations as well as socially inefficient allocation of donations due to insufficient consideration of the satisfaction of the recipients’ needs from different sources. While giving to deserving causes seems to be always desirable, this is not so from a social welfare standpoint when the opportunity cost of giving to one deserving recipient implies giving less to another. If impure altruists tend to give more to some categories of deserving recipients, such as more visible one, donations to which may earn more social standing to donors, then this shift of charitable resources is socially inefficient.

Altruism can go hand in hand with wrongdoing if it serves as a moral justification for unethical behaviors. Moral licensing theory (Miller and Effron 2010) offers two theoretical mechanisms that explain how engaging in altruistic acts can license people to subsequently engage in unethical acts, one operating through “moral credits” and the other through “moral credentials.” According to this theory, moral credits are earned for doing good and may be used to purchase or license the right to behave unethically, and moral credentials enable individuals, in their own eyes, to construe questionable acts in favorable ways.

There is experimental evidence that is consistent with the moral license theory. For instance, individuals who are given the opportunity to benefit another participant in addition to themselves cheat more than when they could not benefit others; people also feel less guilty about cheating when others benefit from their dishonesty (Gino, Ayal, and Ariely 2013; Gino and Ariely 2012; Wiltermuth 2011). Erat and Gneezy (2012) demonstrate in an experiment that although people are reluctant to tell lies that benefit both parties, they are willing to tell altruistic lies that help others but may hurt themselves. This can partially be attributed to the warm-glow of altruism that conceals lying as a morally challenging behavior. Likewise, Gino and Pierce
(2009) show in an experiment that wealth-based inequality can trigger dishonest helpings via feelings of guilt and empathy. In other words, altruistic helping can alleviate the emotion of guilt. At the same time, helping behaviors obscure the moral content of dishonesty.

### 3.2 Giving may limit recipients’ social preferences and reduce incentives to work

Altruistic charitable giving may displace recipients’ incentives to work, invest in their human Capital and insure them themselves (Coate 1995). The risk is that recipients of such charitable giving, if persisting on the long run, will develop habits and attitudes that are not desirable to the individuals who possess them and to society at large.

Parental altruism, when exercised excessively because of parental insufficient self-control, may affect adversely children’s well-being, similar to the idea of the Samaritan's dilemma (Buchanan 1975). When children begin to take parents’ contributions for granted and do not hesitate to ask for more, they are may be spoiled in the sense that they will tend to free ride and shirk, and fail to value the importance of reciprocity, mutual respect, and gratification (Buchanan, 1975; Lubatkin, Michael H., et al., 2005). Similar logic applies to giving to kin. For example, Di Falco and Bulte (2013) show that compulsory kinship sharing undermines people’s incentive to adopt risk-mitigating farm management practices and encourages free-riding. Di Falco and Bulte (2011, 2015) show that kinship sharing norms may attenuate the incentive to accumulate income as well as to invest in human capital among poor households in South Africa, which may result in increased poverty.

Becker’s “rotten kid theorem” (Becker 1991) suggests that with benevolent and altruistic parents, selfish children will behave in a family-efficient way that maximizes their own utility by maximizing family total income. However, relaxing the unrealistic assumptions of this theorem, such as the ignorance of leisure and omission of time, other scholars found that parental altruism
may result in undesirable outcomes. For instance, Bergstrom (1989) suggests the case of the “lazy rotten kid” – children choose too much leisure – and take advantage of parental transfers. Lindbeck and Weibull (1988) show that parental altruism can lead to inefficient choices by children between current and future consumption (early over-consumption and later under-consumption). Similarly, Bruce and Waldman (1990) investigate the two-period rotten kid theorem and show that if parents choose to transfer a large amount in the first period and make the second period transfer inoperative, the child will choose to maximum his own income instead of the family total income (“rotten kid inefficiency”); if parents only transfer a small amount in the first period, the child will realize that the second period transfer is operative and will choose to over-consume and under-save (“Samaritan dilemma”). Parental altruism leads to inefficiency in both cases.

In sum, “excessive” giving may induce a change in recipients’ social preferences such that they will be less cooperative (more “spoiled”) and less hard-working.  

3.3 **Counterproductive altruism in the workplace**

We argued earlier that altruistic behavior improves cooperation in the workplace. But altruism, in association with limited self-control, may manifest itself in being forgiving – too forgiving – to coworkers who shirk. Bernheim and Stark (1988) argue that altruists have difficulty enforcing agreements because they may be reluctant to punish betrayals, and thus can be treated as

---

3 The term “excessive” is in quotation marks to indicate that it is defined relative to the consequences of giving: giving that has the effect of changing recipients’ preferences as indicated in the text is excessive. 

4 For evidence of preference change Becker, Murphy, and Spenkuch (2016) present a theoretical argument that parents invest in children to manipulate children’s altruism towards parents. Gaudeul and Kaczmarek (2017) present experimental evidence that nudges induce donations to charity which eventually lead to attitude change (better attitude to charity) based on cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger 1962). We make a similar argument, namely that excessive giving makes children behave as “rotten kids,” which may further induce attitude and preference changes because people are prone to self-justify their attitudes to align with their behaviors in order to avoid cognitive dissonance. For a detailed discussion of changes in preferences and their impact in the workplace, see Ben-Ner and Ellman (2012).
“softies” whose words are not intimidating enough to enforce agreements. Altruism thus encompasses exploitability that causes loss of efficiency and leaves both parties worse off.

Experimental evidence from a public goods game suggests that altruistic subjects are significantly less likely to punish low contributors than other subjects (Carpenter et al. 2009). Building on this finding, Hwang and Bowles (2012) develop a theoretical argument that altruism attenuates the punishment motive and thus reduces efficient punishment of free riders and defectors, which eventually results in discouragement of cooperation. In a similar vein, desirable mutual monitoring by members of a team may be limited by altruistic sentiments (Ben-Ner and Ellman 2013).

Altruism is hardly ever universalistic in the sense that an individual is equally generous to all others in general or even in a particular context. For example, manager altruism directed at a particular worker could endanger the fairness of performance evaluation and have negative effects on the performance of other workers (Podsakoff et al. 2000). Prendergast and Topel (1996) note that favoritism can lead to inefficiencies in various dimensions. First, organizations suffer from higher turnover cost and loss of specific human capital when employees quit due to unfair evaluation. Second, workers may engage in harmful activities such as reduced work effort and increased ingratiating behaviors. Lastly, unfair evaluation can cause misallocation of workers to jobs. Similarly, worker altruism directed at a supervisor may result in counterproductive work behavior by other workers (Rotemberg 2006).

3.4 Particularistic, parochial and discriminatory altruism

Altruism is commonly analyzed as a general sentiment or disposition focused on “others,” without specifying the others’ identity or relationship to the individual altruist. This is a faulty conception of altruism. In general, it does not make sense to characterize an individual as a
certain degree altruist on the selfish-altruist scale. The same individual may be simultaneously very altruistic toward target $B1$ and much less so toward target $B2$, and a negative altruist towards $B3$ (wanting to take resources away).

In biological terms, altruism arises from genes’ drive to reproduce; genes without it go extinct. Genes act through the individuals who carry them. Human behavior is guided by strategies, “traits” or behavior rules that overall promote successful reproduction of genes. Individuals therefore possesses a selfishness trait, which implies that they will seek resources to survive and reproduce their genes through their offspring as well as through more distant kin. Thus, their selfish motives drive individuals to be altruistic towards those that help them reproduce their genes. Such kin altruism is a manifestation of “selfishness” of the genes (Dawkins 2016[1974]), and it may be viewed as a strategy for global maximization of reproductive capability of an individual, given his or her resources. Thus, one can reproduce one’s genes by having children and by helping individuals with similar genes to raise their own children and to have their own children, and so on. Genetic relatedness declines from immediate family to extended family, followed by people who are increasingly more distant relations. Hence biologically driven altruism is inherently discriminatory in favor of offspring and other kin (see Alger and Weibull (2012) for an evolutionary model of the emergence of behavioral traits).

The degree of altruism depends not only on genetic relatedness but also on the resources that an individual possesses and the resources of his or her kin. When immediate family members have sufficient resources, generosity is extended to more distant relations and members of one’s ethnic, linguistic or other groups that may be genetically related to the individual. When people lived in small groups in ancestral environments, they were all related kin. As societies
grew, natural distinctions between kin and non-kin became blurred but the drive to distinguish between them for purposes of reproduction did not vanish. Individuals search for signals of relatedness: language, features, skin color, religion, culture, customs and clothes, depending on historical and geographic contexts. Wealthier individuals with well-off immediate relations will maximize their genes’ reproductive capacity by donating to more distant relations whose reproductive capacity can be enhanced by additional resources; in modern impersonal societies, such relations are identified by signals such as those just mentioned. This calculus reflects maximization of reproductive capacity by equalizing the marginal returns from different investment opportunities (donations to targets who are related to the donor in varying degrees). This altruism may be termed particularistic or parochial altruism, which inclines the individual to favor some groups but not others.

What about individuals who do not contribute to the reproductive success of an individual’s genes? Those may be people who are essentially genetically unrelated and those who compete with the individual for resources. These competitors are not targets of positive altruism, but are rather opposed. Biological altruistic favoritism is therefore ethnic, religious, cultural and other favoritism and discrimination. Favoritism and discrimination are not restricted to degrees of positive altruism, giving different amounts of resources, but extend to negative altruism, taking away resources. This is the summary of the complementarity between selfishness and altruism, and between altruism and hatred directed at the ‘other’ (for detailed analyses, see Shaw and Wong 1989 and Choi and Bowles 2007).

Altruism is therefore not universal but particularistic and parochial. Such altruism has been essential for the sustainability of living species, including the human species. But what had been essential in the ancestral environment of humankind has become excessive and damaging in
the contemporary environment. The contemporary environment is far more complex, with individuals of very different backgrounds inhabiting common spaces. Members of different groups have to work together, share resources and engage in common activities. Particularistic and discriminatory altruism manifests itself in favoritism towards related individuals and groups and discrimination and even hatred against other individuals and groups, particularly those that lay claims to the same resources.\footnote{Favoritism and discrimination are exercised on many attributes, some of which were noted above, and in many domains. Ben-Ner, McCall, Stephane and Wang (2009), in an experiment, find that individuals favor their in-group members over out-group members based on characteristics such as family and kin, political views, sports fanship, nationality, religion, dress preferences, body type culinary preferences, and more. This preference is found in giving of money in the dictator game, as well as sharing office, work on a team and commuting. In the US, the bulk of individual charitable giving is directed to groups with which donors are affiliated: religious, social or cultural (Ben-Ner 2016).}

Horstmann, Scharf, and Slivinski (2007) suggest that charitable giving for public goods leads to voluntary segregation among individuals who differ only with respect to their preferences for public goods. Subsidies for charitable giving, such as tax benefits, exacerbate segregation. This result is obtained without explicit favoritism or discrimination; segregation is a consequence of different tastes for public goods such as cultural activities, parks and schools, which become lines of differentiation. These different tastes, which define the boundaries among various groups of nearly homogenous individuals, arise, we argued in this section, from evolutionary forces that lead individuals to be altruistic towards those who are similar to them (e.g., by giving voluntarily to public goods that benefit their community) but not to those who are dissimilar.

Behaviors based on parochial altruism have obvious negative effects on those who are discriminated against. But most situations that involve discrimination also entail a loss of general social welfare and economic efficiency. Put differently, in some situations, the net effect of
altruism on key outcomes is negative. In-group oriented altruism could lead to unfavorable outcomes: it negatively affects intergroup relations and exacerbates the tension among different groups, hinders cooperation in teams and organizations, enhances social segregation and polarization, and reduces cooperation and trust among people belonging to different groups (Ben-Ner 2016). Generally, the social and economic consequences of this are negative, lowering economic output, dedicating resources to protecting resources from others and to abscond others’ resources, and so on. It is well to remember Edward Banfield’s (1958) conclusions concerning excessive family-focused altruism, which leads to unwillingness to work cooperatively with members of other families to provide public goods and effective business organizations, resulting in “amoral familism.” Banfield concluded that this leads to isolation, poverty, and social backwardness. Amoral familism is essentially parochial altruism, and Montegano, the fictional name of the place in Italy where he conducted his study, could be any place, in any country.  

4. **Balancing the bright and dark sides of altruism: policy implications**

The bifurcated consequences of altruism arise from the fact that it is not directed in equal measure to all individuals and groups. The biologically-driven altruism that is pointed at other people based on genetic relatedness has been both accentuated and moderated by culture and circumstances so that in contemporary society altruism has distinctly bright and dark sides.

For example, individuals may behave altruistically towards members of their in-group, which improves cooperation and productivity in the workplace and community. The same individuals may cooperate less effectively or conflict with out-group members; this contributes to the emergence of factions, segregation and a fractious workplace and community that operates

---

6 Competition among groups and cooperation within groups may have positive net economic benefits, but the literature on diversity in communities and countries tends to suggest otherwise (E.g., Alesina and La Ferrara 2005).
less effectively. For another example, altruism towards one’s children is clearly privately and socially beneficial, but excessive altruism may inculcate undesirable social preferences and attitudes to work that, if widespread, can stifle economic performance.

At the society level, particularistic altruism that supports beneficial pluralism and diversity under certain socio-economic and political conditions, may, under different conditions, turn into undesirable discriminatory altruism that feeds factionalism, sectarianism and polarization. For example, whereas in the United States during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries particularistic or parochial in-group oriented altruism helped the emergence of useful institutions (as Alexis de Tocqueville famously argued), in the early part of the twenty first century more universalistic altruism is needed to deal with issues that are central to society and which require policy responses that are difficult to craft and carry out in a splintered or polarized society.7

Recognition of the two sides of altruism suggests that indiscriminate encouragement of altruistic behaviors should be attenuated by concerns for the harm it can cause. Public policies that subsidize charitable giving of any kind, such as income tax exemption, may be undesirable at the present time, in line with the argument in the previous paragraph.8 Tax and other policies should favor universalistic giving, which addresses neediness in general, without regard to affiliations to religious, ethnic or other divisive-identity groups. In a similar vein, to reduce the negative effects of excessive altruistic giving in families, progressive inheritance taxes should be considered, along with exemptions of taxes on bequests to universalistic causes.

7 These issues include, for example, climate change, gay marriage, threat of terrorism, income inequality, national budgets and debt, role of religion in the public sphere, abortion rights and immigration.
8 Horstmann, Scharf, and Slivinski (2007) suggest that elimination of subsidies such as tax exemption of charitable donations would be a Pareto-improving policy measure to reduce ethnic, political and other forms of preferences-based segregation.
More broadly, discriminatory, parochial or particularistic altruism, along with pure selfishness, may be tempered through education, public discourse and other institutions that emphasize the social, economic and political benefits arising from universalistic altruism. In fractious and polarized societies, this argument has to be made not only by educators, politicians and clergies, some of whom have contributed to the existing polarization, but by scholars who are informed by research findings.

The literature in behavioral economics has tended to emphasize the benefits of altruism when it came to counter the narrow view of classical economics focused on the self-interest of *Homo economicus*. The research findings concerning the dark side of altruism should be considered carefully to temper the assessment of altruism and in order to inform better public policies in contemporary society.

5. **Conclusions**

In this paper, we have reviewed both the bright and dark side of altruism. Altruism can be beneficial to organizations, families and societies. Altruistic acts in the workplace encourage cooperation among coworkers, reduce free-riding, and thus contribute to organizational effectiveness. Altruism can effectively promote social welfare, market efficiency, and enforce social bonds in society. Altruistic givers acquire physical and mental health benefits. The literature in various discipline, including behavioral economics, has tended to emphasize the bright side of altruism in contrast to pure selfishness.

However, the dark side of altruism should not be ignored. Altruistic behaviors can lead to negative economic, political and social consequences. Altruism may act as a counterproductive force that inhibits self-improvement, creates conflicts and obscures moral boundaries. Crucially for contemporary societies, discriminatory altruism has negative effects on those who are
discriminated against and can increase social segregation and polarization, reduce trust and cooperation, and exacerbate intergroup conflicts.

Recognizing the dark side of altruism has implications for public policy. It adds a layer of complexity in evaluating policies that seek to promote altruistic acts such as charitable donations. Should we continue tax exemption benefits for donations? Should we encourage inheritance tax on bequests to children? Should we educate for selfishness or for altruism that is directed to national, ethic, religious, political and other groups? When considering those policy questions, both the bright and the dark side of altruism should be carefully taken into account to arrive at a comprehensive decision.

Future research should help to understand better the relationship between the two sides of altruism within individuals. There are important questions that have not been answered yet. For example, is a more altruistic attitude towards one’s own kin, ethnic or religious group associated with a lesser altruistic or negative altruistic attitudes towards out-group members? Do altruistic preferences change in response to such as education, financial incentives and other private or public interventions? Do particularistic and universalistic altruism respond similarly to such interventions?
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