



# No Evidence for Audience Effects in Reciprocal Cooperation of Norway Rats

Manon K. Schweinfurth & Michael Taborsky

Department of Behavioural Ecology, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Hinterkappelen, Switzerland

## Correspondence

Manon K. Schweinfurth, Behavioural Ecology,  
Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University  
of Bern, Wohlenstrasse 50a, CH-3032  
Hinterkappelen, Switzerland.  
E-mail: manon.schweinfurth@iee.unibe.ch

Received: January 20, 2016

Initial acceptance: March 9, 2016

Final acceptance: March 22, 2016

(J. Wright)

doi: 10.1111/eth.12499

**Keywords:** altruism, image scoring, indirect reciprocity, reputation, standing strategy

## Abstract

Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*) cooperate according to indirect reciprocity, which implies the involvement of a reputation mechanism. Here, we test whether the rats employ such mechanism in repeated cooperative interactions. Focal subjects were first trained individually to pull food towards a social partner. During the experiment, the focal rats were confronted with two types of trained social partners: one always cooperated and the other one always defected, either in the presence or in the absence of an audience. Based on the hypotheses that the rats possess a reputation mechanism involving image scoring, we predicted them to be more helpful in the presence of an audience, independently of the partner's cooperative behaviour. If, in contrast, reputation involved a standing strategy, we predicted the rats to distinguish more between cooperators and defectors in the presence of an audience than in its absence. The rats helped cooperative partners more than defectors, but against both predictions the presence or absence of an audience did not influence their helping propensity. This indicates that either reputation is not included in the decision of rats to help an individual that has helped others, or that reputation is neither involving image scoring nor a standing strategy. Although the rats have been shown to modulate their decision to help a social partner based on its helpful behaviour towards others, they do not seem to adjust their behaviour strategically to the presence of an audience.

## Introduction

Three forms of reciprocal cooperation among animals have been described: direct reciprocity (Axelrod & Hamilton 1981), where individuals help those that have helped them before; generalized reciprocity (Boyd & Richerson 1989; Pfeiffer et al. 2005; Rankin & Taborsky 2009), where the decision to help a social partner is based on help received from someone else; and indirect reciprocity (Alexander 1987; Nowak & Sigmund 2005), where the decision to help a partner is dependent on the helpfulness of this partner towards others. Whereas animals seem to apply the rather simple decision rules characterizing direct and generalized reciprocity in a wide range of taxa (Taborsky et al. 2016), the application of the decision

rule underlying indirect reciprocity is cognitively more demanding and seems to be largely confined to humans (Milinski 2016).

Cooperation through indirect reciprocity can evolve if it is based on a reputation system, which implies the consideration of social information beyond direct interaction partners (Zahavi 1991; Nowak & Sigmund 1998, 2005). Reputation can be built through either image scoring (Nowak & Sigmund 1998) or a 'standing' strategy (Sugden 1986; Leimar & Hammerstein 2001; Milinski et al. 2001). Image scoring means that the reputation of an individual increases by every helpful act towards others, whereas reputation decreases by every selfish act. The standing strategy assumes that everyone initially has good standing, which can be lost if failing to help someone in good

standing or cooperating with someone in bad standing. The image scoring model has been experimentally supported by a number of games played between human subjects (Milinski 2016). A theoretical comparison of the two strategies suggests that standing is more robust and should more effectively promote indirect reciprocity than image scoring in a population (Leimar & Hammerstein 2001). However, memorizing the standing of each group member is more complex and therefore may constrain the application of this superior mechanism because of a limited memory capacity (Milinski & Wedekind 1998; Milinski et al. 2001).

If individuals can benefit from a reputation to be helpful, they should adjust their behaviour in the presence of witnesses. An 'audience effect' describes that passive observers collect information about interactions between third parties, which in turn can change the behaviour of the actors (McGregor 2005; Earley & Dugatkin 2010). Humans are known to cooperate more in the presence of an audience (economic game model: Haley & Fessler 2005; experimental data: Bateson et al. 2006). So far only one experiment with fish found evidence for the role of audience effects on cooperative behaviour. In cleaner wrasses, the presence of another fish increases pro-social behaviour (Pinto et al. 2011), and there is evidence for image scoring in this interspecific interaction (Bshary & Grutter 2006).

Norway rats show a preference for cooperating in learning tasks (Schuster 2002). They share food (Barnett & Spencer 1951), and their propensity to provide food to a social partner depends on previous helping: Norway rats have been shown to cooperate according to generalized reciprocity (Rutte & Taborsky 2007), direct reciprocity (Rutte & Taborsky 2008) and indirect reciprocity (Spahni 2005). In the latter study, the rats provided more help to social partners that had been observed to help a third rat than to those that refrained to help a third rat. Therefore, focal individuals base their decision to help on observed interactions that did not provide any direct benefits to them. In addition, the rats use information about a conspecific's presence: when a hungry rat was released in a cage with available food, the latency of the rat's approach to the food was significantly shorter in the presence of a conspecific (Narikiyo et al. 2010). Hence, the rats apparently evaluate their social partners' behaviour through observation and they are aware of the presence of an observer. Under free-ranging conditions, Norway rats live in burrows and form social groups (colonies)

with dominance hierarchies (Seward 1944) that contain up to 200 individuals (Telle 1966). Under such conditions, a reputation system may be beneficial, if the costs of monitoring and memorizing are not too high.

Here, we used individually trained rats performing a two-player sequential food-exchange task following Rutte & Taborsky (2008). Focal animals were first exposed to a cooperating (providing food) or a defecting partner (providing no help to get food). After this experience, they could provide food for their previous partners. Both phases, experience and test phase, were conducted with and without an audience (a conspecific present behind a mesh). We predicted that if rats had evolved a reputation mechanism based on image scoring, focal rats would in general provide more help when an audience is present, irrespective of whether the partner had previously cooperated or defected. If rats had evolved a reputation mechanism based on standing, we predicted them to distinguish stronger between cooperators and defectors in the presence of an observer. We therefore expected to find a difference according to the two alternative mechanisms in particular regarding help provided to defectors, because helping defectors would increase the subjects' image score but decrease their standing.

## Methods

### Experimental Subjects and Housing Conditions

We used adult female outbred wild-type Norway rats (source: Animal Physiology Department, University of Groningen, the Netherlands) weighing on average 300 g. All rats were experienced with handling from an early age, so they were well habituated and not stressed when being transported to the experimental cage and by the presence of an observer. The rats were individually marked with standard hair tinting lotion on a hydrogen peroxide basis, and they were housed with littermates in groups of three to five sisters. The cages (80 × 50 × 37.5 cm) were separated from each other through opaque walls to exclude interactions between the groups, whereas rats could smell and hear other rats. The ambient temperature was 20 ± 1°C, with a relative humidity of 50–60% and a 12h/12h light/dark cycle, with lights on at 20:00 h after 30 min of dawn and with a respective dusk period in the morning. All trainings and experiments were conducted under red light conditions during the dark phase of the cycle, because rats are primarily nocturnal (Norton et al. 1975).

### Pre-Experimental Training

The experimental set-up (Rutte & Taborsky 2007, 2008) was based on a two-player sequential food-exchange task (de Waal & Berger 2000). Test cages (80 × 50 × 37.5 cm) were divided into two chambers by a wire mesh. The rats were trained individually and the training was divided into two parts: first, every single rat was trained to pull a reward for itself. To get the reward, the rat learned to pull a stick fixed on a movable platform, which thereby slid into the test cage. In the second training phase, the rats were paired with a training partner and learned over 18 sessions to provide food for their partner and *vice versa*. Roles were exchanged and the intervals between these switches were increased gradually from one single pull to a pulling period of 7 min. A detailed plan of this training has been described by Dolivo & Taborsky (2015a). At the end of the training, a potential donor was able to provide an oat flake to a potential receiver, again by pulling a stick attached to a movable platform. The donor did not receive a reward for this action (Fig. 1).


Five rats were trained to never pull (defectors) and five rats were trained to always pull (cooperators) for their partner. These ten rats had been chosen at random, and in the experiment described below, they served as the social partners providing the respective experience to the focal test subjects. Defectors were trained by placing them several times into the training cage while the platform was blocked for 7 min.

### Test Procedure


Rats (n = 48) were tested in four different situations in a random order with one treatment per day.

After placing the focal subject and a social partner into the test cage and waiting 1 min to acclimatize, the partner (cooperator or defector) got access to the stick and was able to pull a reward (an oat flake) for the focal individual without any direct benefits for itself (Fig. 1). At the end of 7 min, the roles were exchanged immediately and the focal subject could move the platform into the cage, again without any direct benefit for it. After every trial, both cages were cleaned with alcohol to remove potential scent marks. In half of the treatments, a sister of the focal rat was present as an audience. Sisters stayed in a directly adjacent cage allowing visual, olfactory and tactile contact with the focal individual. Focal rats and their sisters were unrelated and have never met the social partners (cooperator and defector) before the experiment. In summary, the same focal individual experienced a cooperative partner in the presence and in the absence of an audience, and it also experienced a defective partner in the presence and in the absence of an audience.

To check whether the intention of focal subjects was to pull the platform for the social partner, that is whether they considered the social context, we conducted a control directly after the experiment. We tested the same focal individuals from the described experiment in two treatments. Here, focal individuals experienced cooperative ('control C') and defective ('control D') partners as described above. However, after the experience phase, we removed the partners. Hence, when the focal rat had access to the pulling stick, it was able to pull for an empty cage instead of a social partner (see Fig. 2 for a description of the entire experimental sequence).



**Fig. 1:** Experimental set-up. After a 1-min habituation phase for all individuals in the cages, a focal subject (n = 48) was exposed to a cooperator or a defector that either pulled or did not pull food for the focal rat for 7 min. Immediately thereafter, the focal rat was able to pull for its partner for the next 7 min. During the entire trial period including experience and test phases, either a sister of the focal subject was present in an adjacent cage (audience +) or not (audience -). Every focal subject experienced all four situations (cooperator +, cooperator -, defector + and defector -).



**Fig. 2:** Experimental procedure including four treatments and controls of both experience and test phases (the order was randomized). Cooperator (+): focal rat was exposed to a cooperator in the presence of an audience (indicated by a pair of eyes). Cooperator (-): focal rat was exposed to a cooperator in the absence of an audience. Defector (+): focal rat was exposed to a defector in the presence of an audience. Defector (-): focal rat was exposed to a defector in the absence of an audience. Control (cooperator): focal rat experienced a cooperator and could afterwards pull for an empty cage. Control (defector): focal rat experienced a defector and could afterwards pull for an empty cage.

### Behaviours

For focal subjects and cooperators, the frequency of pulling and the latency to the first pull were measured.

### Statistical Analysis

We analysed the data with R (version: 3.1.0.) using the packages: lme4, car and survival. All recorded behaviours of focal rats and cooperators were not normally distributed; therefore, nonparametric tests were used.

A generalized linear mixed model was used to account for the repeated-measures design with focal rat's identity as a random factor. We compared the

four treatments by including audience (present/absent) and cooperation level (cooperator/defector) as fixed factors and the focal rats' pulling frequency as dependent variable. We tested the model for overdispersion, which was not the case, and simplified it by taking out the non-significant interaction between cooperation level and audience.

To test for differences in the time to the first pull according to the treatments, we conducted a survival analysis with the latencies to first pull by focal rats during the test phase as the dependent variable, cooperation level and audience as fixed factors and rat identity as a random factor. Like in the previous model, we simplified the model by taking out the non-significant interaction between treatment and audience.

To compare the control situation (pulling for an empty cage) with the test situation (pulling for a cooperator or defector), we used Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests for the focal rats' pulling frequency and latency to the first pull.

To check for a possible audience effect in cooperators during the experience phase, their median pulling rate was compared between the treatments in the presence and in the absence of an audience also with Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests.

Eleven of 48 focal rats nibbled the stick (until it broke). These rats pulled randomly and did not direct their pulls towards their partner. This nibbling behaviour significantly affected the pulling. 'Nibblers' pulled more often than 'non-nibblers' (GLMM:  $z = -6.797$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), and the latency to the first pull was shorter in 'nibblers' (GLMM:  $z = 3.425$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This indicates that these rats pulled the stick for different motivations than to produce food for their partners; hence, these individuals were excluded from all analyses.

#### Ethical Note

In accordance with the animal welfare regulations of Switzerland (Tierschutzverordnung Schweiz 04/2008), rats (weight category 300–400 g) were housed in enriched cages of 80 × 50 × 37.5 cm. Enrichment included a wooden house and board, a channel, a piece of wood to nibble, a loo roll to play, digging material (shavings), nest-building material (shreds and crumbled papers) and a salt block. Food (conventional rat pellets and corn mix) and water were provided *ad libitum* according to the recommendations of the Federation of Laboratory Animal Science Associations (Forbes et al. 2007). We established small groups with a maximum of five individuals per cage (Sharp et al. 2003). All rats experienced a handling procedure from early age onwards, so they were well habituated to humans and not stressed while being transported to the experimental cage or by the presence of an observer. The housing of the animals and the experimental procedure were authorized by the Swiss Federal Veterinary Office under licence BE98/11. In our experiments, there was no possibility of physical contact between the individuals through separating wire mesh, and no injuries occurred. In addition, the animals were constantly monitored during all experiments, and if any deviant behaviour or unexpected physical reactions had occurred, the experiment could have been stopped immediately.


## Results

### Influence of Cooperation Level and Audience on Pulling Behaviour

Rats distinguished between pulling for a cooperator and pulling for a defector; they pulled significantly less often for the latter (GLMM:  $\beta = -0.33 \pm 0.11$ ,  $\chi^2 = 8.80$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.003$ , Fig. 3) and started to pull for defectors significantly later than for cooperators (proportional hazards regression model:  $\beta = -0.62 \pm 0.19$ ,  $\chi^2 = 10.70$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ; see Fig. A1 of the Appendix).

There was no measurable audience effect, neither regarding the pulling frequency (GLMM:  $\beta = -0.90 \pm 0.11$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.70$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.40$ , Fig. 3) nor the latency to the first pull (proportional hazards regression model:  $\beta = -0.14 \pm 0.18$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.55$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.46$ ).

Similar to focal subjects, the cooperators did not show an audience effect either: their helping behaviour did not differ when pulling for a focal rat in the presence or in the absence of a third rat (sister of focal rat), neither regarding the total number of pulls (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test:  $V = 4.5$ ,  $N = 5$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.59) nor the latency to the first pull



**Fig. 3:** Comparison between help performed towards cooperative and defective partners with and without audience. Rats ( $N = 37$ ) pulled more often for previously experienced cooperative than for defective partners. Whether the rats were observed (solid line) or not (dashed line) by an audience did not significantly influence their decision to provide food to their partner. Medians  $\pm$  interquartile ranges are shown.


(Wilcoxon signed-ranks test:  $V = 6$ ,  $N = 5$ ,  $p = 0.81$ ).

### Non-Social Control

Focal rats pulled more often and earlier for cooperative partners than for an empty cage (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: frequency:  $V = 308.0$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ; latency:  $V = 65.0$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.049$ , Fig. 4). However, focal rats did not provide more food to defective partners or pulled for them earlier than for an empty cage (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: frequency:  $V = 188.5$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.13$ ; latency:  $V = 145.0$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.12$ ). Further, focal rats showed similar pulling frequencies and latencies when pulling for an empty cage after they had experienced a cooperator and defector (Wilcoxon signed-ranks tests: frequency:  $V = 112.0$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.27$ ; latency:  $V = 229.0$ ,  $N = 37$ ,  $p = 0.81$ ).

### Discussion

In contrast to our predictions, the presence or absence of an audience did not influence the helping behaviour of focal rats. There was no interaction



**Fig. 4:** Comparison between test and control situations to test for the influence of the social context on the pulling behaviour of focal subjects. Rats ( $N = 37$ ) pulled more frequently for cooperative partners (test situation, solid line) than for an empty cage (control situation, dashed line). They did not pull more often for partners that had been defective than for an empty cage. Medians  $\pm$  interquartile ranges are shown.

effect between the audience (sister present or absent) and the cooperation experienced from the partner (cooperator or defector) on the focal subject's pulling rate and timing. However, irrespective of the presence of an audience, focal rats differed in their cooperative behaviour between situations with cooperators and defectors in both the frequency and timing of providing food for them. They pulled more for cooperators and started earlier to pull for them in contrast to their pulling behaviour for defectors. In addition, the rats clearly discriminated between pulling for a cooperative partner and pulling for an empty cage: they pulled significantly less often when the neighbouring compartment was empty. Because the rats provided more food to cooperative partners, we conclude that the rats base their decision to help on direct reciprocity and help social partners that have helped them before. These results confirm previous studies showing direct reciprocity in female Norway rats (Rutte & Taborsky 2008; Schneeberger et al. 2012; Dolivo & Taborsky 2015a,b). Our study shows in addition that the reciprocal help is independent of an audience.

The absence of an audience effect might imply that focal subjects did not perceive their sister's presence in the adjacent cage. However, the directly adjacent cages enabled acoustic, visual and chemosensory contact, and we did observe behavioural interactions between focal subjects and their respective audience rats. In addition, previous studies showed that rats are able to use observed social information in a similar cooperation set-up (Spahni 2005). Therefore, this explanation seems unlikely.

Why do rats not change their helping behaviour when they are observed by others? Animals are known to respond to the presence of others, particularly during competitive interactions. For example, male Siamese fighting fish (*Betta splendens*) changed their display behaviour in intrasexual contests when a female audience was present (Doutrelant et al. 2001), as did male zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) exposed to a mixed-sex shoal audience (Cruz & Oliveira 2015). Food calls in capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*) were shown to depend on hierarchical structures in the audience and on food scarcity (di Bitetti 2005; Pollick et al. 2005), and ravens (*Corvus corax*) hide food caches in the presence of informed observers (Bugnyar & Heinrich 2005). Alarm calls in vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus pygerythrus*) vary in accordance with the relatedness to the audience (Cheney & Seyfarth 1985). Investment in reputation due to the presence of an audience has so far been shown in cleaner wrasses (*Labroides dimidiatus*; Pinto et al.

2011) and in human children (Engelmann et al. 2012). In contrast, helpers of cooperatively breeding Arabian babblers and bell miners were not found to be more cooperative towards the offspring of breeders when being watched by the latter (Wright 1997; McDonald et al. 2008; Wright & McDonald 2016), which indicates no strategic investment in reputation, contrary to earlier suggestions (Zahavi 1991).

The study of cleaner wrasses (Pinto et al. 2011) suggested that investment in reputation might not be limited by cognitive demands, but its occurrence may rather depend on ecological and social circumstances. In Norway rats, mark–recapture studies showed that population size can fluctuate between 2 and 100 individuals within 1 yr (McGuire et al. 2006). In contrast to the predictable interactions with local clients at the cleaning stations of wrasses (Pinto et al. 2011), rat colonies in comparison may reflect less stable social situations. Hence, while it may be beneficial for a cleaner wrasse to invest in its reputation when a potential client is near that will likely reappear over and over again at the same cleaning station, in the highly dynamic rat colonies meeting well-known social partners repeatedly may be less predictable, thereby reducing potential benefits of adjusting to an audience.

Potential audience effects in our study might have been overridden by the propensity of rats to apply direct reciprocity rules, that is to help a helpful partner and to refrain helping an unhelpful partner, irrespective of an audience. However, if this were the reason for the absence of an audience effect, we should have expected to find such effect in the ‘cooperators’ used to provide helping experience to our focal subjects. Our results reveal no indication for an audience effect in these individuals as well.

To conclude, we did not find evidence for the existence of audience effects in reciprocally cooperating rats. Although the rats use social information gathered by observation, they do not adjust their cooperation level to the presence of observers. This suggests that the rats do not strategically invest in reputation, which might be explained by their highly dynamic social system. This study contributes to a better understanding of mechanisms underlying indirect reciprocity and reputation building in animals. As no reputation system is involved when Norway rats cooperate by indirect reciprocity, alternative mechanisms should be investigated by future studies, such as a potential role of reputation in starting cooperative interactions.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Evi Zwygart for help in caring for the animals, Markus Wyman for building the test apparatus, Valentina Balzarini for drawings, and Jonathan Wright and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on the manuscript. Funding was provided by SNF grants 310030B\_138660 and 31003A\_156152 to Michael Taborsky.

## Conflict of Interest


The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Literature Cited

- Alexander, R. D. 1987: *The Biology of Moral Systems*. Aldine Transaction, New York.
- Axelrod, R. & Hamilton, W. D. 1981: The evolution of cooperation. *Science* **211**, 1390–1396.
- Barnett, S. A. & Spencer, M. M. 1951: Feeding, social behaviour and interspecific competition in wild rats. *Behaviour* **3**, 229–242.
- Bateson, M., Nettle, D. & Roberts, G. 2006: Cues of being watched enhance cooperation in a real-world setting. *Biol. Lett.* **2**, 412–414.
- di Bitetti, M. S. 2005: Food-associated calls and audience effects in tufted capuchin monkeys, *Cebus apella nigritus*. *Anim. Behav.* **69**, 911–919.
- Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. 1989: The evolution of indirect reciprocity. *Soc. Networks* **11**, 213–236.
- Bshary, R. & Grutter, A. S. 2006: Image scoring and cooperation in a cleaner fish mutualism. *Nature* **441**, 975–978.
- Bugnyar, T. & Heinrich, B. 2005: Ravens, *Corvus corax*, differentiate between knowledgeable and ignorant competitors. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **272**, 1641–1646.
- Cheney, D. L. & Seyfarth, R. M. 1985: Vervet monkey alarm calls: manipulation through shared information? *Behaviour* **94**, 150–166.
- Cruz, A. S. & Oliveira, R. F. 2015: Audience effects and aggressive priming in agonistic behaviour of male zebra-fish, *Danio rerio*. *Anim. Behav.* **107**, 269–276.
- Dolivo, V. & Taborsky, M. 2015a: Cooperation among Norway rats: the importance of visual cues for reciprocal cooperation, and the role of coercion. *Ethology* **121**, 1071–1080.
- Dolivo, V. & Taborsky, M. 2015b: Norway rats reciprocate help according to the quality of help they received. *Biol. Lett.* **11**, 20140959.
- Doutrelant, C., McGregor, P. K. & Oliveira, R. F. 2001: The effect of an audience on intrasexual communication in male Siamese fighting fish, *Betta splendens*. *Behav. Ecol.* **12**, 283–286.

- Earley, R. L. & Dugatkin, L. A. 2010: Behavior in groups. In: *Evolutionary Behavioural Ecology* (Westneat, D. F. & Fox, C. W. eds). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, pp. 285–307.
- Engelmann, J. M., Herrmann, E. & Tomasello, M. 2012: Five-year olds, but not chimpanzees, attempt to manage their reputations. *PLoS One* **7**, e48433.
- Forbes, D., Blom, H., Kostmitsopoulos, N., Moore, G. & Perretta, G. 2007: Euroguide on the Accommodation and Care of Animals Used for Experimental and Other Scientific Purposes. FELASA, London.
- Haley, K. J. & Fessler, D. M. T. 2005: Nobody's watching? Subtle cues affect generosity in an anonymous economic game. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **26**, 245–256.
- Jahn-Eimermacher, A., Lasarzik, I. & Raber, J. 2012: Statistical analysis of latency outcomes in behavioral experiments. *Behav. Brain Res.* **221**, 271–275.
- Leimar, O. & Hammerstein, P. 2001: Evolution of cooperation through indirect reciprocity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **268**, 745–753.
- McDonald, P. G., te Marvelde, L., Kazem, A. J. N. & Wright, J. 2008: Helping as a signal and the effect of a potential audience during provisioning visits in a cooperative bird. *Anim. Behav.* **75**, 1319–1330.
- McGregor, P. K. 2005: *Animal Communication Networks* (McGregor, P. K. ed.). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- McGuire, B., Pizzuto, T., Bemis, W. E. & Getz, L. L. 2006: General ecology of a rural population of Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*) based on intensive live trapping. *Am. Midl. Nat.* **155**, 221–236.
- Milinski, M. 2016: Reputation, a universal currency for human social interactions. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **371**, 20150100.
- Milinski, M. & Wedekind, C. 1998: Working memory constrains human cooperation in the Prisoner's dilemma. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 13755–13758.
- Milinski, M., Semmann, D., Bakker, T. C. M. & Krambeck, H.-J. J. 2001: Cooperation through indirect reciprocity: image scoring or standing strategy? *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **268**, 2495–2501.
- Narikiyo, K., Masuda, A., Someya, N., Shiota, N., Usuda, Y. & Aou, S. 2010: Audience effect on hunger- and palatability-induced feeding behavior in rats. *Neurosci. Res.* **68**, e411.
- Norton, S., Culver, B. & Mullenix, P. 1975: Development of nocturnal behavior in albino rats. *Behav. Biol.* **15**, 317–331.
- Nowak, M. A. & Sigmund, K. 1998: The dynamics of indirect reciprocity. *J. Theor. Biol.* **194**, 561–574.
- Nowak, M. A. & Sigmund, K. 2005: Evolution of indirect reciprocity. *Nature* **437**, 1291–1298.
- Pfeiffer, T., Rutte, C., Killingback, T., Taborsky, M. & Bonhoeffer, S. 2005: Evolution of cooperation by generalized reciprocity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **272**, 1115–1120.
- Pinto, A. I., Oates, J. & Grutter, A. S. 2011: Cleaner wrasses *Labroides dimidiatus* are more cooperative in the presence of an audience. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, 1140–1144.
- Pollick, A. S., Gouzoules, H. & de Waal, F. B. M. 2005: Audience effects on food calls in captive brown capuchin monkeys, *Cebus apella*. *Anim. Behav.* **70**, 1273–1281.
- Rankin, D. J. & Taborsky, M. 2009: Assortment and the evolution of generalized reciprocity. *Evolution* **63**, 1913–1922.
- Rutte, C. & Taborsky, M. 2007: Generalized reciprocity in rats. *PLoS Biol.* **5**, 1421–1425.
- Rutte, C. & Taborsky, M. 2008: The Influence of social experience on cooperative behaviour of rats (*Rattus norvegicus*): direct vs generalised reciprocity. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **62**, 499–505.
- Schneeberger, K., Dietz, M. & Taborsky, M. 2012: Reciprocal cooperation between unrelated rats depends on cost to donor and benefit to recipient. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **12**, 41.
- Schuster, R. 2002: Cooperative coordination as a social behaviour: experiments with an animal model. *Hum. Nat.* **13**, 47–83.
- Seward, J. P. 1944: Aggressive behavior in the rat – II An attempt to establish a dominance hierarchy. *J. Comp. Psychol.* **38**, 213–224.
- Sharp, J., Zammit, T., Azar, T. & Lawson, D. 2003: Stress-like responses to common procedures in individually and group-housed female rats. *J. Am. Assoc. Lab. Anim. Sci.* **42**, 9–18.
- Spahni, C. 2005: Indirect reciprocity in Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*). M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Bern, Bern, Switzerland.
- Sugden, R. 1986: *The Economics of Rights, Co-Operation, and Welfare*. B. Blackwell, Oxfordshire and New York.
- Taborsky, M., Frommen, J. G. & Riehl, C. 2016: Correlated pay-offs are key to cooperation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **371**, 20150084.
- Telle, H. 1966: Beitrag zur Erkenntnis der Verhaltensweise von Ratten, vergleichend dargestellt bei *Rattus norvegicus* und *Rattus rattus*. *Z. Angew. Zool.* **53**, 129–196.
- de Waal, F. B. M. & Berger, M. L. 2000: Payment for labour in monkeys. *Nature* **404**, 563.
- Wright, J. 1997: Helping-at-the-nest in Arabian babblers: signalling social status or sensible investment in chicks? *Anim. Behav.* **54**, 1439–1448.
- Wright, J. & McDonald, P. G. 2016: Bell miners: kin-selected helping decisions. In: *Cooperative Breeding in Vertebrates – Studies of Ecology, Evolution, and Behaviour* (Koenig, W. D. & Dickinson, J. eds). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, pp. 165–180.
- Zahavi, A. 1991: Arabian babblers: the quest for social status in a cooperative breeder. In: *Cooperative Breeding in Birds* (Stacy, P. B. & Koenig, W. D. eds). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, pp. 105–130.

## Appendix 1



**Fig. A1:** Comparison between the latencies to start helping cooperative and defective partners in dependence of an audience. Rats pulled earlier for cooperators than for defectors, independently of the presence of an audience. Kaplan–Meier estimates are shown (Jahn-Eimermacher et al. 2012).