

DONATE



Behavior and Charitable Giving

2023 Update

April 2023

About ideas42



We're a non-profit looking for deep insights into human behavior—into why people do what they do—and using that knowledge in ways that help improve lives, build better systems, and drive social change. Working globally, we reinvent the practices of institutions, and create better products and policies that can be scaled for maximum impact.

We also teach others, ultimately striving to generate lasting social impact and create a future where the universal application of behavioral science powers a world with optimal health, equitable wealth, and environments and systems that are sustainable and just for all.

For more than a decade, we've been at the forefront of applying behavioral science in the real world. And as we've developed our expertise, we've helped to define an entire field. Our efforts have so far extended to 55 countries as we've partnered with governments, foundations, NGOs, private enterprises, and a wide array of public institutions—in short, anyone who wants to make a positive difference in peoples' lives.

To learn more, follow us on Twitter [@ideas42](https://twitter.com/ideas42) and visit our website at www.ideas42.org. This review was completed with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect official positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Contents

- About ideas42 ii
- Introduction 1
- Experimental Studies on Donor Behavior..... 2**
 - Social Norms..... 2
 - Signaling and Matching 5
 - Image and Identity..... 7
 - Emotions 10
 - Avoidance..... 12
 - Time Inconsistency..... 14
 - Hassle Factors and Procrastination 14
 - Small Incentives..... 16
 - Framing the Ask..... 17
 - Agency..... 19
 - Mental Accounting 20
 - Information and Ambiguity..... 21
 - Choice Architecture..... 22
- Theoretical Frameworks, Models, and Other Studies 24**
 - Broad Overviews and Literature Reviews 24
 - Emotion and Giving 24
 - Information and Choice in Giving 25
 - Financial Security and Giving 26
 - Emerging Research 26
- Trends in Charitable Giving..... 28**
 - National Trends in Philanthropy..... 28
 - Giving Patterns by Demographics and Channel 28
 - Longitudinal Studies on Giving Behavior 29
- Works Cited 30**

Introduction

The field of giving and philanthropy has undergone substantial shifts since this literature review was last updated in 2019. As COVID-19 emerged as a global challenge, charitable giving in the United States climbed from \$449.64 billion in 2019 (Giving USA 2020) to \$471.44 billion in 2020 (Giving USA 2021) and to \$484.85 billion in 2021 (Giving USA, 2022). Giving by individuals continues to grow, although it now represents a smaller share of total giving than it did four years ago, sitting at roughly two-thirds of total giving (Giving USA 2022) compared to nearly 70% in 2019 (Giving USA 2020). In light of these changes, current research into how people give today is invaluable for connecting philanthropic resources to the organizations pursuing social change.

As the philanthropic landscape in the U.S. has shifted, donors are paying increasing attention to questions of equity and social justice when thinking about causes of interest (Giving USA 2022). Yet even as people may change their intentions, focusing on new causes and issues does not necessarily translate to giving to advance those causes. Past research on giving behavior points to many potential barriers that people may face when trying to give intentionally, rather than reactively. For instance, people may not feel as much emotional satisfaction when giving to a big-picture, abstract cause than when giving to an individual or to a cause that can demonstrate a more immediate and concrete impact. As new research emerges on the factors that can affect how and why people give, these fresh insights can inform interventions that enable donors to give more proactively, strategically, and impactfully.

With support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, ideas42 has continued to explore and test new approaches to integrating findings from behavioral science into the world of charitable giving. As our work has progressed, we have also adapted our project goals, placing an increasing focus not only on enabling people to give more strategically, but also on encouraging giving to advance racial and gender equity. This report updates our 2019 literature review with findings from both recently published research, and from work that is newly relevant to our mandate.

The first section of this review focuses on experimental studies in giving. The bulk of the new works included there are conducted as online lab studies, rather than field studies. Most experimental designs in this section involve asking the participant to make a binary yes/no donation decision to a single solicitation, rather than a decision between multiple causes. This context mirrors real-world scenarios in which solicitations to donate are likely to come from a single non-profit or cause.

The second section catalogs nonexperimental studies, including theoretical frameworks and other literature reviews. The third and final section lists major surveys, reports, and longitudinal studies. These works provide an excellent reference point for exploring national trends in giving, as well as giving patterns by demographic and giving channel (giving directly to a non-profit vs. through a giving platform vs. through a pooled fund, etc.).

Experimental Studies on Donor Behavior

Below, readers will find studies from previous iterations of this literature review, as well as new and newly relevant works. Of the more recent studies, relatively few are conducted through the mail, over the phone, or in-person. These shifts may be caused, in part, by the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as broader trends in social scientific and behavioral research, such as an increasing reliance on online studies. To assist readers with specific goals or interests, each study is tagged with the outreach methods and affected outcomes below. Studies new to this 2023 update are tagged as well.

Social Norms

Humans rely on a wide range of external cues when deciding how to act in any given situation. One of the most powerful cues is the perceived social norm: people tend to observe what others are doing and do the same—especially if they identify with the larger group.

Letting prospective donors know that people like them are contributing to charitable causes can boost participation, and providing a benchmark for how much others have given can influence donation amounts.



Communicating norms increases participation. Clients at a legal services organization ($n = 3,000$) were asked one of two questions during the preparation of their wills: 1) “Would you like to leave any money to charity in your will?” or 2) “Many of our customers like to leave money to charity in their will. Are there any causes you are passionate about?” Clients in the second group were 43% more likely to participate in legacy giving and gave more than double (114% more) than those who received the plain ask. Results from this study illustrate that sharing even a small amount of information about others’ actions has a significant impact on decisions to give (UK Behavioural Insights Team, 2013).



Visible indicators of participation influence giving decisions. Researchers put a transparent donation box in a free art gallery and varied the contents of the box. In different trials, the box was filled with \$100 in coins, small bills, large bills, a mix of currencies, or no money at all. Researchers then tracked contributions by visitors to the gallery ($n = 21,259$) and found that donation amounts tend to reflect the original contents of the box. Presenting many coins results in a large number of small contributions, and presenting a few larger bills results in a smaller number of contributions at higher amounts. The researchers concluded that people estimate whether and how much most others have given when making their own giving decisions (Martin & Randal, 2008).

 For more on the role of visual cues in giving decisions, see:

- ▶ Soetevent, “Anonymity in giving in a natural context—a field experiment in 30 churches” (2005).

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	



Mentioning another donor’s contribution level can increase donation amounts. In a field experiment at a public radio station ($n = 538$), some donors were given information about how much others had contributed. Fundraisers used the script, “We had another member; they contributed \$300. How much would you like to pledge today?” Researchers found that sharing this information, compared to simply asking for a pledge amount, increased average donation amounts by 12% (Shang & Croson, 2009).



Revealing similarities between current and prospective donors increases average donations. During a phone-based fundraising drive for a public radio station ($n = 547$), one group of callers was told, “We had another donor; he/she gave \$300,” with the donor’s gender matched to the caller. A second group of donors was given similar information, but with a previous donor whose gender was different than the caller’s: “We had another donor; he/she gave \$300.” Sharing benchmarks from similar (same-gender) peers resulted in a 34% increase in donations, compared to the opposite-gender benchmark (Croson & Shang, 2010).

For more on the way personal identity interacts with social norms to affect participation in social causes, see:

- ▶ Ratner & Miller, “The norm of self-interest and its effects on social action” (2001).



Donation amounts are higher when choices are made in groups. In an online experiment, participants ($n = 1,109$) were informed about climate change and the option to purchase carbon offsets. They were then randomly assigned to one of three different decision mechanisms: 1) They made an individual choice about the quantity of offsets to buy (individual); 2) Within a group of 9, each member voted on their preferred quantity and the median was bought (majority); 3) Within a group of 9, each member voted on their preferred quantity, but one vote was picked at random for the decision (dictator). Those in the majority and dictator groups made significantly greater contributions than those in the individual group (12% and 17% more respectively). Comparing contributions to beliefs, participants in the individual group contributed significantly less than they believed others would contribute, while participants in the majority group contributed what they believed others would contribute, and participants in the dictator group contributed significantly more than they believed others would contribute (Ponitzsch, 2017).



Providing descriptive norms suggesting high contributions increases donations to an existing public good.

Using a modified [dictator game](#), study subjects ($n = 274$) were informed that they would receive €10 as compensation for their participation. They were then given the opportunity to donate any share of their compensation to offsetting CO2 emissions. However, before deciding on their donation amount, participants were shown one of the following messages informing them of average donations made by previous participants: “In previous sessions of this

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	

experiment, 50 participants on average gave €7 (HIGH) / €1 (LOW) to retire CO2.” They found that for participants who received the social information denoting high contributions, average donation amounts increased by 43% when compared to the control group. The researchers concluded that their findings confirm and offer additional support for the existence of a positive and causal link between social information and pro-social behavior (Goeschl et al., 2018).



Communicating norms about an organization’s donation popularity may redirect donations to “worse-off” organizations.



In three experiments, researchers asked participants ($n = 132$, $n = 99$, and $n = 149$) to donate to a UNICEF project in either Africa or Syria. They were then provided with information about how much each project had raised from previous participants and informed that they could change their decision if desired. In each experiment, participants who learned that their first choice was consistent with the majority of previous participants’ donation choices tended to switch to the less popular project as their final choices (a change rate of 21%, 53%, and 34%, respectively). The researchers concluded that providing social information about relative popularity can elicit empathy for the less popular choice and trigger them to avoid unequal distributions (Saito et al., 2019).



Injunctive norms can increase both donation amounts and donors’ mood.



In an online lab experiment conducted with British citizens ($n = 1,029$), participants were awarded a £10 gift card and presented with an opportunity to donate any portion of the money to a charity of their choosing. The researchers provided participants with a charity list and then made use of two different variables: the researchers manipulated whether the social information included a **descriptive norm**, as well as whether the social information included an **injunctive norm**. This resulted in four total experimental conditions: 1) neither descriptive or injunctive norms, 2) only descriptive norms, 3) only injunctive norms, or 4) both forms of social norms. Finally, to measure their mood after donating, participants were asked to respond to the question “How are you feeling at this moment?” where response options ranged from 1 (“Very bad”) to 10 (“Very good”). The results of the experiment showed that using an injunctive norm (telling participants what sort of donations are appropriate) outperformed descriptive norms (telling participants what sort of donations are common) and significantly increased both donation amounts (10%) and donors’ moods (10%) (van Teunenbroek et al., 2021).



Collaborative giving does not increase donation generosity, but may increase donor enjoyment.




In two field experiments ($n = 202$ and $n = 310$), pairs of undergraduate college students were first presented with an opportunity to earn money. They were then randomly assigned to


Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	


donate collaboratively (Experiments 1–2), individually in each other’s presence (Experiments 1–2), or privately (Experiment 2). The results from both experiments showed no significant differences on generosity with respect to giving collaboratively. However, through a post-donation questionnaire, participants indicated that they derived greater intrinsic enjoyment from making a collaborative donation with a peer. The researchers concluded that collaborative giving may indirectly boost generosity (Proulx, 2022).






Signaling and Matching

In charitable giving, the behavior of lead actors can communicate information about organizational quality. Signals about who else has already given, and how much, can influence decisions to give. These cues are especially powerful when people are uncertain about whether an organization merits their support, since potential donors who lack information are much more likely to do nothing than to conduct their own research.

 **Sharing information about major supporters validates your organization.** In one large-scale natural field experiment, researchers sent direct mail solicitations to new donors who were unfamiliar with the fundraising charity ($n = 61,483$). One group of donors was told that contributions would be matched by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and a second group was informed of an anonymous match. Those who were informed that the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation was the source of match funding were 39% more likely to donate and donated on average 44% more than those who did not know the identity of the match donor. This experiment suggests that the public match campaign, which implied that a major institution viewed the charity favorably, provided a credible quality signal for new donors (Karlan & List, 2018).

 **Seed money increases donations.** In one experiment, researchers mailed letters asking for funds to support a capital campaign at the University of Central Florida ($n = 3,000$). All solicitations described an initial seed donation, through which a lead donor had already covered a portion of the costs. Increasing the size of the seed donation from 10% to 67% of program costs generated a sixfold increase in contributions and more than doubled the likelihood of donating. This finding suggests that potential donors viewed the size of the seed donation as a reliable signal of the cause’s worthiness (List & Lucking-Reiley, 2002).

 **Lead gifts encourage participation and higher donation amounts.** Researchers ran a direct mail fundraising campaign for the Sierra Club ($n = 3,000$) in which some letters described a match offer, with every dollar in donations later matched by a dollar from a lead donor. In other letters, researchers referenced a “challenge gift” already contributed by a lead donor. Mentioning a challenge gift increased participation rates by 23% and total contributions by 18%, compared to a plain ask. The challenge gift also outperformed the total amount raised under the match offer by 31%, although this difference was not statistically significant (Rondeau & List, 2008).

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	



Offering time-limited matches prior to Giving Tuesday can increase overall giving. In a field experiment ($n = 39,931$), researchers sent email solicitations a few weeks prior to Giving Tuesday that offered special match offers with a three-day deadline. Compared to the control group, individuals who received the early match offer were 50% more likely to donate and gave more than double the control group (\$3.71 vs. \$1.34). Across treatment and control groups, the number of donors who gave on Giving Tuesday was similar, suggesting that the early time-limited matches created new, additional donations rather than only substituting those who would have given on Giving Tuesday (Castillo et al., 2018).

 For more on the varying effectiveness of match rates, see:

- ▶ Karlan et al, “Small Matches and Charitable Giving: Evidence from a Natural Field Experiment” (2010).
- ▶ Karlan & List, “Does Price Matter in Charitable Giving? Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field experiment” (2006).

 For a comparison of a lead gift, conventional matching scheme, and alternative matching scheme:

- ▶ Adena & Huck, “Matching donations without crowding out? Some theoretical considerations, a field, and a lab experiment” (2017).

 For more on match incentives and social norms, see:

- ▶ Anik et al, “Contingent Match Incentives Increase Donations” (2014).

 For an economic model of leadership gifts, see in section two:

- ▶ Andreoni, “Toward a Theory of Charitable Fund-Raising” (1998).



Non-profit quality certification increases donation amounts and donor trust.



In a field experiment at several German universities, undergraduate students ($n = 500$) were asked to choose an amount of money between €0 and €17 that would be donated to a charity if they were selected in a random lottery. Students in the treatment group additionally received a letter that informed them that the charity had been awarded a quality certificate. Results showed that participants in the certificate group chose donation amounts on average 10% higher than the non-certificate group, and more individuals chose the maximum amount, compared to the non-certificate group (Adena et al., 2019).



Positive non-profit reputation increases donations.



In a lab test ($n = 340$), researchers tested the effects of three dimensions of non-profit reputation—financial efficiency, media visibility, and accreditation status—on charitable giving behavior. Participants first read short descriptions of eight non-profit organizations who provide comparable education and cultural programs to young children. Each of the organizations had a different combination of the three dimensions of reputation. Participants were then asked to decide on a dollar amount between 0 and 100 that they’d like to donate to the non-profit. The results of this test showed that each of the reputation dimensions has

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

a significant individual effect on giving behavior. However, the study found that participants found financial efficiency to be more influential than the other two dimensions, suggesting that people place a higher value on the extent to which their donations will be used to produce greater benefits for the communities they serve. It's important to note that for each dimension, the significant effects varied based on a participant's past giving behavior—for instance, those who had done volunteer work in the past were less swayed by reputational variables, and were more likely to give more generously (Peng et al., 2019).



Donor giving is likely to conform to the majority size of previous donation amounts.



In an analysis of actual donation data ($n = 9,989$) on a donation-based crowdfunding platform in Japan (JapanGiving), researchers investigated the relationship between donors' behavior when compared to others' most-recent preceding donation amounts to the campaign. On any crowdfunding campaign page on JapanGiving, the campaign's most recent four or five donations are listed in chronological order, including a donor's name, comments, date and time of donation, and contribution amount. By analyzing panel data from this platform, the researchers found that when donors are presented with a set of a campaign's most recent donation amounts, they are likely to donate in alignment with the most frequently donated amount (Sasaki, 2019).

Image and Identity

Each of us has a multifaceted identity: we are parents, friends, consumers, investors, advocates, artists, and much more. Most of the time, we seek to act in accordance with the way we see ourselves or hope to be seen by others. Encouraging people to identify as charitable donors, or reminding them that their actions influence the way they are perceived by others, can increase contributions.



Reaffirming donors' identities as charitable, generous people increases donations. As



part of a widely publicized local fundraising campaign, canvassers visited households and asked for contributions ($n = 153$). Some donors were told, "You are a generous person. I wish more of the people I met were as charitable as you," while other donors were given no feedback about their personality. In a later fundraiser for a related cause, those who had been called out as charitable gave on average 71% more than those who had not been labeled (Kraut, 1973).



Reminding people of their past behavior as "donors" increases contributions. In a



large-scale field experiment conducted with the American Red Cross, researchers sent direct mail solicitations to individuals who had previously donated to the Red Cross but had not contributed in the last 24 months ($n = 17,061$). All letters used the greeting, "Dear Friend and Supporter," but one set of letters also included the note, "Previous Gift: [date]" below the postal address. Researchers found that including this extra line reminded donors of their identity as supporters of the Red Cross and increased the probability of a donation by 20%. Average donation amounts also increased by about 4.1% (Kessler & Milkman, 2014).

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	



Offering public recognition increases donations. In a field experiment, members of a service club at Yale University contacted alumni and asked them for donations that would go to support various student groups on campus ($n = 4,168$). Some people were told that donors contributing above a certain threshold would be listed in the service club’s newsletter. Compared to those who received only a plain ask for donations, those offered recognition were 2.7 percentage points more likely to give and gave on average 14 percentage points higher amounts (Karlan & McConnell, 2013).



Selective recognition increases donations. In one lab study ($n = 205$), individuals were given \$10 each and split into small groups. Study participants chose to make a \$0–10 donation to the Red Cross using the money they had been given, with the following information about what would happen next.

- Group 1: All individual donation amounts would be seen by group members.
- Group 2: All individual donation amounts and names would be seen by group members.
- Group 3: The two lowest donation amounts and names would be seen by group members.
- Group 4: The two highest donation amounts and names would be seen by group members.




Compared to the first group, which contributed an average of \$5.26, public recognition boosted donations in the second group by 14%. The comparative increase in the third group was 20%, demonstrating that individuals act to avoid the shame associated with being a low contributor. In the fourth group, average contributions rose by 32%, showing that the public prestige of being a generous donor can be a powerful motivator (Samek & Sheremeta, 2015).

 For more on how prestige influences donor behavior, see:

- ▶ Harbaugh, “What do Donations Buy? A Model of Philanthropy Based on Prestige and Warm Glow” (1997).



Donors react differently to information on charity efficiency depending on the social-signaling value of the decision. In a lab experiment using real money and charities, participants ($n = 297$) were first given an endowment to split between themselves and a charity from a large list. Subjects then received new information about the charities’ financial efficiency and were allowed to modify their initial decisions. Some were told they had to stand up at the end of the experiment and announce both the amount and efficiency information they received. This public condition generated a mixed reaction from donors, resulting in no overall effect on giving amount. Researchers found that a third of donors decreased their donation amount in response to good news because they could deliver the same social image signal for a lower price. In contrast, for the group where donation decisions remained private, receiving positive information about the expense efficiency of a charity increased the average donation amount (Butera & Horn, 2017).

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	



Focusing donors' attention on their moral goals and identity changes where they give.



In a series of five lab studies, participants ($n = 1,325$) were primed to consider either the impact of their donation or their donation as an affirmation of their moral self-concept. They were then asked to donate to either a nearby or faraway cause. Donors primed to think about moral goals gave more to further away causes, seemingly because they considered more people within their “moral circle.” Donors primed to think about the tangible impact of their donations gave more to causes close to themselves. While in the real world people are often prompted by giving solicitations that focus on the impact of a donation, researchers conclude that focusing instead on moral goals may expand people’s willingness to give to people further away. The researchers find that this effect is stronger among those who place a greater importance on their identity as moral individuals (Xu et al., 2020).

 For more on how activating moral identities can modify donor behavior toward different social groups, see:

- ▶ Freeman et al., “Overcoming Beneficiary Race as an Impediment to Charitable Donations: Social Dominance Orientation, the Experience of Moral Elevation, and Donation Behavior” (2009).



Donors are biased to give to those who look like themselves.



In a lab study ($n = 678$), researchers assessed participants’ implicit (i.e., unconscious) biases toward different skin colors using a Skin-tone Implicit Association Test, and also asked them their willingness to donate to people living in developing countries. The researchers found that those who demonstrated more colorism, or bias against people with darker skin tones whether conscious or unconscious, were less willing to give to those causes, even when controlling for sociodemographic variables and past giving behavior. A positive bias toward one’s own social groups, and a negative bias toward other social groups, is a well-documented—though not necessarily universal—phenomenon. However, with this study, the researchers showed that colorism, rather than just racial bias, may play a role in reducing donations to causes that benefit people with darker skin tones (Bhati, 2021).



People tend to like—and support—people who are similar to themselves. Researchers asked female undergraduate students to donate to the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation ($n = 82$). Some students were approached by a solicitor whose name tag matched the prospective donor’s first name. On average, these people donated more than twice as much as those in a comparison group with no name matching. Researchers conclude that the incidental similarity evokes a fleeting sense of liking the solicitor and encourages positive responses. This study is a great segue to the following section on emotions, as image and identity can often evoke strong emotions, as seen in these results (Burger et al., 2004).

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**



Donating can be perceived as a signal of trustworthiness, even if donors are not necessarily more trustworthy than nondonors.

In a lab experiment ($n = 148$), one set of participants (senders) playing an exchange game were instructed to send money to another randomly selected participant (receiver) with the expectation—but no guarantee—that these receivers would return the money to them at a later point in the study. Some of the receivers of the money were presented with the option to donate some of their received money to a charity of their choice, and some were not. In the second part of the study, the senders were then given the option to choose between a “donor” or “nondonor” interaction partner to complete the same action with again. Participants who were labeled “donor” were chosen by their peers at a significantly higher rate than participants who had no option to donate, or who had an opportunity to donate and had chosen not to. These “donors” were perceived as more trustworthy. However, the researchers note that participants who chose to give to charity were actually no more trustworthy than those who didn’t, as both donors and nondonors returned their peers’ money at roughly equal rates (Fehrler & Przepiorka, 2016).

Emotions

People often make decisions based on their positive or negative feelings toward a subject, rather than on objective analysis. Different kinds of information evoke varying degrees of emotion, and strong positive emotions seem to encourage prosocial behavior.



Photographs that elicit emotion increase donations. In one lab experiment ($n = 11$), subjects were given \$15 dollars each and told it was theirs to keep but that any portion they chose could be donated to an orphanage in Sudan. During the experiment, subjects were shown both photographs and silhouettes of individual beneficiaries. Subjects were more than twice as likely to donate when viewing photographs, compared to silhouettes. Neural imaging and follow-up surveys ($n = 22$) indicated that photographs elicit stronger positive emotions, leading to more generosity (Genevsky et al., 2013).



Sharing information about an “identifiable victim” heightens emotions. In one lab experiment, researchers asked participants to donate to sick children in need of an expensive medicine ($n = 153$). Different groups were shown an identified individual (i.e., name, age, picture), an unidentified individual, a group of identified individuals, or a group of unidentified individuals. The identified individual elicited the most donations, which researchers suggest is due to an intensified emotional response from participants (Kogut & Ritov, 2005).

 For more on the effect of perceived closeness of beneficiaries on donations, see:


- ▶ Small & Loewenstein, “Helping a Victim or Helping the Victim: Altruism and Identifiability” (2003).

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	



Considering a volunteer experience activates an emotional mindset and increases generosity.

Researchers provided study participants with information about a charitable organization ($n = 199$). One group of participants was asked how much time they would give to the charity, while the other was not prompted to consider volunteering. Both groups were then asked how much money they would donate to the charity. Those who had first considered volunteering offered 49% more money than those who were only asked to donate. Follow-up studies measured actual donation activity with similar findings ($n = 193$). Researchers conclude that thinking about volunteering triggers an emotional mindset and prompts people to seek meaning and satisfaction, with positive effects on monetary donations. In contrast, thinking primarily about financial contributions triggers a value-maximization mindset and suppresses donations (Liu & Aaker, 2008).

 For more on differing responses to “helping opportunities” (donations of time or effort) and “giving opportunities” (donations of money or other resources), see:

- ▶ Yang et al., “Eager to Help yet Reluctant to Give: Pro-Social Effort and Pro-Social Choices Diverge” (2014).



Deliberative thought suppresses emotion-based giving.

Researchers gave study participants the opportunity to donate \$0–5 to famine relief efforts at Save the Children ($n = 159$). One group received letters that included a picture and brief description of a little girl. A second group received a letter describing factual information about food security, and a third group received letters with both the little girl’s profile and factual information. The photo and description prompted an emotion-based response, raising more than twice as much money as the factual solicitation. Including factual information with the girl’s profile reduced this effect, with no significant difference in giving between those who received both pieces and those who received factual information only (Small et al., 2007).

 For more on the effects of factual information on giving patterns, see:

- ▶ Karlan & Wood, “The Effect of Effectiveness: Donor Response to Aid Effectiveness in a Direct Mail Fundraising Experiment” (2015).
- ▶ Fielding et al., “Materialists and altruists in a charitable donation experiment” (2019).



The entitativity of a group can affect the amount of donations they receive.

In a series of experiments ($n = 737$), researchers studied how adjusting language to create a perception of cohesion among a group of victims can affect donor behavior. In each experiment, one condition simply asked participants to donate to help a number of victims. The treatment condition asked people to donate to that same number of victims, but this time they were grouped together (a family of people, a herd of gazelles, a flock of birds, etc.). The results of this study showed that when victims are perceived to be “entitative” (be it through physical cues such as common movement, conceptually such as belonging to a

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

family, or peoples’ individual perceptions of entitativity), they receive higher donations when compared to “less entitative” but otherwise identical victims. The researchers concluded that this effect is likely because people experience stronger feelings of concern toward, and give more to, a coherent group rather than a number of individuals (Smith et al., 2013).



Negatively framed giving appeals can increase donations.



Using text mining, researchers analyzed the message content of 3,826 crowdfunding campaigns on GoFundMe.com to measure the effect of negatively (versus positive) framed donation messages on donor behavior (i.e., social media spread of the campaign message, number of donors who decide to donate from seeing the message, and donation amount per donor). The text analysis indicated the percentage of a message that contained negative emotion words. A higher score on negative wording indicated that the text contained a larger portion of words describing the hardships facing the recipient and how donations will help to prevent further hardship; a lower score on negative wording indicated that the text highlighted the positive opportunities available to the recipient thanks to the donation. Results showed that messages containing higher scores on negative emotional wording led to a greater number of donors and greater sharing of the message on social media, but smaller donation amounts per donor. The authors attributed this effect to the “mood management theory of donation”: negatively framed messages tend to put people in a negative state, and they attempt to recover their mood by donating (Jang & Chu, 2022).

Avoidance

It’s often hard for people to say no, including when they’re asked to give to charitable organizations. Direct, personal solicitations can therefore increase donations, but resulting gifts may not reflect true support for particular causes. Further, some people may preemptively avoid requests to donate.



Avoiding emotional stories and requests to donate helps people justify decisions not to give.



In a large field experiment ($n = 5,976$), researchers set up an online voting contest for different animal groups. After selecting an organization, each voter was asked to click through to the following step to register their vote. Some voters were told they would also have the opportunity to donate to their chosen animal group. The click-through rate for voters who expected—and could thus avoid—a solicitation was 22% lower than the click-through rate for those who were simply asked to register. Displaying a pet adoption story before the registration request countered this effect. Researchers found that avoiding both compelling information about a charity and direct requests to donate gives people more “wiggle room” to justify not participating in prosocial behavior (Exley & Petrie, 2018).



Avoiding direct, oral requests to donate defends against impulsive giving.



In a randomized natural field experiment ($n = 8,831$), Salvation Army solicitors were stationed sometimes at one and sometimes at both of two main entrances to a supermarket. This gave

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	

some shoppers an easy way to avoid requests to donate. Solicitors were either silent and simply rang a bell as shoppers passed or made eye contact and asked shoppers to “please give today.” Researchers found that orally asking people to give dramatically raised participation rates and increased the total amount donated by more than 50%. However, the direct ask also led a third of shoppers to avoid solicitors altogether by using other entrances. Evidence suggests that “avoiders” are shielding themselves from emotion-based impulses to give and the guilt associated with not giving, revealing a sophisticated understanding of empathy and altruism rather than callousness or selfishness (Andreoni et al., 2017).



People may give to avoid saying no. During a door-to-door fundraising campaign ($n = 7,668$), researchers tested the effects of 1) providing advance notice for solicitation visits and 2) allowing people to easily opt out of them altogether. Compared to neighbors who received basic, unannounced solicitations, people who received advance notice were 9% less likely to answer their doors. Similarly, those who could opt out were 24% less likely to answer their door and 31% less likely to give if they did open the door. Finally, total contributions were significantly lower among those who could choose to opt out. This drop was driven by the loss of small-dollar donations, showing that many people give simply to avoid saying no (DellaVigna et al., 2012).

For more on gender differences in avoidance behavior, see:

- ▶ DellaVigna et al., “The importance of being marginal: gender differences in generosity” (2013).



Leaving a donation decision to chance may allow people to avoid saying no. In two lab experiments, researchers gave some participants the option to be randomly assigned a donation amount rather than to make the donation decision themselves. In the first study ($n = 322$), one group of participants could choose whether or not to donate a portion of their \$2 bonus to charity, while the second group also could choose to randomly assign an amount (\$0 to \$2). In the second study ($n = 299$), one group had the choice of donating \$1, \$2, \$3, or not at all, while the second group also had the option to be randomly assigned an amount (\$1, \$2, \$3). In both studies, the random option significantly reduced the rate of refusal—by 28% in the first study, and by 14% percentage points in the second. Researchers found that only those who would have refused the prosocial request were drawn to the random option in this context (Lin & Reich, 2018).

For more on leveraging avoidance to increase efficiencies in giving, see:

- ▶ Kamdar et al., “Once and Done: Leveraging Behavioral Economics to Increase Charitable Contributions” (2015).


For more on the effect of personal solicitations on donations, see:


- ▶ Meer & Rosen, “The ABCs of Charitable Solicitation” (2009).


Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	

Time Inconsistency

Preferences change over time, especially when it comes to money. People tend to be present-biased, valuing today's money more than they value tomorrow's. This means that losses in the present are more painful than losses at some future point. Asking donors to commit today to donating funds later can boost total contributions.


 **Asking donors to “Give More Tomorrow” encourages generosity.** In one field experiment with a large and well-known Swedish charity, fundraisers called monthly contributors and asked them to increase their recurring donation amounts ($n = 1,134$). One group was simply asked to give more if possible, implying an immediate increase. A separate group was asked to give more if possible “beginning in January,” providing a two-month delay. Donors exhibited present-biased behavior: average increases in giving were 32% higher for those offered a delayed start, compared to those who were asked to give more immediately. This was driven both by greater participation and larger increases (Breman, 2011).

 **Asking to donate future income at a later date increases participation.** In a lab experiment ($n = 352$), participants were asked to donate \$5 of their participation fee for that day's session to charity. Another group was asked to donate \$5 out of their participation fee from the next week's session. The one week delay in charitable gift transaction increased participation from 31% to 45%—a 50% increase in giving. The researchers propose a model of social signaling in which donors receive social utility from deciding to give now in addition to the warm glow of actual giving at a later time (Andreoni & Serra-Garcia, 2021).

 **Asking people to donate a potential windfall before it is certain encourages generosity.** In five lab and field experiments ($n = 1,363$), charitable donations were solicited from small lottery winnings, varying in whether the outcome of the lottery was known at the time. Pooled together, participants were 23% more likely to donate from the winning income and gave 25% more when asked to donate before the lottery's outcome was determined, compared to those who were asked to donate after learning they had won (Kellner et al., 2019).


Hassle Factors and Procrastination

“Hassle factors” are small roadblocks that must be dealt with in order to complete an action. Despite being small, hassle factors can lead to outsized consequences if not resolved (e.g., needing to find a stamp could result in a late or missed rent payment). These seemingly minor inconveniences are at play in charitable giving as well, and can lead people to procrastinate, then forget about following through, or decide not to give after all.

 **Making it easier to donate encourages participation.** In field experiments conducted with a direct-mail fundraising campaign in Germany, researchers tested two tactics designed to help people follow through on their intentions to give. In the first study ($n = 5,000$), researchers sent follow-up letters reminding people about the campaign. The reminders


Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	

generated responses and increased response rates by 46%. In another experiment ($n = 25,000$), researchers added prefilled bank transfer forms to some solicitation letters and gave people the option to donate with a credit card over the phone. People who received these additional tools were 26% more likely to respond, compared to those who received only a solicitation letter (Rasul & Huck, 2010).

-  For more on the circumstances in which making it harder to donate can promote giving behaviors, see:
- ▶ Olivola & Shafir, “The Martyrdom Effect: When Pain and Effort Increase Prosocial Contributions” (2011).



Reminders encourage participation. In a field experiment, researchers sent out emails soliciting donations for a large Danish charity ($n = 29,057$). One group of people received an email reminder in addition to the original message. This increased both the likelihood of giving (by 50%, or 0.2 percentage points) and the total amount raised (Damgaard & Gravert, 2014).

-  For more on the effect of reminders on charitable giving, see:
- ▶ Sonntag & Zizzo, “On Reminder Effects and Dominance: Evidence from an Online Experiment on Charitable Giving” (2015).



Even minor inconveniences can depress giving. In a door-to-door fundraising campaign ($n = 1,536$), volunteers asked households to support a local charity that provides blankets to families in need. Solicitors explained that holiday cards would accompany the blankets funded by donors. They told the control group that cards had been prewritten, but gave the treatment group the option of writing messages. Contrary to the researchers’ hypothesis, households in the treatment group were 20% less likely to donate. They conclude that the opportunity to write a card may drive up the cost of giving in multiple ways: 1) more social pressure to accompany the personal gesture with a larger gift amount, 2) increased time to complete a transaction, or 3) additional need to make two decisions—whether to give, and whether to write a card—rather than one (Chuan & Samek, 2014).



Not specifying a deadline may be best for reducing procrastination and increasing participation. Individuals ($n = 3,199$) randomly selected from the New Zealand voter roll were invited to take part in a five-minute online survey on charitable giving. If participants completed the survey, the researchers would donate \$10 to the individual’s choice between two charities. Letters either did not specify a deadline to complete the survey or set a deadline one week or one month from when letters were delivered. The response rate was highest (8.3%) when no deadline was specified and lowest with the one-month deadline (5.5%). The researchers concluded that a longer deadline may send a signal that there is no urgency to act, and so people procrastinate and may forget (Knowles et al., 2015).

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

Small Incentives

When they are thoughtfully designed, incentives can attract attention and inspire action. For example, providing small, nonmonetary gifts when making requests can sometimes trigger desires to reciprocate. However, the danger of incentivizing prosocial behaviors is that the external reward will “crowd out” the intrinsic desire to contribute by turning a donation into a transaction.



Lottery prizes increase the likelihood of giving. Researchers studied the effects of lotteries on donations in a door-to-door fundraising campaign for a local institution ($n = 2,149$). One group of households was informed that each dollar contributed would secure a lottery ticket for a \$1,000 prepaid credit card. In all, 45.5% of these lottery-offer households participated, compared to only 25.3% of households who were simply asked to donate. Similarly, the average donation per contact was 87% greater in the lottery treatment compared to the group with the standard ask (Landry, et al., 2006).



Nonmonetary upfront gifts encourage donations. In this experiment, researchers conducted a direct-mail solicitation campaign ($n = 9,846$). Each household was randomly assigned to receive a letter alone, a small gift (a postcard and envelope) along with the letter, or a large gift (four postcards and envelopes) along with the letter. Recipients of the small gift donated at a 17% higher rate than recipients in the no-gift condition, and recipients of the large gift donated at a 75% higher rate than those in the no-gift condition. The researchers concluded that this “gift-exchange” activates desires to reciprocate the charity’s generosity (Falk, 2007).



Conditional thank-you gifts can distract from and demotivate charitable giving. In a field experiment ($n = 3,641$), researchers tested the effect of thank-you gifts during a non-profit’s direct mail fundraising campaign to previous donors. The gift group received a standard solicitation letter with a glossy insert advertising one of two thank-you gifts for a donation above a certain threshold—either a “swag” gift or 60 meals for a local food bank. Including the gift offer decreased donation rates by over 2 percentage points on average, compared to the control group that received no offer. Researchers note that the glossy gift insert may have been highly salient to donors and likely diverted attention away from the solicitation letter and the intrinsic motivation it mentions. Additionally, the difference between the gifts—a standard donor gift versus a matching gift—may also have been a factor (Chao, 2017).



Social incentives can be more effective than purely material incentives.

In a field experiment ($n = 933$) in Germany, people were asked to donate to a cinema’s environmental campaign by researchers in the lobby of the cinema. In three of six treatments, participants received varying oral information; across the other three conditions, upon donating at least a minimum amount, they received either a material reward (a mug or bag), a material reward with a status gift (a mug or bag identifying the owner as a supporter of the

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

New for
2023

theater’s campaign), or a purely status award (being mentioned on the theater’s social media). The material reward (the mug or bag) that mentioned the recipient’s status as a supporter of the campaign resulted in significantly more frequent contributions, and a significantly greater average contribution amount, than the other conditions. The authors speculated that the repeated social signaling value of the material social status gift may have led to the increased contributions (Dannenberg et al., 2022).

Framing the Ask

Often, *how* you ask matters more than what you are asking. People tend to behave and make decisions based on the framework and semantics presented to them, which can emphasize different aspects of the same decision. In the realm of charitable giving, small differences in the wording of donation solicitations (e.g., whether the cause is framed concretely or abstractly) can significantly affect donors’ responses even without changing any substantive aspects of the choice being presented.



Framing a donation decision as “how much to give” rather than “whether to give” increases the likelihood of engagement.

In seven studies ($n = 9,028$), researchers found that choice framings that induce a continuous mindset (how much to donate) increased donation rates compared to discrete choices (whether to donate or not). In one study, participants were given eight donation amount options (including \$0) were more likely to make a donation than those given a binary yes or no choice - 79.5% of those given amount options donated, compared to 67.5% who were given a binary choice. In another, the authors varied the minimum donation amount across four conditions (open ended, \$1, \$5, or \$10) and still saw significantly higher participation in the suggested donation conditions compared to the open-ended one (Moon & VanEpps, 2022).

For more on the influence of framing the suggested donation amounts (donation appeals scale):

- ▶ Desmet & Feinberg, “Ask and Ye Shall Receive: The Effect of the Appeals Scale on Consumers’ Donation Behavior” (2003).



Feeling resource-abundant may influence generosity for abstractly framed causes.

In a lab study ($n = 147$), subjects first viewed an image of a ladder and were asked to either compare themselves in terms of their access to resources to people at the bottom of the ladder (relative abundance) or to people at the top of the ladder (relative nonabundance). Subjects then viewed a charitable appeal that had a concrete (“serve a meal”) or more abstract (“address hunger”) solicitation. Those who were primed with relative nonabundance donated significantly more when presented with the concrete appeal. The opposite effect was observed for the abundance condition, with participants donating more to the abstract appeal (Macdonnell et al., 2015).



Framing a donation solicitation as one in a series decreases donation amounts.

In a field experiment ($n = 35,705$), an opera house sent solicitation letters to its customers to donate to a separate charity. Letter A asked for donations in a standard way; letter B made the expectation of future solicitations more salient and framed the ask as the first in an annual series. An additional treatment letter C added the possibility of opting out of future mailings.

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
Direct Mail	Phone Solicitation	In-person	Online	Participation Rate	Donation Amount	

While all three letters had the same response rate, the control letter A resulted in significantly higher donations and a higher return per letter (Adena & Huck, 2019).



A unit-asking strategy can overcome scope insensitivity. When people are asked to decide their willingness to donate to a certain number of needy persons, respondents largely ignore the number in their decision-making. As a field experiment, researchers created two versions of a website that employees ($n = 320$) were directed to during a company fundraiser for 40 students affected by earthquakes. The control version asked how much they were willing to donate to all the children, while the unit-asking version first asked employees to think about one child and how much they would hypothetically donate to help that one child, before being asked how much they were willing to donate to all the children. While the participation rates were not significantly different, the average donation was 65% higher (about \$21 more) in the unit-asking group than in the control group (Hsee et al., 2013).




Charitable solicitations using formal appeals receive greater support.

Combining an exploratory study with a series of experimental studies ($n = 524$), the authors found that, in charitable solicitations, using formal language style, rather than colloquial language, leads to greater charitable support. This effect is particularly strong among donors who believe that the social status quo of the world is generally just and fair to everybody. The researchers explain this finding by noting that it's likely that people who hold these just-world beliefs might perceive formal language as more effortful and thus may expect people asking for their monetary support to expend that effort in their communications (Pfeiffer et al., 2022).



Tailoring framing language to an audience's political beliefs can change their giving patterns.

In a series of five lab studies ($n = 807$), researchers noted that those who hold liberal political beliefs prefer to distribute their help more than the average person, and that conservatives prefer to concentrate their help more than average. When presented with a list of opportunities to donate, conservatives concentrate their donation in fewer causes, while liberals spread their donations across more causes. A mediation analysis demonstrated that liberals distribute out of a desire for broad social justice, while conservatives concentrate out of a desire to preserve social order by supporting members of smaller social in-groups. However, changes in messaging were able to change this pattern: when researchers emphasized that broad giving would protect the social order, conservatives gave with breadth, and when researchers emphasized that concentrated giving would reduce inequality, liberals gave with depth. In this way, modifying the message used can substantially change the way someone donates (Farmer et al., 2020).

 As Sharps & Schroeder (2019) note, the average person has a preference for “distributing” over “concentrating” their help to others—a summary of this paper can be found in the later Choice Architecture section.

Outreach Methods				Outcomes Affected		New for 2023
 Direct Mail	 Phone Solicitation	 In-person	 Online	 Participation Rate	 Donation Amount	

Agency

As decision makers and actors, we often like to exert our agency on situations that are presented to us. In general, people would rather have (or at least think they would rather have) more avenues to express and act on individual preferences. In giving decisions, while agency may not be a central consideration for all donors, restricting or expanding the donor's choice set can impact generosity.



Giving individuals the agency to direct their donations increases generosity, even when the option is not taken.

In a field experiment ($n = 10,605$), two groups were created from a list of donors who had given to a university's Association of Former Students' Annual Fund during the previous year. One group was sent a solicitation email asking for a donation to the unrestricted fund; the second group was sent the same email but also given the option to direct some or all of their gift specifically to support programs at their college. While there was no difference in donation rate between groups, the average gift was \$82.33 larger in the choice group. Furthermore, very few donors actually chose the option to direct their gifts, suggesting that allowing for choice increases donations without limiting charities' flexibility in allocating donations (Eckel et al., 2017).



Setting a minimum donation amount can increase donations.

In several experiments (total $n = 2,522$), researchers studied whether constraining people's donation choice set to a binary of (1) giving nothing, or (2) giving a larger amount than they'd otherwise give (here, their entire study bonus) could raise more donation dollars than a traditional unconstrained decision. Participants were given a bonus for completing a small task and then presented with information about charity to which they were asked to donate. They were either asked to donate a percentage of their bonus (control), or they were presented with a binary choice to donate none or all of their bonus (treatment). The results of these experiments showed that the binary-choice ask produced a 21% increase in the amount of money raised when compared to the unconstrained ask. The researchers concluded that this effect could be due to the fact that the binary-choice ask motivates people to give by forcing them to consider whether donating the proposed amount would be better than simply donating nothing anything at all. Interestingly, previous lab studies have indicated that minimum donation amounts may reduce donation amounts. This indicates that the particular setup of a minimum required donation will depend on context: setting a minimum donation amount that is just high enough to prompt increased donations from people who would otherwise have given less, while not so high that people walk away entirely, will likely vary significantly across different contexts (Kraft-Todd et al., 2022).

 For more on how minimum donation amounts can reduce donations:

- ▶ Cartwright & Mirza, "Charitable Giving When Donors are Constrained to Give a Minimum Amount" (2021).

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate




Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

 For more on how competing preferences for agency and effective giving can affect donation behavior:

- ▶ Butera & Houser, “Delegating Altruism: Toward an Understanding of Agency in Charitable Giving” (2018).

 For more on the role of suggested defaults, see:

- ▶ Goswami & Urmitsky, “When Should the Ask be a Nudge? The Effect of Default Amounts on Charitable Donations” (2016).



Personalized recommendations can decrease a donor’s sense of autonomy.



In a lab study, researchers investigated what effect personalized recommendations in charity advertising have on people’s ($n = 119$) donation intentions. Study participants in the personalized recommendation condition were told that they were visiting a website for charity and were shown some information on its mission and goals by “intelligent recommendations.” In the condition without personalized recommendations, however, participants were told that they were visiting a website for charity and found the same charity information by having to browse and search. They were then evaluated on their intention to donate and their perceived autonomy in arriving at their donation decision. People who received charity advertising information through “personalized recommendations” (versus without) had lower donation intentions. The researchers attributed this effect to a donor’s perceived decrease in autonomy, in line with self-determination theory, which holds that an individual’s behavior changes with the degree of their autonomy, self-motivation, and will (Lv & Huang, 2022).

Mental Accounting

Although we might agree in theory that money is fungible, and that a dollar is a dollar regardless of where it came from, many studies have shown that people treat and value money differently depending on subjective factors such as the source of the money and the intended use. Using these subjective criteria, people create separate mental accounts for their money and make decisions for these accounts separately, which can lead to inconsistent and suboptimal financial decisions. Getting donors to feel they are donating from a “windfall” or “bonus” mental account, or from money directly earned for charity, rather than from out of their own pocket can increase generosity.



Individuals are more generous if they feel they are earning directly for charity rather than donating income they have already earned.

In a lab experiment ($n = 246$), participants selected a charity and performed a 75-minute effort task, which earned them money. Some participants could only donate from their earnings at the end of the experiment (with and without a reminder of their charity choice); some were able to donate earnings at any time and were reminded of their charity choice; and some were able to switch where their earnings were going, themselves or their charity choice, at any time. The final condition, in which subjects could choose to direct their efforts directly to the charity, resulted in higher donation rates and amounts than all other conditions (Brown et al., 2013).

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

 For more on how prosocial incentives affect work performance, see:

▶ Imas 2014 “Working for ‘Warm Glow’: On the Benefits and Limits of Prosocial Incentives.”



Donors are more generous with windfall money than with earned income. In a lab experiment ($n = 188$), students were asked to give to a disaster relief charity with windfall money or with money earned from a real task. They were given two different randomized tasks: in one, participants were granted a windfall before donating, and in the other they earned a variable amount of money based on their performance in a counting task before donating. Participants were more likely to give, and gave 29% more, when they received the windfall money (Li et al., 2018).



People may treat charitable giving and political donations as substitutes.



In both a lab experiment ($n = 3,000$) and an analysis of secondary data encompassing both a natural experiment and correlational study, researchers from the National Bureau of Economic Research investigated the relationship between giving to charitable and political causes. They found that people donate less to charity after they are prompted to give to a political candidate or cause, and give less in political donations when something prompts them to give to charity. For instance, they found that immediately after a natural disaster, donations to charities like the American Red Cross increase, and political contributions decrease. Interestingly, they didn’t find that people adjust other types of spending in response to these events, suggesting that reducing one form of giving to increase another isn’t purely about budget constraints (otherwise, we would expect people to also reduce their spending on other goods and services). These findings suggest that people have a single mental account for both political and charitable causes. This also indicates that political giving and charitable giving may arise from similar motivations (Yildirim et al., 2020).

Information and Ambiguity

The articles below explore in an experimental setting how information—or lack thereof—can influence donation decisions. People make very different choices when they have imperfect information about the consequences of their choice, and in the real world, information is very rarely comprehensive. Minimizing the hassles or costs of finding information, and concretizing the effects of a donation when possible, may increase donor generosity.



Uncertainty can make people less generous, as they use ambiguity as an excuse not to give.

In a lab study ($n = 200$), participants were asked to make decisions in a series of binary choices, each between either a guaranteed payout or a risky/ambiguous lottery payout. Researchers varied the amounts of the payouts, as well as whether the payout would go to the participant themselves or to a charity. The authors found that participants were more willing to select

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

the risky option when directing payouts to themselves, and preferred charity only when the amount to be donated was relatively clear. These results suggest that people use ambiguity and risk to provide “moral wiggle room” and excuse their decisions not to give (Garcia et al., 2020).

 For more on how “moral wiggle room” can affect generosity, see:

- ▶ Dana et al., “Exploiting Moral Wiggle Room: Experiments Demonstrating an Illusory Preference for Fairness” (2007).



People will not necessarily invest resources to seek out information on the best ways to give, even if that information would provide clarity on the impact of their donation.



In two lab experiments ($n = 495$), participants completed several tasks, including a donation exercise. In that exercise, the participants were told they had been matched with either a high- or low-performing non-profit. Some participants had the opportunity to buy information about the charity with which they had been matched, while other participants didn’t and had to make their donation decision under uncertainty. The type of information offered to the former group was also varied—some could buy information about aid impact, others about the population served, and others about overhead costs. The researchers found that nearly three-quarters of participants did not buy any information, but a majority donated, indicating a low overall demand for information. Information about impact was demanded the least, and donors did not change their donation decisions when any information was provided for free. Together, these results suggest that people have a generally low desire for information about non-profits, indicating a barrier to minimizing reactive giving and encouraging well-informed giving in the real world (Metzger & Günther, 2019).

Choice Architecture

Choice architecture represents a classic area of study for behavioral science: How does the way a decision is set up, including the number and order of options presented, affect the outcome? Studies listed here indicate that donors tend to be more generous when offered more choices, and that people tend to prefer distributing their donations among potential causes, rather than concentrating on a few.



Offering donors more choice can increase giving.



Across six experiments ($n = 6,321$) and a large field study ($n = 10,000$), participants were asked to donate to either a single cause or multiple causes. Viewing multiple bids for help increased both a hypothetical intention to donate and actual donations. It is worth noting that this effect would almost certainly have diminishing returns at a point—prior research has indicated that offering too many options can feel overwhelming, and make a choice more difficult. However, these findings indicate that increasing a solicitation from a single request to

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

multiple requests drives greater donation amounts without reducing the proportion of people who donate (Weisz & Cikara, 2020).



People tend to prefer distributing their giving, rather than concentrating it, when presented with a list of people or groups in need.



In nine lab experiments ($n = 3,016$), researchers found that people tend to prefer to distribute donations across those in need rather than concentrate them. Participants report that distributed helping feels more “fair,” and the authors note that participants who perceive distributing as fairer are more likely to spread their donations around. As the number of requests for help increase, the total donation amount also increases, consistent with Weisz and Cikara (2020). In contrast to the findings of Weisz and Cikara, though, the average donation per requester decreases. As a final note, the authors of this paper found that people give more when they have to consider each requester individually; when a donation decision is packed into a single decision, donations decrease. Thus, avoiding bundled donation decisions, and instead prompting donors to consider multiple causes and asks for help individually, may increase donations (Sharps & Schroeder, 2019).

Outreach Methods



Direct Mail



Phone Solicitation



In-person



Online



Participation Rate



Donation Amount

**New for
2023**

Theoretical Frameworks, Models, and Other Studies

This section highlights papers that synthesize research on charitable giving and provide theoretical frameworks that help explain giving behaviors and variability between individuals. While models of giving have not shifted dramatically in the four years since this review was last updated (in 2019), we have included here several papers that explore emerging areas of research.

Broad Overviews and Literature Reviews

The papers below orient readers interested in the state of research on charitable giving and philanthropy. What questions have been asked? Which remain unanswered? How strong is the evidence underlying a given conclusion? These works summarize broad themes and provide direction for further reading.

- Andreoni, “Philanthropy” (2006).
- Andreoni, “Economics of Charity and Philanthropy” (2015).
- Bekkers & Wiepking, “Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review” (2007).
- Bekkers & Wiepking, “Who gives? A Literature Review of Predictors of Charitable Giving. Part One: Religion, Education, Age and Socialization” (2011).
- Hill, “The Relationship between Volunteering and Charitable Giving: Review of Evidence” (2012).
- Mesch et al., “How and Why Women Give: Current and Future Directions for Research on Women’s Philanthropy” (2015).
- van Steenburg et al., “The New World of Philanthropy: How Changing Financial Behavior, Public Policies, and Covid-19 Affect Nonprofit Fundraising And Marketing” (2022).
- van Teunenbroek et al., “Look to Others Before You Leap: A Systematic Literature Review of Social Information Effects on Donation Amounts” (2020).

Emotion and Giving

Papers in this section explore the relationship between giving behaviors and happiness, well-being, and mood. Researchers have explored both directions of causality (i.e., the hypotheses that giving causes happiness and that happy people are more likely to give) from several angles. Taken together, the evidence suggests that both may be true: giving can engender a “warm glow,” or positive emotional boost, and happier people donate more.

- Aknin et al., “Does Social Connection Turn Good Deeds into Good Feelings?” (2013).
- Aknin et al., “Making a Difference Matters: Impact Unlocks the Emotional Benefits of Prosocial Spending” (2013).

- Anik et al., “Feeling Good about Giving: The Benefits (and Costs) of Self-interested Charitable Behavior” (2009).
- Andreoni, “Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-glow Giving” (1990).
- Bock et al., “Encouraging Consumer Charitable Behavior: The Impact of Charitable Motivations, Gratitude, and Materialism” (2018).
- Hill & Howell, “Moderators and mediators of pro-social spending and well-being: The influences of values and psychological need satisfaction” (2014).
- Kopelman, “The Effect of Mood on Social Value Orientation: Positive Mood Induces Prosocial Behavior while Negative Mood Induces Individualistic and Competitive Behavior” (1998).
- Mayo & Tinsley, “Warm Glow and Charitable Giving: Why the Wealthy Do Not Give More to Charity” (2008).
- Null, “Warm Glow, Information, and Inefficient Charitable Giving” (2011).
- Okten et al., “Life Satisfaction and Charitable Giving: New Evidence from the PSID” (2016).
- O’Brien & Kassiere, “People are Slow to Adapt to the Warm Glow of Giving” (2018).

Information and Choice in Giving

No individual can give to every cause or charity that might benefit from her generosity. All donors must choose how best to allocate their limited funds. However, it can be difficult to access and evaluate information about organizations, programs, and beneficiaries. The papers in this section describe how people request, avoid, and interpret different types of information when making decisions about how much to give, and to whom. Donors often expect a substantial degree of insight into non-profit financial information, particularly as tech platforms and online non-profit databases have often focused their certification systems on financial efficiency and transparency. Thus, beyond the papers found in the previous update to this work, we have included a paper describing the theory of non-profit financial efficiency as a proxy for non-profit quality, as well as the challenges nonprofits face as a result of this increased financial surveillance.

- Andreoni, “Toward a Theory of Charitable Fund-raising, (1998).
- Andreoni et al., “Who Gives? The Roles of Empathy and Impulsiveness”(2018).
- Baron & Szymanska, “Heuristics and Biases in Charity” (2010).
- Berman et al., “Impediments to Effective Altruism: The Role of Subjective Preferences in Charitable Giving’ (2018).
- Brown et al., “Social Distance and Quality Ratings in Charity Choice” (2017).
- Cain et al., “Giving Versus Giving In” (2014).
- Fisman et al., “Individual Preferences for Giving” (2007).

- Fong & Oberholzer-Gee, “Truth in Giving: Experimental Evidence on the Welfare Effects of Informed Giving to the Poor” (2011).
- Huber et al., “Donate different: External and Internal Influences on Emotion-Based Donation Decisions” (2010).
- Krasteva & Yildirim, “(Un)Informed Charitable Giving” (2013).
- Mitchell & Calabrese, “Proverbs of Nonprofit Financial Management” (2019).
- Niehaus, “A Theory of Good Intentions” (2020).
- Vesterlund, “The Informational Value of Sequential Fundraising” (2003).

Financial Security and Giving

The questions of whether to give and how much to give involve financial decision-making, which is strongly influenced by an individual’s perceptions of financial security and life satisfaction. The papers below describe the financial and psychological factors that influence these often subjective feelings, such as the perceived relationship between expected income and expense, as well as the perceived costs of giving.

- Havens et al., “Charitable Giving: How Much, by Whom, to What, and How?”(2006).
- Howell et al., “Money Buys Financial Security and Psychological Need Satisfaction: Testing Need Theory in Affluence” (2013).
- Meer et al., “The Great Recession and Charitable Giving” (2016).
- Murphy, “Financial and Psychological Determinants of Donors’ Capacity to Give” (2003).
- Wiepking & Breeze, “Feeling Poor, Acting Stingy: The Effect of Money Perceptions on Charitable Giving” (2012).

Emerging Research

Most of the studies in this literature review draw on the fields of psychology, applied economics, and behavioral science. However, emerging research can offer valuable and unique approaches to the domain. From fresh methodologies like global surveys and big data to growing integration with fields like personality and cultural psychology, the papers below exemplify how new insights are being applied to research charitable giving and donor behavior.

Survey research has long been a fixture in understanding how people give. However, emerging methods are tackling complex questions of *why* people give. The papers below each look to address these questions, the first using surveys of donors, and the second using big data from giving platforms.

- Chapman et al., “Identity Motives in Charitable Giving: Explanations for Charity Preferences from a Global Donor Survey” (2020).
- Sisco & Weber, “Examining Charitable Giving in Real-world Online Donations” (2019).

Beyond more traditional forms of social psychology, other subfields have increasingly contributed their perspectives to understanding giving behaviors. The following papers provide a glimpse into how fields such as sociology, personality and cultural psychology, and others can provide insights into donor behavior.

- Louis et al., “Emerging Research on Intergroup Prosociality: Group Members’ Charitable Giving, Positive Contact, Allyship, and Solidarity with Others” (2019).
- Zhou et al., “Every Penny Counts: The Effect of Holistic-Analytic Thinking Style on Donation Decisions in the Times of Covid-19” (2021).

Studies on the non-profit sector over time also represent an intriguing development in the field, as researchers can explore how different long-term trends can affect non-profit success. An example study, suggesting a link between willingness to break reputational norms and long-term ability to spend, is listed below.

- Mitchell & Calabrese, “The Hidden Cost of Trustworthiness” (2023).

Trends in Charitable Giving

This final section outlines mostly survey-based reports in which readers can find key statistics, as well as overviews of trends and attitudes in giving.

National Trends in Philanthropy

The two publications below regularly track and report on national statistics related to giving and philanthropy.

Giving USA: The Annual Report on Philanthropy. Published annually since 1956 by the Giving USA Foundation, with research support from the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, this report includes key data on total giving as well as breakouts by sources and uses.

Philanthropy Panel Study. The Philanthropy Panel Study tracks the philanthropic behaviors of the same set of 8,000 families throughout their lives. Formerly known as the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study, this longitudinal study is now a module of the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research Panel Study of Income Dynamics.

Giving Patterns by Demographics and Channel

The reports below summarize trends in giving within specific income brackets, age ranges, and channels.

Charitable Giving by Affluent Households. Released every two years since 2006, this publication reports on the philanthropic behaviors of America's wealthiest households. The research series, previously known as the Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy, is a collaboration between Bank of America and the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy.

A Decade of Million-Dollar Gifts. This report analyzes gifts of \$1 million or more between 2000 and 2011. It categorizes gifts by donor and recipient type, among other factors.

Money for Good 2015. This report produced by the Camber Collective focuses on "the donor's voice," outlining key motivations and preferences underlying donor behavior and translating these into recommendations for fundraising organizations. It is the third in a series of reports that draws on surveys and focus groups of Americans with \$80,000 or more in household income.

Giving by Generation. This Giving USA publication from 2023 outlines generational differences in giving behaviors, highlighting key tactics for non-profits to engage younger donors and cultivate future bases of support.

Millennial Impact Report. The Case Foundation, with research support from Achieve, recently concluded its decade-long study of millennials, with topics ranging from their giving behaviors to their views on social change. Reports span from 2009 to 2019.

National Philanthropic Trust Annual Donor-Advised Fund Report. Since 2007, this annual report has tracked the size and scope of donor-advised funds across the U.S. In addition to highlighting overall growth, the report breaks contributions down by sponsor type and projects future trends in this sector.

Giving in Numbers. CECP's annual report focuses on a wide range of corporate giving programs. The most recent edition (2022) is based on data from 222 companies and includes analyses of the overall growth in corporate giving, changes in the allocation of resources, and the shifting priorities or issue areas of corporate giving strategy.

Giving Tuesday Data Commons. While not an individual report, the Data Commons aggregates and reports on individual giving behavior across the social sector and around the world.

Longitudinal Studies on Giving Behavior

The following studies analyze donation data (either real donations or survey data) over a period of time to investigate the longitudinal aspects of donation decisions.

Workplace Giving. This study focuses on individual-level factors and employee giving behavior at a large public university in two annual workplace campaigns across an eight-year period (Agypt et al. 2012).

Marriage and Generosity. This study examined how marriage affects volunteering and charitable giving, using longitudinal data from the 2001 to 2009 waves of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Einolf & Philbrick 2014).

Longitudinal Dynamics. This study investigated the dynamics in charitable giving decisions with a large data set from a Dutch panel research organization in which more than 20,000 individuals made nearly 300,000 donation decisions over a 10-month period (Leliveld & Risselada 2017).

Works Cited

- Achieve. (2015). Cause, Influence, & the Next Generation Workforce: The 2015 Millennial Impact Report. The Case Foundation. https://www.themillennialimpact.com/sites/default/files/reports/2015-MillennialImpactReport_01_0.pdf
- Adena, M., Alizade, J., Bohner, F., Harke, J., & Mesters, F. (2019). Quality certification for nonprofits, charitable giving, and donor's trust: Experimental evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 159, 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.01.007>
- Adena, M., & Huck, S. (2017). Matching donations without crowding out? Some theoretical considerations, a field, and a lab experiment. *Journal of Public Economics*, 148, 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2017.02.002>
- Adena, M., & Huck, S. (2019). Giving once, giving twice: A two-period field experiment on intertemporal crowding in charitable giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 172, 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.01.002>
- Agypt, B., Christensen, R. K., & Nesbit, R. (2012). A Tale of Two Charitable Campaigns: Longitudinal Analysis of Employee Giving at a Public University. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(5), 802–825. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011418836>
- Aknin, L. B., Dunn, E. W., Sandstrom, G. M., & Norton, M. I. (2013). Does social connection turn good deeds into good feelings? On the value of putting the “social” in prosocial spending. *International Journal of Happiness and Development*, 1(2), 155. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHD.2013.055643>
- Aknin, L.B., Dunn, E.W., Whillans, A.V., Grant, A.M., Norton, M.I. (2013). “Making a Difference Matters: Impact Unlocks the Emotional Benefits of Prosocial Spending.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 88: 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2013.01.008>
- Andreoni, J. (1990). “Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving”. (June). *The Economic Journal*. 100(401): 464–477. <http://econweb.ucsd.edu/~jandreon/Publications/ej90.pdf>
- Andreoni, J. (1998). “Toward a Theory of Charitable Fund-Raising.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(6J): 1186–1213. <http://econweb.ucsd.edu/~jandreon/Publications/JPE98.pdf>
- Andreoni, J. (2007). “Charitable Giving.” In *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition, eds. Durlauf, Steven N. and Blume, Lawrence E. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andreoni, J. “Economics of Charity and Philanthropy.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd Ed., Vol. 3, ed. Wright, James D. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Andreoni, J., Koessler, A.-K., & Serra-Garcia, M. (2018). Who Gives? The Roles of Empathy and Impulsiveness. In K. Scharf & M. Tonin (Eds.), *The Economics of Philanthropy: Donations and Fundraising* (p. 0). The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11694.003.0005>
- Andreoni, J., Rao, J. M., & Trachtman, H. (2017). Avoiding the Ask: A Field Experiment on Altruism, Empathy, and Charitable Giving. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(3), 625–653. <https://doi.org/10.1086/691703>
- Andreoni, J., & Serra-Garcia, M. (2021). Time inconsistent charitable giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 198, 104391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2021.104391>
- Anik, L., Aknin, L. B., Norton, M. I., & Dunn, E. W. (2009). “Feeling Good about Giving: The Benefits (and Costs) of Self-Interested Charitable Behavior.” *Harvard Business School*. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/10-012_0350a55d-585b-419d-89e7-91833a612fb5.pdf
- Anik, L., Norton, M.I., & Ariely, D. (2014). “Contingent Match Incentives Increase Donations.” *American Marketing Association*, LI: 790–801. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.13.0432>
- Baron, J. & Szymanska, E. (2010). “Heuristics and Biases in Charity.” In *The Science of Giving: Experimental Approaches to the Study of Charity*, eds. Daniel M. Oppenheimer and Christopher Y. Olivola. New York, NY: Psychology Press, 215–235.
- Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2007). “Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review.” *Science of Generosity*. https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/17632/generosity_and_philanthropy_final.pdf
- Berman, J. Z., Barasch, A., Levine, E. E., & Small, D. A. (2018). Impediments to effective altruism: The role of subjective preferences in charitable giving. *Psychological Science*, 29(5), 834–844. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617747648>

- Bhati, A. (2021). Does Implicit Color Bias Reduce Giving? Learnings from Fundraising Survey Using Implicit Association Test (IAT). *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32(2), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00277-8>
- Bock, D. E., Eastman, J. K., & Eastman, K. L. (2018). Encouraging Consumer Charitable Behavior: The Impact of Charitable Motivations, Gratitude, and Materialism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(4), 1213–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3203-x>
- Breman, Anna. (2011). “Give More Tomorrow: Two Field Experiments on Altruism and Intertemporal Choice.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(11): 1349–1357. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272711000764>
- Brown, A. L., Meer, J., & Williams, J. F. (2013). *Why Do People Volunteer? An Experimental Analysis of Preferences for Time Donations* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 2269480). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2269480>
- Brown, A. L., Meer, J., & Williams, J. F. (2017). Social distance and quality ratings in charity choice. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 66, 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.04.006>
- Burger, J.M., Messian, N., Patel, S., del Prado, A. and Anderson, C. (2004). “What a Coincidence! The Effects of Incidental Similarity on Compliance.” *Personality Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(1): 35–43. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0146167203258838>
- Butera, L., & Horn, J. (2016). Good News, Bad News, and Social Image: The Market for Charitable Giving. Working Papers, Article 1041. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/gms/wpaper/1041.html>
- Butera, L., & Houser, D. (2018). Delegating altruism: Toward an understanding of agency in charitable giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 155, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.08.010>
- Cain, D. M., Dana, J., & Newman, G. E. (2014). Giving versus giving in. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 505–533. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.911576>
- Camber Collective. (2015). “Money for Good 2015: Revealing the Voice of the Donor in Philanthropic Giving.” [http://static1.squarespace.com/static/55723b6be4b05ed81f077108/t/56957ee6df40f330ae018b81/1452637938035/\\$FG+2015_Final+Report_01122016.pdf](http://static1.squarespace.com/static/55723b6be4b05ed81f077108/t/56957ee6df40f330ae018b81/1452637938035/$FG+2015_Final+Report_01122016.pdf)
- Cartwright, E. J., & Mirza, Z. (2021). Charitable giving when donors are constrained to give a minimum amount. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 73(1), 295–316. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oepp/gpz063>
- Castillo, M., Petrie, R., & Samek, A. (2017) Time to Give: A Field Experiment on Intertemporal Charitable Giving. https://bpb-us-e2.wpmucdn.com/sites.utdallas.edu/dist/8/1090/files/2022/03/ragan_petrie_paper.pdf
- CECP. Giving in Numbers. <http://cecp.co/measurement/benchmarking-reports/giving-in-numbers.html>
- Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. (2010). “Charitable Giving and the Millennial Generation.” *Giving USA* spotlight, Issue 2. <http://download.2164.net/PDF-newsletters/Giving%20USA%202010%20spotlight.pdf>
- Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. Philanthropy Panel Study. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/6310>
- Chapman, C. M., Masser, B. M., & Louis, W. R. (2020). Identity Motives in Charitable Giving: Explanations for Charity Preferences from a Global Donor Survey. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(9), 1277–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21362>
- Chicago Community Trust. (2015). On the Table 2015 Impact Report. http://www.onthetablereport.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/OntheTable_2015_report.pdf
- Chuan, A., & Samek, A.S. (2014). “Feel the Warmth” Glow: A Field Experiment on Manipulating the Act of Giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 108(December), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.09.011>
- Chao, M. (2017). Demotivating incentives and motivation crowding out in charitable giving. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(28), 7301–7306. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1616921114>
- Crosno, R., Handy, F. & Shang, J. (2010) “Gendered Giving: The Influence of Social Norms on the Donation Behavior of Men and Women.” *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15(2): 199–213. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/nvsm.385>
- Damgaard, M. T., & Gravert, C. (2017). Now or never! The effect of deadlines on charitable giving: Evidence from two natural field experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 66, 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.04.013>

- Dana, J., Weber, R. A., & Kuang, J. X. (2007). Exploiting Moral Wiggle Room: Experiments Demonstrating an Illusory Preference for Fairness. *Economic Theory*, 33(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00199-006-0153-z>
- Dannenberg, A., Johansson-Stenman, O., & Wetzels, H. (2022). Status for the Good Guys: An Experiment on Charitable Giving. *Economic Inquiry*, 60(2), 721–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.13039>
- DellaVigna, S., List, J. A., & Malmendier, U. (2012). Testing for Altruism and Social Pressure in Charitable Giving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1), 1–56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41337205>
- DellaVigna, S., List, J. A., Malmendier, U., & Rao, G. (2013). The Importance of Being Marginal: Gender Differences in Generosity. *American Economic Review*, 103(3), 586–590. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.3.586>
- Desmet, P., & Feinberg, F. M. (2003). Ask and ye shall receive: The effect of the appeals scale on consumers' donation behavior. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 24(3), 349–376. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870\(02\)00166-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(02)00166-6)
- Eckel, C. C., Herberich, D. H., & Meer, J. (2017). A field experiment on directed giving at a public university. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 66, 66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.04.007>
- Einolf, C.J. & Philbrick, D. (2014), Generous or Greedy Marriage? A Longitudinal Study of Volunteering and Charitable Giving. *Fam Relat*(76): 573-586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12115>
- Exley, Christine L. & Petrie, Ragan. (2015). "Finding Excuses to Decline the Ask." Working Paper. Harvard Business School. <https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/finding-excuses-to-decline-the-ask>
- Falk, A. (2007), Gift Exchange in the Field. *Econometrica*, 75: 1501-1511. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2007.00800.x>
- Farmer, A., Kidwell, B., & Hardesty, D. M. (2020). Helping a Few a Lot or Many a Little: Political Ideology and Charitable Giving. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 30(4), 614–630. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1164>
- Fehrler, S., & Przepiorka, W. (2016). Choosing a partner for social exchange: Charitable giving as a signal of trustworthiness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 129, 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2016.06.006>
- Fidelity Charitable. (2015). Giving and Planning: Research Insights. <http://www.fidelitycharitable.org/giving-strategies/grant-making/giving-and-planning.shtml>
- Fielding, D., Knowles, S., & Robertson, K. (2020). Materialists and altruists in a charitable donation experiment. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 72(1), 216–234. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oepp/gpaz027>
- Fisman, R., Kariv, S. and Markovits, D. (2007). "Individual Preferences for Giving." *American Economic Review*, 97(5): 1858-1876. <http://www.doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.5.1858>
- Fong, C.M & Oberholzer-Gee, F. (2011). "Truth in Giving: Experimental Evidence on the Welfare Effects of Informed Giving to the Poor." *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(5): 436-444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.10.017>
- Freeman, D., Aquino, K., & McFerran, B. (2009). Overcoming Beneficiary Race as an Impediment to Charitable Donations: Social Dominance Orientation, the Experience of Moral Elevation, and Donation Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(1), 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208325415>
- Garcia, T., Massoni, S., & Villeval, M. C. (2020). Ambiguity and Excuse-Driven Behavior in Charitable Giving. *European Economic Review*, 124, 103412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2020.103412>
- Genevsky, A., Västfjäll, D., Slovic, P., & Knutson, B.. (2013). Neural Underpinnings of the Identifiable Victim Effect: Affect Shifts Preferences for Giving. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(43), 17188. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2348-13.2013>
- Giving Tuesday Data Commons. GivingTuesday. (2023, July 25). <https://www.givingtuesday.org/givingtuesday-data-commons>
- Giving USA (2023). Giving USA 2023: Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2022. <https://givingusa.org/>
- Giving USA. (2023). (rep.). *Giving by Generation: Examining the shifts in giving among donor generations*. McLean, VA: Giving USA.
- Goeschl, T., Kettner, S. E., Lohse, J., & Schwioren, C. (2018). From Social Information to Social Norms: Evidence from Two Experiments on Donation Behaviour. *Games*, 9(4), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/g9040091>
- Goswami, I. and Urminsky, O. (2016). "When Should the Ask Be a Nudge? The Effect of Default Amounts on Charitable Donations." *Journal of Marketing Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.15.0001>

- Harbaugh, W. (1998). "What do Donations Buy? A Model of Philanthropy Based on Prestige and Warm Glow." *Journal of Public Economics*, 67:269-284. <http://pages.uoregon.edu/harbaugh/Papers/Donations.pdf>
- Havens, J.J. & O'Herlihy, M.A. & Schervish, P. (2006). Charitable giving: How much, by whom, to what, and how?. *The non-profit sector: A research handbook*. 542-567.
- Hill, G., & Howell, R. T. (2014). Moderators and mediators of pro-social spending and well-being: The influence of values and psychological need satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 69, 69-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.05.013>
- Hill, M. 2012. "The Relationship Between Volunteering and Charitable Giving: Review of Evidence." CGAP Working Paper. <http://www.cgap.org.uk/uploads/Working%20Papers/WP%20volunteering%20and%20charitable%20giving%20MH.pdf>
- Howell, R. T., Kurai, M., & Tam, L. (2013). Money buys financial security and psychological need satisfaction: Testing need theory in affluence. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(1), 17-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9774-5>
- Hsee, C. K., Zhang, J., Lu, Z. Y., & Xu, F. (2013). Unit Asking: A Method to Boost Donations and Beyond. *Psychological Science*, 24(9), 1801-1808. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613482947>
- Huber, M., Van Boven, L., & McGraw, A. P. (2011). Donate different: External and internal influences on emotion-based donation decisions. In D. M. Oppenheimer & C. Y. Olivola (Eds.), *The science of giving: Experimental approaches to the study of charity* (pp. 179-197). Psychology Press.
- Imas, A. (2014). Working for the "warm glow": On the benefits and limits of prosocial incentives. *Journal of Public Economics*, 114, 14-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2013.11.006>
- Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. 2013. A Decade of Million-dollar-Gifts: A Closer Look at Major Gifts by Type of Recipient Organization, 2000-2011. http://go.ccsfundraising.com/mdl_overview
- Indiana University Lilly School of Philanthropy. (2021). *The 2021 Bank of America Study of Philanthropy: Charitable Giving by Affluent Households*. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/ff2ebcdc-fe48-41fe-baf9-6437b62f8bfa/content>
- Jang, H., & Chu, W. (2022). The effect of message features on donations in donation-based crowdfunding. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 21(6), 1464-1477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.2099>
- Kamdar, A., Levitt, S.D., List, J.A., Mullaney, B. & Syverson, C. (2015). "Once and Done: Leveraging Behavioral Economics to Increase Charitable Contributions." *Science of Philanthropy Initiative Working Paper*, 025. http://spihub.org/site/resource_files/publications/spi_wp_025_list.pdf
- Karlan, D. and List, J. (2006). "Does Price Matter in Charitable Giving? Evidence From a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment." *American Economic Review*, 97(5): 1774-1793. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w12338>
- Karlan, D. and List, J. (2020). How can Bill and Melinda Gates increase other people's donations to fund public goods? *Journal of Public Economics*, 191, 104296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104296>
- Karlan, D., List, J.A. and Shafir, E. (2010). "Small Matches and Charitable Giving: Evidence from a Natural Field Experiment." *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(2011):344-350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.024>
- Karlan, D., & McConnell, M. A. (2014). Hey look at me: The effect of giving circles on giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 106, 402-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.06.013>
- Karlan, D. & Wood, D. (2014). "The Effect of Effectiveness: Donor Response to Aid Effectiveness in a Direct Mail Fundraising Experiment." Economic Growth Center. Discussion Paper 1038. http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp1038.pdf
- Kellner, C., Reinstein, D., & Riener, G. (2019). Ex-ante commitments to "give if you win" exceed donations after a win. *Journal of Public Economics*, 169, 109-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.10.009>
- Kessler, J.B. & Milkman, K.L. (2014). "Identity in Charitable Giving." Working Paper. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/inm/ormnsc/v64y2018i2p-845-859.html>
- Knowles, S., Servátka, M., & Sullivan, T. (2015). Deadlines, Procrastination, and Inattention in Charitable Giving: A Field Experiment. Economics Discussion Papers Series, No. 1501. University of Otago. <http://hdl.handle.net/10523/5519>
- Kogut, T., & Ritov, I. (2005). The singularity effect of identified victims in separate and joint evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.02.003>

- Kopelman, S. (1998). "The Effect of Mood on Social Value Orientation: Positive Mood Induces Prosocial Behavior While Negative Mood Induces Individualistic and Competitive Behavior." *Kellogg Journal of Organization Behavior*.
- Kraft-Todd, G., Norton, M. I., & Rand, D. (2022). Setting a Price for Charitable Giving Increases Donations. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kw5t9>
- Kraut, R. E. (1973). Effects of social labeling on giving to charity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(6), 551–562. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(73\)90037-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(73)90037-1)
- Krasteva, S., & Yildirim, H. (2013). (Un)Informed charitable giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 106, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2013.06.011>
- Landry, C. E., Lange, A., List, J. A., Price, M. K., & Rupp, N. G. (2006). Toward an Understanding of the Economics of Charity: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2), 747–782. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25098805>
- Leliveld, M. C., & Risselada, H. (2017). Dynamics in charity donation decisions: Insights from a large longitudinal data set. *Science advances*, 3(9), e1700077. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700077>
- Li, H., Liang, J., Xu, H. et al. Does Windfall Money Encourage Charitable Giving? An Experimental Study. *Voluntas* 30, 841–848 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-9985-y>
- Lin, S. C., & Reich, T. (2018). To Give or Not to Give? Choosing Chance Under Moral Conflict. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 28(2), 211–233. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1008>
- List, J. A., & Lucking Reiley, D. (2002). The Effects of Seed Money and Refunds on Charitable Giving: Experimental Evidence from a University Capital Campaign. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(1), 215–233. <https://doi.org/10.1086/324392>
- Liu, W. and Aaker, J. (2008). "The Happiness of Giving: The Time-ask Effect." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1292548>
- Louis, W. R., Thomas, E., Chapman, C. M., Achia, T., Wibisono, S., Mirnajafi, Z., & Droogendyk, L. (2019). Emerging Research on Intergroup Prosociality: Group Members' Charitable Giving, Positive Contact, Allyship, and Solidarity with Others. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(3), e12436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12436>
- Lv, L., & Huang, M. (2022). Can Personalized Recommendations in Charity Advertising Boost Donation? The Role of Perceived Autonomy. *Journal of Advertising*, 0(0), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2022.2109082>
- Macdonnell, R. & White, K. (2015). How Construals of Money versus Time Impact Consumer Charitable Giving. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(4), 551–563. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv042>
- MacLaughlin, S. (2014). "Charitable Giving Report: How Nonprofit Fundraising Performed in 2014." Blackbaud Idea Lab. <https://institute.blackbaud.com/asset/2014-charitable-giving-report/>
- Martin, R. & Randal, J. (2008). "How is Donation Behavior Affected by the Donations of Others?" *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 67(1): 228–238. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268107001631>
- Mayo, J.W. and Tinsley, C.H. (2008). "Warm Glow and Charitable Giving: Why the Wealthy do not Give to Charity." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 30(2009): 490–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2008.06.001>
- Meer, J., Miller, D. H., & Wulfsberg, E. (2016). "The Great Recession and Charitable Giving." National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.doi.org/10.3386/w22902>
- Meer, J. & Rosen, H.S. (2009). "The ABCs of Charitable Solicitation." NBER Working Paper. 15307. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15037>
- Mesch, D., Osili, U., Ackerman, J. & Dale, E. (2015). "How and Why Women Give: Current and Future Directions for Research on Women's Philanthropy." Women's Philanthropy Institute. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/6983>
- Metzger, L., & Günther, I. (2019). Making an Impact? The Relevance of Information on Aid Effectiveness for Charitable Giving. A Laboratory Experiment. *Journal of Development Economics*, 136, 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.08.015>
- Mitchell, G. E., & Calabrese, T. D. (2019). Proverbs of Nonprofit Financial Management. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 49(6), 649–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074018770458>

- Mitchell, G. E., & Calabrese, T. D. (2023). The Hidden Cost of Trustworthiness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 52(2), 304–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640221092794>
- Moon, A., & VanEpps, E. (2022). *Giving Suggestions: Using Quantity Requests to Increase Donations* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 3080731). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3080731>
- Murphy, T.B. (2003). Financial and psychological determinants of donors' capacity to give. *Philanthropic Fundraising*, 2000: 33-50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pf.2903>
- National Philanthropic Trust. 2015. Donor-Advised Fund Report 2015. <http://www.nptrust.org/daf-report/>
- Niehaus, P. (2020). "A Theory of Good Intentions." National Bureau of Economic Research. http://econweb.ucsd.edu/~pniehaus/papers/good_intentions.pdf
- Null, C. (2011). Warm glow, information, and inefficient charitable giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(5–6), 455–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.06.018>
- O'Brien, E., & Kassirer, S. (2019). People Are Slow to Adapt to the Warm Glow of Giving. *Psychological Science*, 30(2), 193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618814145>
- Okten, C., Osili, U. & Ozer, E. "Life Satisfaction and Charitable Giving: New Evidence from the PSID." https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/event_resources/lifesatisfactiondonations14112.pdf
- Olivola, C., and Shafir, E. (2011). "The Martyrdom Effect: When Pain and Effort Increase Prosocial Contributions." *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 26, 91-105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.767>
- Peng, S., Kim, M., & Deat, F. (2019). The Effects of Nonprofit Reputation on Charitable Giving: A Survey Experiment. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(4), 811–827. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00130-7>
- Pfeiffer, B. E., Sundar, A., & Cao, E. (2023). The influence of language style (formal vs. colloquial) on the effectiveness of charitable appeals. *Psychology & Marketing*, 40, 542–553. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21729>
- Points of Light. 2014. The Civic 50: A Roadmap for Corporate Community Engagement in America. http://www.civic50.org/Civic50_2014_SummaryReport_FINAL.pdf
- Pönitzsch, G. (2017). Pro-Social Behavior by Groups and Individuals: Evidence from Contributions to a Global Public Good (SSRN Scholarly Paper 2940249). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2940249>
- Proulx, J. D. E., Akin, L. B., & Barasch, A. (2022). Let's Give Together: Can Collaborative Giving Boost Generosity? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640221074699>
- Rasul, I. and Huck, S. (2010) "Transactions Costs in Charitable Giving: Evidence from Two Field Experiments." *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-1682.2494>
- Ratner, R.K. & Miller, D.T. (2001). "The Norm of Self-Interest and Its Effects on Social Action." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1): 5-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.5>
- Rondeau, D. and List, J. (2008). "Matching and Challenge Gifts to Charity: Evidence from Laboratory and Natural Field Experiments." *Experimental Economics*, 11(3): 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-007-9190-0>
- Saito, Y., Ueshima, A., Tanida, S., & Kameda, T. (2019). How Does Social Information Affect Charitable Giving?: Empathic Concern Promotes Support for Underdog Recipient. *Social Neuroscience*, 14(6), 751–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2019.1599421>
- Samek, A & Sheremeta, R.M. (2015). "Selective Recognition: How to Recognize Donors to Increase Charitable Giving." Economic Science Institute, Working Papers. 15–26. http://www.chapman.edu/research-and-institutions/economic-science-institute/_files/WorkingPapers/Red-Cross-2015.pdf
- Sasaki, S. (2019). Majority Size and Conformity Behavior in Charitable Giving: Field Evidence from a Donation-Based Crowdfunding Platform in Japan. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 70, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.10.011>
- Shang, J. & Croson, R. (2009). "Field Experiments in Charitable Contribution: The Impact of Social Influence on the Voluntary Provision of Public Goods." <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.565.1945&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Sharps, D. L., & Schroeder, J. (2019). The Preference for Distributed Helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 117, 954–977. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2019-14549-001>
- Sisco, M. R., & Weber, E. U. (2019). Examining Charitable Giving in Real-World Online Donations. *Nature Communications*, 10(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-11852-z>
- Small, D.A. & Loewenstein, G. (2003). “Helping a Victim or Helping the Victim: Altruism and Identifiability.” *The Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 26(1): 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022299422219>
- Small, D.A., Loewenstein, G., & Slovic, P. (2007). “Sympathy and Callousness: The Impact of Deliberative Thought on Donations to Identifiable and Statistical Victims.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102(2): 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.01.005>
- Smith, R. W., Faro, D., & Burson, K. A. (2013). More for the Many: The Influence of Entitativity on Charitable Giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(5), 961–976. <https://doi.org/10.1086/666470>
- Soetevent, A. R. (2005). Anonymity in giving in a natural context—A field experiment in 30 churches. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89(11), 2301–2323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2004.11.002>
- Sonntag, A., & Zizzo, D. J. (2015). On Reminder Effects, Drop-Outs and Dominance: Evidence from an Online Experiment on Charitable Giving. *PLOS ONE*, 10(8), e0134705. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134705>
- U.S. Trust and Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University. 2014. “The U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy: Issues Driving Charitable Activities Among Wealthy Households.” <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/6360>
- UK Behavioural Insights Team. 2013. “Applying Behavioural Insights to Charitable Giving.” https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/203286/BIT_Charitable_Giving_Paper.pdf
- Van Steenburg, E., Anaza, N. A., Ashhar, A., Barrios, A., Deutsch, A. R., Gardner, M. P., Priya, P., Roy, A., Sivaraman, A., & Taylor, K. A. (2022). The New World of Philanthropy: How Changing Financial Behavior, Public Policies, and COVID-19 Affect Nonprofit Fundraising and Marketing. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 56(3), 1079–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12461>
- van Teunenbroek, C., Bekkers, R., & Beersma, B. (2020). Look to Others Before You Leap: A Systematic Literature Review of Social Information Effects on Donation Amounts. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019869537>
- van Teunenbroek, C., Bekkers, R., & Beersma, B. (2021). They Ought to Do It Too: Understanding Effects of Social Information on Donation Behavior and Mood. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 18(2), 229–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-020-00270-3>
- Vesterlund, L. (2003). The informational value of sequential fundraising. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(3–4), 627–657. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(01\)00187-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(01)00187-6)
- Weisz, E., & Cikara, M. (2020). Merely Increasing Action Options Increases Charitable Donation [Preprint]. In Review. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-59021/v1>
- Wiepking, P. and Breeze, B. (2012), Feeling poor, acting stingy: the effect of money perceptions on charitable giving. *Int. J. Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Mark.*, 17: 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.415>
- Xu, A. J., Rodas, M. A., & Torelli, C. J. (2020). Generosity Without Borders: The Interactive Effect of Spatial Distance and Donation Goals on Charitable Giving. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 161, 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.01.007>
- Yang, A., Hsee, C.K. & Urminsky, O. (2014). “Eager to Help Yet Reluctant to Give: How Pro-social Effort and Pro-social Choices Diverge.” http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2733331
- Yildirim, P., Simonov, A., Petrova, M., & Perez-Truglia, R. (2020). Are Political and Charitable Giving Substitutes? Evidence from the United States (Working Paper No. 26616; Working Paper Series). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w26616>
- Zhou, X., Kim, S., & Wang, L. (2019). Money Helps When Money Feels: Money Anthropomorphism Increases Charitable Giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45(5), 953–972. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy012>
- Zhou, X., Requero, B., Gonçalves, D., & Santos, D. (2021). Every Penny Counts: The Effect of Holistic-Analytic Thinking Style on Donation Decisions in the Times of Covid-19. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110713>



To find out more, visit us at ideas42.org or follow us [@ideas42](https://twitter.com/ideas42)  