
A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

XX(X) 1–50

© 2010 SAGE Publications

Reprints and permission: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

DOI: 10.1177/0899764010380927

<http://nvsq.sagepub.com>



René Bekkers¹ and Pamala Wiepking¹

Abstract

The authors present an overview of the academic literature on charitable giving based on a literature review of more than 500 articles. They structure their review around the central question of why people donate money to charitable organizations. We identify eight mechanisms as the most important forces that drive charitable giving: (a) awareness of need; (b) solicitation; (c) costs and benefits; (d) altruism; (e) reputation; (f) psychological benefits; (g) values; (h) efficacy. These mechanisms can provide a basic theoretical framework for future research explaining charitable giving.

Keywords

Philanthropy, literature review, mechanisms, charitable giving, altruism, research

An overwhelming body of knowledge is available on philanthropy in the social sciences. Research on philanthropy appears in journals from very different disciplines, including marketing, economics, social psychology, biological psychology, neurology and brain sciences, sociology, political science, anthropology, biology, and evolutionary psychology. Scholars as well as practitioners educated in these disciplines could benefit from a systematic survey of the mechanisms studied in the academic literature. We present an overview of research on determinants of charitable giving from all disciplines.

¹VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands

Corresponding Author:

René Bekkers, Center for Philanthropic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands

Email: R.Bekkers@fsw.vu.nl

More than 30 years ago, David Horton Smith wrote that “scholars concerned about voluntary action research should consciously seek out cross-disciplinary inputs” (D. H. Smith, 1975), a call that Payton, Tempel, and Rosso (1991) and Clotfelter (1997) more recently made as well. Since the 1980s, philanthropic studies have emerged as a new, multidisciplinary field in the social sciences (Katz, 1999). However, a strong tendency in the past 30 years toward specialization among scientists in different disciplines has created the undesirable situation that scholars usually know little about the insights gathered in other disciplines. In addition, few of the insights from the academic literature have found their way in handbooks on fundraising. The assessment by Lindahl and Conley (2002) that fundraising is “a field in need of a greater base of substantive, objective research rather than a casual acceptance of anecdotal evidence” still holds. For instance, Warwick’s (2001) guide to successful fundraising letters contains literally zero references to scientific research. This article aims to guide scholars as well as practitioners in the third sector through the available knowledge on determinants of charitable giving by individuals and households. We define charitable giving as the donation of money to an organization that benefits others beyond one’s own family.

Previous reviews available to researchers in philanthropy are mostly confined to a specific discipline or a limited period of time. Recently, Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) reviewed the literature on charitable giving from a marketing perspective. Reviews in the field of social psychology have dealt with helping behavior in general (Batson, 1998; Piliavin & Charng, 1990; Schroeder, Dovidio, Penner, & Piliavin, 1995; Schwartz, 1975). Helping behavior is a very broad category of actions, ranging from assisting a stranger in an emergency (e.g., saving somebody from a fire, (Latané & Darley, 1970) to donating a piece of one’s body to a relative (e.g., bone marrow donation; Schwarz & Howard, 1980). Charitable giving is studied as an example of helping behavior in the social psychological literature. The subject gained popularity in mainstream social psychology toward the end of the 1970s and continued to be studied in applied social psychology in the 1980s. However, charitable giving is likely to be different from many other forms of helping behavior. One crucial difference is that the recipient of charitable donations is usually absent from the context in which a donation is made, while the beneficiary is present in the helping situation investigated in most studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s. Presence of a beneficiary strongly affects the social dynamics and motivations for helping behavior but is atypical for many examples of philanthropy. The present review differs from that by Piliavin and Charng (1990) in that we are not concerned primarily with the question to what extent prosocial behavior can be considered altruistic.

Our review also differs from that of the overviews of economic theories of giving by Andreoni (2006), Vesterlund (2006), and Meier (2007b). Economists are increasingly trying to incorporate basic insights from sociology and social psychology into their models. However, many classical studies that provided these insights are unknown or not cited in present day economics. Our review may serve as a reference resource for

classical intuitions. In addition, we present studies in disciplines like marketing, geography, and biology that are not well known.

To our knowledge, no systematic reviews on philanthropy exist in the fields of sociology or psychology. Sociologist John Wilson (2000) reviewed the literature on volunteering. Because volunteering like philanthropy is a form of formal prosocial behavior, there are many striking parallels between their respective determinants.

Our review differs from the reviews by Sargeant (1999), Lindahl and Conley (2002), Havens, O'Herlihy, and Schervish (2007) and Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007), by covering a longer period of time, studies from a larger number of sources, and ordering the material in different categories. Many of the categories used in previous reviews are broad groups of predictors. We present predictors of philanthropy in terms of eight mechanisms that explain why these predictors are related to philanthropy.

We hope that our review will not only be useful for an academic audience but also for practitioners. Experimental studies often shed light on why some people are more likely to give and some give more generously than others. Fundraisers can take advantage of the insights gained in these studies to increase fundraising effectiveness.

Method

This article is based on an extensive literature search that we conducted using seven types of sources. We searched (a) online full text collections of publishers (Wiley Interscience, Emerald Insight, SpringerLink, Sage Journals Online; Elsevier's Scirus); (b) academic databases (PsychInfo, Sociological Abstracts, PubMed, EconLit); (c) Google Scholar; (d) the authors' own literature databases; (e) the references cited in the articles we found; (f) the IUPUI Payton Library Philanthropic Studies Index; (g) Arnova Abstracts. We used the following keywords: donations, philanthropy, charitable giving, charitable behavior(u)r, altruism, helping, prosocial behavior. We concluded our search in August 2007. The results of this search formed the basis for this article. References to articles that have been published since we concluded our search have been updated.

Then we refined our search to include only papers that contained empirical analyses of charitable giving by adult individuals or households. Theoretical papers (not reporting empirical data), studies using children as participants, and studies on charitable behavior of organizations are not reviewed. Studies on contributions to public goods in experiments are included only when such contributions involve real monetary donations to real charitable organizations. Studies identifying individuals as beneficiaries (e.g., "dictator games" in experimental economics) are included only when beneficiaries are strangers and when participants consider the outcome of their decisions to be charitable donations. Studies in languages other than English are disregarded although they were used to retrieve references to other studies with characteristics that fit our restrictions. Our search yielded only a few publications in languages other than English, notably Dutch, German, Italian, Spanish, and Polish. Most of the studies were

conducted in the United States, followed by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Canada. This may be a source of bias although it is unclear to what extent the bias is systematic.

Unless otherwise noted, “giving” refers to voluntary charitable donations by households or individuals to nonprofit organizations as reported in questionnaires or observed in experiments. Studies on donations to specific types of charitable organizations (e.g., religion, health, alumni donations) are included, but denoted as such. Unless otherwise noted, all studies are published in academic (but not necessarily peer-reviewed) journals, books, or edited volumes. References to unpublished research were included only if the research was publicly available.

In a literature survey like this, space constraints prohibit us to do justice to all the arguments, findings, and methods of the studies reviewed. Also the reader should make his or her own judgment on the quality of the papers we reviewed. We have refrained from judgments on the quality of individual publications. To facilitate the reader’s own judgments on the quality of the work cited, we have constructed a database containing valuable information on the individual publications. Among others, this database includes the exact citation, the mechanism investigated, the discipline of publication (based on the journal and/or first author’s affiliation), and the methodology used (survey, experiment). Two criteria we believe increase research quality are (a) when the research aims to explicitly test or measures mechanisms that can explain charitable giving and (b) when more adequate statistical models are used.

Why Do People Give? Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving

Experiments in economics, sociology, social psychology, biology, and marketing have shown how situations can be created that encourage giving. The situations in these experiments are created by researchers, which allows for causal inferences about determinants of giving. From these experiments, conclusions can be drawn about why people give. We reviewed this literature and identify eight mechanisms as the key mechanisms that have been studied as determinants of philanthropy. They are (a) awareness of need; (b) solicitation; (c) costs and benefits; (d) altruism; (e) reputation; (f) psychological benefits; (g) values; (h) efficacy.

Our categorization is a refinement and extension of previous categorizations that distinguished types of “costs and benefits” associated with participation in voluntary organizations (Chinman, Wandersman, & Goodman, 2005; Clark & Wilson, 1961). In their theory of incentive systems in organizations, Clark and Wilson (1961) distinguished material benefits, solidary benefits, and purposive benefits associated with participation in organizations. Charitable giving is a form of participation. Therefore the incentive theory should be applicable. Material benefits are tangible rewards that can be assigned a monetary value; solidary benefits are intangible social rewards, and purposive benefits are intangible benefits associated with the goals of an organization (Chinman et al., 2005). However, the incentive theory also seems incomplete when applied to philanthropy. We have refined this typology to repair two specific drawbacks.

Table 1. Overview of Mechanisms

Mechanism	What?	Where?	Who?	
	Tangible or intangible	Within, outside or between people	Actors	Targets
1. Need	Tangible and intangible	Within, outside and between	Beneficiaries and organizations	Donors
2. Solicitation	Tangible and intangible	Between	Beneficiaries and organizations	Donors
3. Costs/benefits	Tangible	Outside	Organizations	Donors
4. Altruism	Tangible	Outside	Donors and organizations	Beneficiaries
5. Reputation	Intangible	Between	Alters	Donors
6. Psychological costs and benefits	Intangible	Within	Donors	Donors
7. Values	Intangible	Within	Donors	Donors and beneficiaries
8. Efficacy	Intangible	Within	Organizations	Donors

The first drawback is that previous categorizations assume purposive actors who make deliberate choices if and to what extent they will participate, depending on the consequences of their participation actions. In this perspective, the actions of charitable organizations and beneficiaries are ignored. In many cases donors do not actively seek opportunities to donate, but simply respond to the needs of beneficiaries and solicitations from charitable organizations. We distinguish these influences in separate mechanisms.

The second drawback is that the types of categories are rather broad and multidimensional, covering qualitatively different processes that affect charitable giving. Purposive benefits, for instance, cover such different mechanisms such as altruism (benefits for beneficiaries), values (endorsement of the charity’s goals), personal satisfaction from contributing, and efficacy of contributions. We argue that it is more informative to distinguish these influences in separate mechanisms.

Our categorization of mechanisms is based on differences in four dimensions (see Table 1), that can be captured by the questions “What?” “Where?” and “Who?” The first dimension is the “what,” or the physical form of the mechanism. Is it a tangible object that can be touched? The second dimension is the “where,” or the location of the mechanism. Is it located within, outside, or between individuals? The third and fourth dimension constitute the “who,” or the parties involved. The third dimension is the actor in the mechanism. We distinguish beneficiaries, (charitable, nonprofit) organizations, donors, and alters (people in the social environments of donors). The fourth dimension is the target of the cause (who is affected). Targets may be donors or beneficiaries.

Each of the mechanisms is a different combination of values on the four dimensions. Table 1 is not exhaustive because not all combinations occurred in the literature. The order in which the eight mechanisms are presented below does not reflect the importance or causal strength of the mechanisms. Rather, the order corresponds to the chronological order in which they affect giving in the typical act of donation. In doing so, we follow previous reviews of related literatures (Schroeder et al., 1995; Schwartz, 1975; Schwartz & Howard, 1984), in which prosocial behavior and helping others are conceptualized as a series of consecutive decisions. For each mechanism, we present the main effect. In many cases, these main effects can be moderated (or sometimes mediated) by other factors. Moderating factors are factors that weaken or strengthen the effect of the mechanism: conditions or personal characteristics that interact with the main effect. More information on factors moderating the mechanisms can be found in an appendix to this article, available online.

Mechanism 1: Awareness of Need

Awareness of need is a first prerequisite for philanthropy. People have to become aware of a need for support. In terms of the four dimensions in Table 1, needs may be tangible as well as intangible (Dimension 1: the “what”); needs reside within, between, and outside people (Dimension 2: the “where”); needs originate from beneficiaries and organizations and target donors (Dimensions 3 and 4: the “who”). People may have material needs for tangible objects outside themselves (e.g., food, shelter, security, medication, treatment), social needs (e.g., a need for company, which is something intangible that happens between people) or psychological needs (intangible phenomena within themselves: e.g., consolation). Awareness of need is a mechanism that is largely beyond the control of donors, preceding the conscious deliberation of costs and benefits of donating. It is the result of actions of beneficiaries (who seek help) and charitable organizations (who communicate needs to potential donors).

The effects of need have been documented mostly in social psychology, beginning with a series of field experiments from the mid 1960s onwards (Berkowitz, 1968; Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964; Schwartz, 1975). In these experiments a variety of helping behaviors were studied, including practical assistance, blood donation, organ donation, as well as donating money. Generally speaking, the degree of need for help is positively related to the likelihood that help will be given (Levitt & Kornhaber, 1977; Schwartz, 1974; Staub & Baer, 1974). One study specifically tested for effects of need on donations (Wagner & Wheeler, 1969) and revealed that not objective need but subjective perceptions of need are crucial. An experimental study tested for effects of watching a telethon and found a positive effect on attitudes toward disabled people but not on donations (Feldman & Feldman, 1985). Survey studies reveal that more generous alumni perceive a higher need for contributions to their alma mater (Diamond & Kashyap, 1997; Weerts & Ronca, 2007) and that volunteers perceive a higher need for volunteers in their community (Unger, 1991). A survey study on intentions to donate

to international relief organizations also reveals a positive effect of need (Cheung & Chan, 2000). A survey study on donations to panhandlers shows that perceived need is positively related to donations (Lee & Farrell, 2003).

Experiments usually manipulate need by exposing participants to needy victims. Knowing a victim, however, also promotes giving to other victims to whom the individual is not exposed directly (Small & Simonsohn, 2006). In focus groups, donors cite knowing a (potential) beneficiary as a motive for charitable contributions (Polonsky, Shelley, & Voola, 2002; Radley & Kennedy, 1995). Survey studies also suggest that awareness of need is increased when people know potential beneficiaries of a charitable organization. People who have relatives suffering from a specific illness are more likely to give to charities fighting those illnesses (Bekkers, 2008; Burgoyne, Young, & Walker, 2005), though they may not give more on average (Smith, Kehoe, & Cremer, 1995). A study in Norway showed that health charities fighting more common illnesses had higher numbers of members, and therefore received higher private contributions (Olsen & Eidem, 2003). People knowing a beneficiary of United Way funds are more likely to donate to United Way (Pitts & Skelly, 1984). People who have (had) “a deeply loved pet animal” are more likely to prefer giving to animal welfare rather than other charitable causes (Bennett, 2003).

Awareness of need may also be increased by solicitors for charitable contributions informing potential donors about the needs of victims. One experimental study found that this technique increases the likelihood of making donations but yields lower contributions among those making a donation (Dolinski, Grzyb, Olejnik, Prusakowski, & Urban, 2005).

Awareness of need is facilitated by the (mass) media. Simon (1997) shows that more extended media coverage of an earthquake has a strong positive relationship with private contributions supporting those affected. In turn, the amount of attention the media pays attention to beneficiaries’ needs depends on, among others, the number of beneficiaries (or those affected in the case of disasters), and the demographic and psychological distance between potential donors and beneficiaries (Adams, 1986; Simon, 1997). A survey study of donations to relief appeals—often advertised on television—reveals that the amount of time spent watching television is positively related to relief donations (Bennett & Kottasz, 2000).

Early analyses of charitable donations reported on tax returns reveals that donations are higher in time periods (Schwartz, 1970) and states with more poverty (Abrams & Schmitz, 1984; Amos, 1982), which suggests that donors respond to need with increased contributions. Recent studies (Bielefeld, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2005; Gittell & Tebaldi, 2006) do not uniformly support this conclusion. Schiff (1990) found that individuals in states with higher proportions of poor households give less to higher education and combined appeals but more to lower education. Bielefeld, Rooney, & Steinberg (2005) found that donations to causes other than religion were higher in areas with higher levels of income inequality, allegedly because of a higher need for charitable contributions in these areas.

It is likely that the awareness of need for support for a specific cause among the general public increases over time as charities working for the cause continue to exist. In a study of Spanish development aid organizations, it was found that older charities in the sector attracted more donations because these organizations have a larger pool of volunteers available to them (Marcuello & Salas, 2000, 2001). A study from the United Kingdom, however, found no effect of organizational age on private contributions to overseas charities (Khanna, Posnett, & Sandler, 1995) though an effect of age on contributions to health, religion, and social welfare organizations was found. A later study, found no effect of organizational age (Khanna & Sandler, 2000). A first study in the United States found significant age effects on contributions received by organizations in the arts and culture sector, hospitals, and nonprofit organizations sponsoring scientific research (Weisbrod & Dominguez, 1986). A later study, however, found negative effects of organizational age for higher education institutions and scientific research (Okten & Weisbrod, 2000). While a study from Canada found no effect of organizational age on contributions received by organizations (Callen, 1994), both a study from Singapore (Wong, Chua, & Vasoo, 1998) as well as a study from Norway found positive organizational age effects (Olsen & Eidem, 2003).

Mechanism 2: Solicitation

A second mechanism that precedes the conscious deliberation of various types of costs and benefits of donating is solicitation. Solicitation refers to the mere act of being solicited to donate. The way potential donors are solicited determines the effectiveness of solicitations. The effects of different methods are captured by the other mechanisms. In terms of the four dimensions in Table 1, solicitations (a) may be tangible (e.g., a fundraising letter) or intangible (a personal request); (b) are interactions between people; (c) originate from beneficiaries or charitable organizations; (d) target potential donors. Studies on solicitation have appeared in journals from a variety of disciplines, including marketing, psychology, and economics.

A large majority of all donation acts occurs in response to a solicitation. Bryant, Slaughter, Kang, and Tax (2003) find that 85% of donation acts among respondents in the 1996 Independent Sector survey on Giving and Volunteering in the preceding year are following a solicitation for a contribution. Bekkers (2005a) finds that 86% of the donation acts in 2 weeks preceding the 2002 Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey are following a solicitation. The evidence from these cross-sectional studies that solicitations greatly enhance the likelihood of donations is complemented by the earlier experimental finding showing that actively soliciting contributions rather than passively presenting an opportunity to give increases the likelihood that people donate (Lindsay, Forte, Haake, & Schmidt, 1977). The implication is that the more opportunities to give people encounter, the more likely they are to give. Survey studies in marketing and sociology usually find that receiving a higher number of solicitations for charitable contributions is associated with increased philanthropic activity (Bekkers, 2005a; Lee & Farrell, 2003; Schlegelmilch, Love, & Diamantopoulos, 1997;

Simmons & Emanuele, 2004; Tiehen, 2001; Wiepking & Maas, 2009) although two studies did not find such an association (Marx, 2000; Sokolowski, 1996).

This does not imply that fundraising organizations should mindlessly increase the number of individuals receiving their appeals. A survey study of alumni donations revealed that higher education institutions soliciting contributions from a larger proportion of their alumni receive lower average contributions (Leslie & Ramey, 1988). This finding may reflect strongly decreasing marginal utility of the number of persons solicited. In addition, charitable organizations should take care not to overburden their donors with solicitations. Increasing the number of solicitations may produce “donor fatigue” and may lower the average contribution (Van Diepen, Donkers, & Franses, 2009; Wiepking, 2008b). Taking a life time value perspective, the number of solicitations may even be reduced by optimizing the search for more responsive targets (Piersma & Jonker, 2004).

It is not surprising that larger donors receive more solicitations per year for charitable contributions (Bekkers, 2005a; Van Diepen et al., 2009). This is not only because solicitations yield contributions but also because responding to solicitations for contributions attracts new solicitations: “Once on the list of usual suspects, I’m likely to stay there” (Putnam, 2000; Van Diepen et al., 2009). Because of increasing numbers of solicitations for charitable contributions, the standard response is to reject an appeal, except for older people who tend to take appeal letters more serious and hence more often respond to them (Diamond & Noble, 2001). As a result, it is not surprising that small modifications of direct mail appeals do not easily affect giving (Katzev, 1995). Even in single encounters that are unlikely to result in a long term involvement with a charity, people try to avoid being solicited for contributions (Pancer, McMullen, Kabatoff, Johnson, & Pond, 1979).

Mechanism 3: Costs and Benefits

The third mechanism covers the material costs and benefits associated with donating. Adapting a definition from Clark & Wilson (1961) and Chinman, Wandersman & Goodman (2005), we define material costs and benefits as “tangible consequences that are associated with a monetary value.” In terms of the four dimensions in Table 1, costs and benefits (a) are tangible objects; (b) reside outside donors; (c) originate from organizations; and (d) affect donors. Effects of costs and benefits are most often documented in studies in economics.

Costs

It is clear that giving money costs money. When the costs of a donation are lowered, giving increases (Bekkers, 2005c; Eckel & Grossman, 2003, 2004; Karlan & List, 2006). This is not only true for the absolute costs but also for the perception of the costs of a donation (Wiepking & Breeze, 2009). This is not to say that philanthropy is motivated by material self-gain: because “donors will always be better off not making

a donation” (Sargeant & Jay, 2004, p. 100). Studies of hypothetical giving also show that requests for larger donations are less likely to be honored (Andreoni & Miller, 2002; Bekkers, 2004).

Economists have studied the empirical effects of the price of giving on philanthropy using survey data and tax files in many papers since the 1970s. A large number of studies have estimated the effects of tax price on philanthropy (see Abrams & Schmitz, 1978, 1984; Andreoni, 1993; Andreoni & Payne, 2003; Auten, Cilke, & Randolph, 1992; Auten et al., 2002; Barrett, 1991; Barrett, McGuirk, & Steinberg, 1997; Boskin & Feldstein, 1977; Brooks, 2003b; Brown, 1997; Brown & Lankford, 1992; Choe & Jeong, 1993; Chua & Wong, 1999; Daneshvary & Luksetich, 1997; Duncan, 2004; Eaton, 2001; Feenberg, 1987; N. E. Feldman, 2007; Feldstein, 1975a, 1975b; Feldstein & Taylor, 1976; Glenday, Gupta, & Pawlak, 1986; Greenwood, 1993; Hood, Martin, & Osberg, 1977; Jones & Posnett, 1991a, 1991b; Khanna et al., 1995; Khanna & Sandler, 2000; Kingma, 1989; Lankford & Wyckoff, 1991; J. E. Long, 2000; McClelland & Kokoski, 1994; O’Neill, Steinberg, & Thompson, 1996; Park & Park, 2004; Randolph, 1995; Reece, 1979; Reece & Zieschang, 1985, 1989; Ricketts & Westfall, 1993; Robinson, 1990; Schiff, 1985, 1990; Simmons & Emanuele, 2004; Slemrod, 1989; Richard S. Steinberg, 1985, 1991; Taussig, 1967). Reviews of these studies are given in Steinberg (1990), Simmons & Emanuele (2004), and Pelozo and Steel (2005). The latter article provides a meta-analysis, showing that estimates of the price effect are generally negative, but vary widely between studies, depending on the scope of the sample and the statistical methods used. More recent estimates of price effects, based on econometric models developed for the analysis of panel data, tend to be lower than estimates from earlier studies (McClelland, 2002). The most recent study reached the conclusion that changes in the tax deduction for charitable contributions have a large, persistent price effect between -0.79 and -1.26 and a smaller transitory price effect between -0.40 and -0.61 (Auten, Sieg, & Clotfelter, 2002). The price effects appear to be larger for religious donations (Wiepking, 2007). Tax benefits seem the most important motive for payroll giving in the United Kingdom (Romney-Alexander, 2002). When employers match charitable contributions of their employees, they give more (Okunade & Berl, 1997).

However, when the costs of donating are increased by increasing the amount requested, the amount donated may actually increase if the amount requested is not perceived as excessive (Doob & McLaughlin, 1989). However, one study found that a request for a “generous contribution” rather than a specific amount decreases the likelihood that a gift will be made in door-to-door solicitations (Weyant & Smith, 1987). Desmet (1999) found a positive effect of asking for more on average donations in a direct mail campaign among irregular donors but not among regular donors. In addition, higher donations were offset by a lower response rate. Similar findings are reported by Fraser, Hite, and Sauer (1988). In another study, a higher reference point contribution increased the amount donated but did not decrease the likelihood of making a contribution (Alpizar, Carlsson, & Johansson-Stenman, 2007).

The costs of a donation sometimes involve more than just money. A survey study found that people who perceive fewer obstacles to give are more likely to give (Smith & McSweeney, 2007). Physical discomfort also discourages philanthropy. People are more likely to donate money to a charity when weather conditions are better. One study found a sizeable positive effect of temperature on giving to the Salvation Army in the period between Thanksgiving and Christmas (Jobu & Knowles, 1974). However, an experimental study of donations in church found no effect of sunshine (Soetevent, 2005). Survey studies of the timing of donations in the United Kingdom (Banks & Tanner, 1999; Pharoah & Tanner, 1997) and Ireland (Carroll, McCarthy, & Newman, 2006) reveal that December is by far the most generous month of the year. In the second quarter of the year, U.K. households are more likely to give but do not give higher amounts (Pharoah & Tanner, 1997).

Benefits

Occasionally, donations to charitable organizations buy services or other “selective incentives” (Olson, 1965). For instance, when donors to universities, museums, or symphony orchestras get access to exclusive dinners, meetings, or special concerts. These donations may be characterized as exchange, when they are rooted in part in consumption motives. Offering access to exclusive services in exchange for contributions brings giving closer to buying. The benefits mechanism is mostly studied by economists and marketing scientists. Studies on alumni giving show that alumni are more generous after graduation if their university spent more on them (Baade & Sundberg, 1996a, 1996b; Harrison, Mitchell, & Peterson, 1995). A study of donations to the opera found that fringe benefits increase contributions (Buraschi & Cornelli, 2002). When these fringe benefits are matched to selected categories of gifts, giving is pushed up even more (Andreoni & Petrie, 2004). Lotteries constitute another type of material benefits for donations, which increase the number of donors (but not the amount donated per donor) in fundraising campaigns (Landry, Lange, List, Price, & Rupp, 2006). Offering material benefits may also provide donors with an excuse for a donation in cases where they are otherwise withheld by a norm of self-interest (Miller, 1999). A survey study of charitable gifts and lotteries in Canada reveals that the two behaviors are complements, not substitutes (Apinunmahakul & Devlin, 2004). Analysis of donations as reported on tax forms suggests that on the whole, philanthropic contributions seem to depend less strongly on direct benefits than on indirect benefits and value orientations (Amos, 1982).

A popular belief among fundraisers is that including a gift in a direct-mail package increases donations. However, there is no strong foundation for this belief in the empirical studies we reviewed. We found four articles testing whether a gift increases donations (Alpizar et al., 2007; Chen, Li, & MacKie-Mason, 2006; Edlund, Sagarin, & Johnson, 2007; Harris, Liguori, & Stack, 1973), with different results. Alpizar et al. (2007) find that gifts increase the likelihood of contributions to a natural park in Costa

Rica. However, the gift reduced the amount contributed among donors. Edlund, Sagarin and Johnson (2007) found that participants who were offered a bottle of water purchased more raffle tickets for an alumni association, especially those who had a stronger "belief in a just world." Harris et al. (1973) conducted a series of three experiments offering a cookie to prospective donors, and found a positive effect of a gift in only one experiment. Chen et al. (2006) conducted an online fundraising campaign offering premiums (mouse pads, book lights, and CD cases) but found no effect.

Having profited personally from services from a nonprofit organization seems to enhance the probability of subsequent donations although the evidence is rather thin (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2005; Schervish & Havens, 2002).

The effect of benefits may partly explain why congregational giving declines when congregation size increases. In larger congregations the likelihood of having direct personal access to clergy is much lower (Davidson & Pyle, 1994; Olson & Caddell, 1994; Stonebraker, 2003; Sullivan, 1985; Zaleski & Zech, 1992, 1994; Zaleski, Zech, & Hoge, 1994). However, giving may also be lower in larger groups because of free rider-effects (Kropf & Knack, 2003; Olson & Caddell, 1994; Olson, 1965), because of a lower level of commitment to the group (Finke, Bahr, & Scheitle, 2006; Knoke, 1981), or because of a lower level of social pressure (see below). In Presbyterian churches, however, giving increases with congregation size (Lunn, Klay, & Douglass, 2001). Interestingly, the authors explained this finding as the result of "increased ministerial services."

There is a danger in offering material benefits for charitable contributions. When people receive material benefits for helpfulness, they tend to undermine self-attributions of helpfulness (Zuckerman, Lazzaro, & Waldgeir, 1979), which reduces the effect of prosocial self-attributions on future helpfulness. Fringe benefits change the decision into an exchange (do I get value for money?). Gruber (2004) finds that subsidies for religious contributions reduce church attendance. Eckel and Grossman (2000) find that participants in a dictator game experiment who are recruited through flyers telling they could earn money are less generous and less strongly motivated by nonmonetary factors than participants recruited in class. Meier (2007a) found that removing a subsidy for private contributions to a Swiss university fund reduced such contributions in consecutive years. This may be taken as evidence of a "crowding out" effect of subsidies on intrinsic motivation. Not only the donor's self-image may be affected by entering the domain of exchange but also the nonprofit organization's image. Charities offering products for sale in catalogues face lower contributions (Desmet, 1998).

In many cases, charitable donations do not provide immediate material benefits to oneself but do provide benefits to individuals known to the donor or a group of which the donor is a member (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2005; Schervish & Havens, 2002; Tam Cho, 2002). Examples are donations to the local hospital and one's church. Such contributions can be explained as a form of generalized exchange. In addition, if the contributions are made (in) public, they will be recognized by fellow community members and may be explained by reference to the mechanism of reputation discussed below.

Finally, individuals may perceive their donations as fair contributions that will maintain services that they may use at some later point in time. For instance, donors may perceive donations to medical research as a means of relieving their own future health needs (Burgoyne et al., 2005).

Mechanism 4: Altruism

An obvious reason why individuals may contribute money to charities is because they care about the organization's output, or the consequences of donations for beneficiaries. Economists, who dominate the study of this mechanism, have labeled this motive "altruism" (Andreoni, 2006). In terms of the four dimensions in Table 1, (a) altruism yields consequences that are tangible; (b) that reside outside individuals; (c) that originate from donors, are often channeled through charitable organizations; and (d) accrue solely to beneficiaries.

Purely altruistic motivation (in the economic sense) would lead individuals who learn about an increase in contributions by others with US\$1 to reduce their own contribution with US\$1. This is called a "crowding out" effect. Numerous studies in economics have sought to estimate the magnitude of crowding out; a landmark study is that of Kingma (1989). Results of empirical studies testing for crowding out effects show that crowding out may exist, but is often less than perfect: A US\$1 dollar increase in governmental spending decreases private giving with less than US\$1. Some studies find no crowding out effect at all (Brooks, 1999; Kropf & Knack, 2003; Marcuello & Salas, 2001; Reece, 1979) and some studies even find crowding in-effects (Brooks, 2003b; Diamond, 1999; Hughes & Luksetich, 1999; Khanna et al., 1995; Khanna & Sandler, 2000; Okten & Weisbrod, 2000; Schiff, 1985, 1990). One study found that increased government support was correlated with a higher number of donors but with lower average private contributions (Brooks, 2003a).

Theoretically, the often less than perfect crowding out implies that other and perhaps more powerful things besides altruism motivate donations. From the behavior of donors we can infer that they do not care so much about the public benefits generated by that their contributions. The private benefits or selective incentives (M. Olson, 1965) for contributions dominate altruistic motives. Hence donors may be called "impure altruists" (Andreoni, 1989, 1990; Kingma, 1989). In practice, the findings imply that "a severe cut in government funding to non-profit organizations is not likely, on average, to be made up by donations from private donors" (Payne, 1998, p. 338).

Mechanism 5: Reputation

The mechanism of reputation refers to the social consequences of donations for the donor. In terms of Table 1, these consequences are intangible phenomena that happen between individuals: People in the social environment of donors verbally or nonverbally reward donors for giving or punish them for not giving. Reputation is studied

most often in psychology and economics, together accounting for about two thirds of the studies on this mechanism.

Giving is usually viewed as a positive thing to do (Charities Aid Foundation, 2005; Horne, 2003; Muehleman, Bruker, & Ingram, 1976), especially when giving reduces inequality (Brickman & Bryan, 1975), and when giving is less costly, beneficiaries are not to blame and is more effective (Horne, 2003). Thus people who give to charitable causes are held in high regard by their peers (Muehleman et al., 1976; Wiepking, 2008a). They receive recognition and approval from others. Laboratory experiments with abstract public goods games by economists and social-psychologists reveal that individuals are willing to incur costs to recognize generous contributions (Clark, 2002). Conversely, not giving damages ones reputation. This is especially true when donations are announced in public or when they are directly observable (Alpizar et al., 2007; Barclay, 2004; Bateson, Nettle, & Roberts, 2006; Bereczkei, Birkas, & Kerekes, 2007; Harris, Benson, & Hall, 1975; Hoffman, McCabe, & Smith, 1996; Long, 1976; Satow, 1975; Soetevent, 2005). When given the choice, people generally prefer their donations to be known by others (Andreoni & Petrie, 2004). Thus face-to-face solicitations are more effective than solicitations made over the telephone (Brockner, Guzzi, Kane, Levine, & Shaplen, 1984), and giving people the option of donating money in an envelope rather than having them hand over the money reduces donations (Hoffman et al., 1996; Thornton, Kirchner, & Jacobs, 1991). Gaining reputation for donations has been facilitated recently with the advent of ribbons (e.g., pink) and wristbands (e.g., yellow); a practice conceptualized as “conspicuous compassion” (Grace & Griffin, 2006; West, 2004) with an eye to the classic study of Veblen (1899).

To some extent, the effect of being watched may be physical in nature. One study found that solicitors in a door-to-door fundraising campaign who looked potential donors in the eye raised more money than solicitors who looked at the collecting tin (Bull & Gibson-Robinson, 1981). Cues of being watched need not even be consciously perceived: stylized eyes spots also have a positive effect on donations (Haley & Fessler, 2005).

Recognition may be given by persons who are not physically present. Merely knowing that one’s contribution is perceived by others may be enough to motivate people to give. In a study determining factors that influence giving during a telethon, Silverman, Robertson, Middlebrook, and Drabman (1984) found that viewers were most likely to give at the times when the names of pledging donors were shown on the screen. Because larger groups are often more anonymous, it may be that incidence and level of donations decrease when group sizes increases in bars and school classes (Wiesenthal, Austrom, & Silverman, 1983). Survey studies by sociologists and scholars studying religion have consistently found a negative relation between the size of congregations and religious contributions (Davidson & Pyle, 1994; Hungerman, 2005; Olson & Caddell, 1994; Stonebraker, 2003; Zaleski & Zech, 1994; Zaleski et al., 1994). Although donors often deny the importance of social pressure (Polonsky et al., 2002), survey studies have found that donations are rather strongly related to measures of social pressure (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008; Mathur, 1996; Pitts & Skelly, 1984; Smith &

McSweeney, 2007). Also the finding by Clotfelter (2003) that those who are still related to former alumni tend to give more to private colleges and universities may be explained by the mechanism of reputation.

Mechanism 6: Psychological Benefits

Giving not only yields social benefits but also psychological benefits for the donor. In terms of Table 1, the mechanism of psychological benefits refers to the intangible benefits that donors bestow on themselves as a result of donating, and to the intangible costs that donors avoid by donating. A large majority of all studies on this mechanism is conducted by (social) psychologists who have shown that giving may contribute to one's self-image as an altruistic, empathic, socially responsible, agreeable, or influential person. In addition, giving is in many cases an almost automatic emotional response, producing a positive mood, alleviating feelings of guilt, reducing aversive arousal, satisfying a desire to show gratitude, or to be a morally just person.

The "Joy of Giving"

There is ample evidence from studies on helping behavior that helping others produces positive psychological consequences for the helper, sometimes labeled "empathic joy" (Batson & Shaw, 1991). In economic models of philanthropy, this category of motives is labeled "warm glow" or "joy of giving" (Andreoni, 1989). Recent evidence from neuropsychological studies suggests that donations to charity "elicit neural activity in areas linked to reward processing" (Harbaugh, Mayr, & Burghart, 2007) and "anterior sectors of the prefrontal cortex are distinctively recruited when altruistic choices prevail over selfish material interests" (Moll et al., 2006). There are several reasons why humans may have pleasurable psychological experiences on giving: people may alleviate feelings of guilt (avoid punishment), feel good for acting in line with a social norm, or feel good for acting in line with a specific (prosocial, altruistic) self-image. Behavioral brain studies suggest these experiences require a relatively low level of perceptual processing (Tankersley, Stowe, & Huettel, 2007).

The joy of giving (relative to keeping money for oneself) can be manipulated by benign thoughts. People are more generous after they have spent some time thinking about their own death (Jonas, Schimel, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2002), about an act of forgiveness (Karremans, Lange, & Holland, 2005), or about things in life for which they are grateful (Soetevent, 2005).

Positive moods in general may motivate giving. Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) found that people are more likely to choose a charity donation over a discount when buying frivolous products (e.g., Sundae, frozen yoghurt) rather than functional products (e.g. backpack, toothpaste). A positive mood may also be induced by the question "how do you feel today?" Most people answer positively to this question ("I'm fine, thank you") and are subsequently more likely to comply with a request for a donation. This is called the "foot-in-the-mouth effect" (Aune & Basil, 1994; Dolinski et al., 2005;

Howard, 1990). It may also be that the “foot-in-the-mouth effect” works not so much because it brings about a positive mood but because it creates relational obligations (Dolinski et al., 2005).

The advice to fundraisers is to test fundraising materials for their mood effects and to avoid the use of materials that bring about a negative mood. Simply telling prospective donors that donating will bring them in a good mood increases giving, especially when victims are depicted as innocent (Benson & Catt, 1978). Donors also self-report “feeling good” as a motive for donating to charitable causes (57% of a sample of Dutch citizens in Wunderink, 2000).

In specific circumstances, negative moods can also encourage giving. Cunningham et al. (1980) show that people in a good mood respond better to rewards associated with giving (a warm-glow feeling, or a present) and that people in a bad mood are more responsive toward avoiding punishments that come with not giving (for example the phrase “Image how you would feel not helping”).

Self-Image

When giving entails positive psychological benefits, people are said to have positive personal norms (Schwartz, 1970). Personal norms strengthen the effect of social norms. When the social norm is to give, those who feel bad about themselves for violating the norm are more likely to give. Not giving would entail feelings of guilt, shame, or dissonance with one’s self-image. Experiments on helping behavior show that assisting others may be an effective way of repairing one’s self-image after one has harmed another (Carlsmith & Gross, 1969; Freedman, Wallington, & Bless, 1967; Konečki, 1972; Regan, Williams, & Sparling, 1972).

One study tested the guilt hypothesis by comparing donations among people entering a church during confession hours and people leaving church after confession, when their guilt had been reduced (Harris, Benson, & Hall, 1975). Consistent with the guilt hypothesis, the former group donated more often than the latter. Although the higher likelihood of obtaining social approval among coreligionists for donations may also explain this difference, another more recent study confirms that feelings of guilt promote donations (Basil, Ridgway, & Basil, 2006). The study also showed that feelings of guilt lead to giving by enhancing feelings of responsibility.

Survey studies have also provided evidence of a link between an altruistic self-image and philanthropy. Many studies find that dispositional empathy (measured with items like “I am a soft-hearted person”) is positively related to charitable giving (Bekkers, 2006b; Bennett, 2003; Davis, 1983; Piferi, Jobe, & Jones, 2006; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). One study that asked individuals whether they would be more or less generous than average found that donors considered themselves more generous than nondonors (Schlegelmilch, Diamantopoulos, & Love, 1997). However, giving is not only the result of an altruistic self-image but also reinforces such an image. Piliavin and Callero (1991) found that blood donors develop an altruistic self-identity as a result of continued blood donation. A similar process is likely to exist for the donation

of money to charitable causes (L. Lee, Piliavin, & Call, 1999). It is likely that such a reciprocal relationship between giving and altruistic self-image also exists for traditional philanthropy although Sokolowski (1996) did not find evidence for this assumption using cross-sectional data. Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, and Bartels (2007) find that empathy mediates a negative effect of social exclusion on charitable giving. People feeling socially excluded temporarily lack the ability to experience empathic concern, decreasing the incidence and level of charitable giving.

The self-image mechanism can be used by charities in fundraising campaigns. Experimental field studies with adults have found that labeling potential helpers as “helpers” promotes helping behavior. Kraut (1973) found that if a canvasser labeled donors to one charity as “charitable” but did not make such a comment to other donors, a consecutive fundraising campaign was more successful among those who had been labeled charitable. Swinyard and Ray (1979) also found a positive labeling effect. A self-image of being helpful can also be created by the “foot-in-the-door technique.” The technique includes making a small request before a larger request is made. Compliance with the first request makes people feel helpful, which creates a pressure to comply with the second, larger request (Freedman & Fraser, 1996; Rittle, 1981).

The promise elicitation technique (Cialdini, 2001, p. 62) is another method to take advantage of the desire of people to behave in a manner consistent with their self-image. People tend to regard themselves as more generous than their peers (Muehleman et al., 1976; Pronin, Lin, & Ross, 2002) and tend to overestimate their generosity in hypothetical (Bekkers, 2006a) and real life situations (Komter, 1996). When they are first asked their intentions to give, they are more likely to give in real life because people want to live up to their self-image.

Kerr et al. (1997) found that commitment to a promise made to unknown others motivated contributions in an experimental game situation. Not contributing would create cognitive dissonance, feelings of guilt. Donors anticipate feelings of guilt on reducing their current level of giving. Sargeant and Woodliffe (2005) found that committed donors perceived that “there would be a consequence for the beneficiary group of their withdrawing their support.” Another survey study found that respondents who anticipated feeling guilty for not giving were more likely to give (Smith & McSweeney, 2007).

Although the majority of studies on self-image have focused on altruism or helpfulness, other types of self-images may promote giving as well. For instance, giving enhances one’s self esteem (Ickes, Kidd, & Berkowitz, 1976). People may be motivated to give to enhance their self-esteem. A survey study in the United Kingdom found that individuals who report a stronger sense of accomplishment are more likely to donate (Sargeant, Ford, & West, 2000). A survey study in New Zealand found that individuals with a more active orientation to life are more likely to donate (Todd & Lawson, 1999). A similar finding emerges from a survey study in the Netherlands, in which more extraverted individuals—commonly described as more active and outgoing—are more likely to give and give higher amounts (Bekkers, 2006b). One study did not find an association between “empowerment” and giving to human

services (Marx, 2000). Another survey study found that esteem-enhancing motivations among older adults were negatively correlated with giving (Mathur, 1996).

Mechanism 7: Values

In the eyes of donors, the works of nonprofit organizations may make the world a better place. Attitudes and values endorsed by donors make charitable giving more or less attractive to donors. Donations can also be instrumental to exemplifying one's endorsement of specific values to others, but this is captured by the mechanism of reputation. In terms of Table 1, values are intangible phenomena located within individuals, originating from donors, and targeted at themselves as well as beneficiaries. Studies on the effects of values are most often published by journals in sociology, psychology, and philanthropic studies.

Endorsement of prosocial values generally has a positive association with charitable giving. Because values are difficult if not impossible to manipulate, experimental studies on the effects of social values on philanthropy are nonexistent. Some experimental studies link survey measures of attitudes and values to donations: humanitarianism and egalitarianism (Fong, 2007) and prosocial value orientations (Van Lange, Van Vugt, Bekkers, & Schuyt, 2007). Survey studies, mostly conducted by sociologists and marketing scientists, show that people who have altruistic values (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008; Farmer & Fedor, 2001), who have prosocial values (Bekkers, 2006b, 2007; Van Lange et al., 2007), who are less materialistic in general (Sargeant et al., 2000), who endorse postmaterialistic goals in politics (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2006), who value being devout and spiritual (Todd & Lawson, 1999), who endorse a moral principle of care (Schervish & Havens, 2002; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010), who care about social order, consensus, and social justice in society (Todd & Lawson, 1999), who feel socially responsible for the recipient organization (Weerts & Ronca, 2007) and society as a whole (Amato, 1985; Reed & Selbee, 2002; Schuyt, Smit, & Bekkers, 2010) are more likely to give because they are motivated to make the world a better place.

Not only do some social values promote donations in general but also do specific social values promote donations to particular charities (Wiepking, 2009). Philanthropy is a means to reach a desired state of affairs that is closer to one's view of the "ideal" world. What that ideal world looks like depends on one's value system. Through giving, donors may wish to make the distribution of wealth and health more equal; they may wish to reduce poverty, empower women, safeguard human rights, to protect animals, wildlife, or the ozone layer. Donors may also have objectives that are partisan or even terrorist. Supporting a cause that changes the world in a desired direction is a key motive for giving that has received very little attention in the literature. The desire for social justice is most often studied in relation to philanthropy (Furnham, 1995; Todd & Lawson, 1999). Bennett (2003) studied the relationship between personal values and the choice of charitable organizations and found that a similarity between personal values and organizational values increases the probability that a donation to that particular organization is made. Keyt, Yavas, and Riecken (2002) found that

donors to the American Lung Association are more concerned about health issues than nondonors. In addition, donors to political parties endorse values central to the ideology of those parties (Francia, Green, Herrnson, Powell, & Wilcox, 2005).

Mechanism 8: Efficacy

Efficacy refers to the perception of donors that their contribution makes a difference to the cause they are supporting. In terms of the four dimensions in Table 1, efficacy perceptions are intangible (psychological) consequences of donations for donors, generated by charitable organizations. Efficacy is most often studied in philanthropic studies, economics, and psychology, respectively.

Survey studies reveal that when people perceive that their contribution will not make a difference, they are less likely to give (Arumi et al., 2005; Diamond & Kashyap, 1997; Duncan, 2004; Mathur, 1996; Radley & Kennedy, 1992; Smith & McSweeney, 2007) or leave a charitable bequest (Wiepking, Madden, & McDonald, 2010). These findings may be the result of reverse causality and/or justification.

Although efficacy has been studied extensively in the helping behavior literature, we have been unable to locate any experimental studies on philanthropy that manipulated efficacy. Experiments with public goods games have found that contributions to public goods increase with the perceived efficacy of contributions (Sweeney, 1973). Three experimental studies tested the effect of providing donors with information about the effectiveness of contributions and found positive effects on philanthropy (Jackson & Mathews, 1995; Parsons, 2003, 2007). It appears that financial information is especially influential among committed donors (Parsons, 2007). Studies of aggregate donations at the state level, however, do not find a consistently positive effect of the level of accountability of charitable organizations required in a state (Berman & Davidson, 2003; Irvin, 2005). Studies of private contributions received by nonprofit organizations in Canada and the United States find that organizational efficiency are positively related to private donations (Callen, 1994; Trussell & Parsons, 2007).

People generally overestimate the effectiveness of their own contributions (Kerr, 1989). In their study of opera donations, Buraschi and Cornelli (2002) found that this holds especially for low-income donors. There appear to be individual differences in the tendency to view contributing to public goods in a rational manner. People who do so follow the free rider-reasoning (Olson, 1965): An additional dollar does not solve the problem; not giving does not make things worse. Survey studies reveal that a more coldly rational approach to life reduces giving (Bekkers, 2006b; Todd & Lawson, 1999) and is related to a lower level of volunteering (Bekkers, 2005b; Unger, 1991).

Perceived efficacy is a likely explanation for the effects of leadership donations and seed money that have been studied extensively by economists (Andreoni & Petrie, 2004; Bac & Bag, 2003; Chen et al., 2006; Landry et al., 2006; List & Lucking-Reiley, 2002; List & Rondeau, 2003; Potters, Sefton, & Vesterlund, 2005). When people see that others give to a charity, they can take this as a signal that others have confidence in the organization. The leadership effect was described earlier by social psychologists

as a “modeling effect” (Bryan & Test, 1967; Lincoln, 1977; Reingen, 1982). Lincoln (1977) found that observing another person make a donation increased subsequent donations, especially if the model was a male. Jiobu and Knowles (1974) however, found no modeling effect. A matching offer by a third party (e.g., one’s employer) can also have a legitimizing effect: People will think that the third party had enough confidence in the organization to offer the matching contribution. Endorsement of a charity by a high status person is also likely to generate higher donations through a legitimization effect. One field experiment with a health charity (Vriens, Scheer, Hoekstra, & Bult, 1998) found that a signature by a professor in health care research raised donations by 2.4%. A lab experiment found that observing high status individuals making donations lead others to increase their donations, whereas the leadership effect was not found when low status individuals were observed making contributions (Kumru & Vesterlund, 2005).

Surveys reveal that donors have an aversion against expensive fundraising methods (Arumi et al., 2005; Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2005; Schervish & Havens, 2002). Evidence from the United Kingdom (Sargeant et al., 2000) and the Netherlands (Bekkers, 2003) suggests that donors overestimate fundraising costs of charitable organizations. An experiment revealed that donors react less positively to “flashy” fundraising materials (Bekkers & Crutzen, 2007). Low-perceived efficacy decreases giving more strongly among altruistically motivated donors (Bekkers, 2006a).

Perceptions of efficacy are related to charitable confidence and perceptions of overhead and fundraising costs. Donors who have more confidence in charitable organizations think their contributions are less likely to be spent on fundraising costs and overhead (Bekkers, 2006a; Sargeant, Ford, & West, 2006). Such beliefs about the efficacy of charitable organizations are likely to promote giving (Bekkers, 2006a; Bennett, 2003; Bennett & Gabriel, 2003; Bowman, 2006; Keyt et al., 2002; Parsons, 2003; Sargeant et al., 2006; Schervish & Havens, 2002; Schlegelmilch, Diamantopoulos et al., 1997; Yavas, Riecken, & Parameswaran, 1981). Wiepking (2009) finds that confidence in charitable organizations specifically increases the likelihood of giving to organizations with an international focus; she finds no relationship between confidence and making donations to other types of organizations. Survey studies by Sargeant and colleagues reveal that the relationship of confidence with giving is mediated by relationship commitment (Sargeant et al., 2006; Sargeant & Lee, 2004).

Although attractive design of fundraising materials is often believed to attract the attention of donors (Diamond & Gooding-Williams, 2002), field experiments tell a different story. Warwick (2001) reports 23 tests of design elements on outer envelopes used in donor acquisition mailings and found no effect in 19 cases, a negative effect in three cases, and a positive effect in only one case. In a field experiment with direct-mail letters for a health charity, the optimal fundraising letter was found to contain no “amplifiers” (like bold printing), and no illustration (Vriens et al., 1998). In a field experiment with donations in a campaign for refugees in Ruanda, Bekkers and Crutzen (2007) found that a plain envelope raised more money than an envelope including a picture of the beneficiaries.

How Do the Mechanisms Relate to Each Other?

The relative influence of each of the eight mechanisms—whether donations are primarily made in response to awareness of need, solicitation, costs and benefits, altruism, reputation concerns, psychological rewards, or efficacy—is unclear. Multiple motives are likely to operate simultaneously (Batson & Shaw, 1991; Clotfelter, 1997) and the mix of these motives differs over time, place, organizations, and donors. It is also likely that the eight mechanisms have interactive effects (e.g., that awareness of need may promote giving more strongly when efficacy is high). We think that identifying systematic patterns in the mix of the mechanisms and interactions among them are important tasks for future research.

Throughout our review, we have distinguished experimental from survey studies. Each of these methods has its own advantages and disadvantages. Experiments typically test for short-term effects of manipulations, create artificial conditions, and rely on small groups of participants (university students). Strictly speaking, results cannot be generalized to the general population. The advantage of experimental control is the potential to draw causal inferences. Survey studies typically investigate donations over a longer period to real organizations among population samples but cannot be used to infer causation.

Much would be gained by combining the strengths of the two methods. However, due to specialization of scholars in disciplines with different methodological preferences, there are virtually no studies combining survey and experimental methods (an exception is Bekkers, 2007b). We hope that with this review, researchers using either method will become more aware of the insights gained in studies using the other method. In particular, insights from experimental studies illuminate results from survey studies. We illustrate this with a discussion of the influence of religion on philanthropy. What mechanisms may explain this relation? Scholars often distinguish “conviction” and “community” or “norms” and “networks” as two broad explanations (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008; Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995; Wuthnow, 1991). “Conviction” refers to (religious) beliefs, values and attitudes that encourage altruism; “community” refers to identification with the religious community, social pressure, and solicitations for contributions. The “conviction” explanation pulls together three mechanisms: altruism (a real concern for others), psychological benefits (earning one’s place in heaven), and values (the importance of helping others). “Community” pulls together solicitation (receiving requests for contributions), reputation (recognition from others), and psychological benefits (feeling part of a community).

A Case for Progress?

If the studies discussed above are viewed in a chronological order, do we then see any evidence for theoretical progress in the study of philanthropy? Taken together, theoretical progress in the literature on philanthropy is limited. The majority of articles we

reviewed are not based on solid theoretical foundations. This is not to say that there is no progress at all; subsequent studies may build on theoretical arguments without making them explicit. If the implicit hypotheses are reconstructed, we may detect progress. We do not make this exercise here because it is not the purpose of the present article. Instead, we will indicate groups of studies in which we discern theoretical progress.

A set of articles published in social psychology from the 1970s to mid 1980s may be characterized as applied research testing for boundary conditions of fundamental mechanisms. Although the insights from these studies may be reconstructed as refinements of general hypotheses, the studies themselves often do not state these hypotheses explicitly.

Another set of articles, published in economics, does have more solid theoretical foundations. Model building in economics started with the public good model, but when no or little crowding out was observed in empirical studies, the model was found too crude. Subsequently, impure altruism models were proposed (Andreoni, 1989, 1990), collapsing all nonaltruistic motives in one parameter. The revision of the model in subsequent studies as a result of empirical disconfirmation is a clear example of theoretical progress.

Other formal models of philanthropy deal with only one mechanism. Glazer and Konrad (1986) have modeled the reputation mechanism in a mathematical form. They call their model a signaling explanation for charity. By giving, people signal to others that they are concerned about others and/or that they have wealth (Frank, Gilovich, & Regan, 1996). Both signals buy prestige (Harbaugh, 1998). Duncan's model of impact philanthropy focuses on the desire of donors to have impact on beneficiaries (Duncan, 2004). The model accurately describes one specific ingredient of the "warm glow." As far as we know, there are no theoretical models describing the mechanisms of solicitation, psychological rewards, values, and efficacy.

Philanthropic acts are commonly the result of multiple mechanisms working at once. However, formal models of philanthropy (e.g., Ribar & Wilhelm, 2002) have focused on only one or sometimes two motives. More than 10 years ago, Brown (1997, p. 183) described the state of affairs with regard to theory as follows: "No single model captures all the motivations that underlie charitable action." Although it is probably impossible to capture all mechanisms in one elegant formal model, Brown's assessment still holds and provides a challenge for model builders.

There is a large potential for theoretical progress in the literature on philanthropy. The challenge for all scholars, model builders, and other scientists alike is to test competing alternative explanations—potentially from different disciplines—against each other. Scholars trying to prove their pet theories do not add much to our understanding of philanthropy. Progress is hindered by the lack of awareness of research in distant times and disciplines. Hopefully this review reduces some of the barriers to progress.

Appendix

Moderating Factors

In the literature review we have described eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. This appendix describes factors moderating the effects of the mechanisms. Moderators are factors that weaken the effect of the mechanism (negative moderators) or strengthen the effect (positive moderator). Moderators may be other mechanisms, situational conditions, or personal characteristics.

Mechanism 1: Awareness of Need. Moderators of the effect of need include other mechanisms: costs, reputation, psychological benefits, and efficacy; situational conditions: dependence of the beneficiary on the donor; and personal characteristics: perceptions of deservingness; acceptance (vs. denial) of responsibility, mood religiosity, and political orientation.

Costs. Material costs moderate the effect of need. When a larger need implies a higher cost, it does not increase helping behavior (Piliavin & Piliavin, 1972).

Reputation. An experiment on volunteering revealed that the opportunity to gain social approval for helping promotes the effect of need (Fisher & Ackerman, 1998).

Psychological benefits. Awareness of need has little effect if potential donors face psychological costs when confronted with the need. In an early study, a picture of a needy, handicapped child was found to depress giving in a door-to-door fundraising campaign presumably because it depressed the mood of potential donors (Isen & Noonberg, 1979). Dyck and Coldevin (1992) came to the same conclusion in an experiment testing the effect of no photo, a positive, and a negative photograph in appeal letters. The picture with “a less pleasant, needy “negative” photograph” yielded lowest response rates and contributions.

Efficacy. The display of need may backfire when the need is perceived as impossible to solve (Small, Loewenstein, & Slovic, 2007; for further evidence on the interaction with efficacy, see below; Warren & Walker, 1991) or when a picture displaying needy recipients depresses the potential helper (Isen & Noonberg, 1979). In face-to-face solicitations, a picture to illustrate need may make no difference at all (Thornton, Kirchner, & Jacobs, 1991). Finally, West and Brown (1975) found in an experiment with helping behavior that severity of need did result in more giving when the victim was more attractive.

Dependence. Berkowitz (1968) found that need produces helping only when the beneficiary is dependent on help from the donor. In addition, social class differences were found. Working class boys tended to react to need only when they had received help earlier, especially from the same person. Middle-class boys were not affected by help received. Thus when victims are dependent on potential helpers and these helpers adhere to a moral principle of care, need produces helping.

Perceptions of deservingness and acceptance of responsibility. Whether beneficiaries are perceived as deserving also moderates the effect of need (Miller, 1977). When

victims are perceived as causes of their own misfortune, potential donors may deny their responsibility for relieving the needs of the victim (Furnham, 1995). For example, people are less prepared to sponsor welfare recipients when they know the recipients are unwilling to engage in paid work (Fong, 2007). Refusals to give to the homeless are often explained in these terms (Radley & Kennedy, 1992), as are refusals to give to poverty relief in developing countries (Bennett & Kottasz, 2000; Taormina, Messick, Iwawaki, & Wilke, 1988). Denial of responsibility is less likely to occur when the fate of victims is perceived as beyond people's control (Lerner & Simmons, 1966), at least among politically liberal individuals (Skitka, Mullen, Griffin, Hutchinson, & Chamberlin, 2002). Survey data reveal that awareness of need is not associated with giving when potential donors attribute responsibility to government (Eschholz & Van Slyke, 2002; Polonsky, Shelley, & Voala, 2002; Radley & Kennedy, 1992).

It should be noted that denial of responsibility is sometimes a consequence of not helping, rather than a cause. People are creative in finding post hoc excuses for not giving (Hibbert, Chatzidakis, & Smith, 2005). Ascription of responsibility is also a dispositional variable that determines people's motivation to engage in helping behavior (Bennett, 2003; Furnham, 1995; Schwartz, 1973, 1974). Denial of responsibility is related to the belief in a just world, the belief that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get (Appelbaum, 2002; Furnham, 1995; Lerner & Simmons, 1966). Econometric studies suggest that donors weigh the needs of distant others against the future needs of their own children. Parents give more to charities when their children are economically better off (Auten & Joulfaian, 1996; Joulfaian, 2004). They reduce giving to charities and increase bequests when their children's income is lower.

Identification of a specific victim. Solicitations for contributions that identify a specific victim are more likely to result in willingness to contribute (Kogut & Ritov, 2005a, 2005b) and actual donations than solicitations that provide statistical information on the number of victims (Small & Loewenstein, 2003; Small et al., 2007). Information about single victims is more vivid and more emotionally distressing than information about multiple unidentified victims (Kogut & Ritov, 2005a, 2005b).

Religious and political preferences. Finally, what constitutes need or whether a (group of) needy person(s) is also deserving of assistance is controversial. A participant in an Australian focus group study (Polonsky et al., 2002) said, "What constitutes a need to one person is not to another." Persons from different religious backgrounds (Will & Cochran, 1995) and with different political preferences (Skitka et al., 2002) may evaluate the same objective situation differently.

Overall strength of effect. The result of these moderating factors is that the overall effect of need on giving is small. It may well be that instead of the most needy, those with the best marketers receive the highest contributions (Polonsky et al., 2002). Thus it is the awareness of need that is related to giving rather than the objective need. As Milofsky and Blades (1991) point out, the largest health charities in the United States include organizations for rare diseases like muscular dystrophy (affecting only 6 children in 100,000) and cystic fibrosis (affecting 20 in 100,000).

Mechanism 2: Solicitation. Obviously, not all types of solicitations are equally effective. Ingredients of the most effective solicitations are discussed in the literature review under the other mechanisms. For instance, a solicitation for a contribution is likely to be more effective if giving in response to the solicitation provides an opportunity to acquire, maintain, or strengthen a positive social reputation. In addition, some types of people may be more compliant with requests for charitable contributions than others. The analyses reported in Bryant et al. (2003) suggest this; however, because this study is based on survey data it may also reflect self-selection of these respondents. Finally, one remarkable study tested whether monetary compensation paid to solicitors for successful solicitations affects the likelihood of success (Gneezy & List, 2006). One group of solicitors was paid 100% more for going door to door than another group. The result was that an initially positive effect of overpayment waned after a few hours.

Mechanism 3: Costs and Benefits. Although we have found no studies that investigated moderators of the effects of material benefits of donations, many studies have examined moderators of the material costs of giving. Price effects depend on the psychological benefits of donations, national context, characteristics of recipient organizations, and personal characteristics of donors.

Psychological benefits. It makes a difference how price reductions are framed: when price reductions are presented as rebates—"when you give €1, you pay only €0.50"—they are less effective than when presented as matches—"when you give €1, we'll add another €1"; (Bekkers, 2005; Eckel & Grossman, 2003, 2004). It is believed that framing price reductions as rebates yields a perceptual focus on the material costs of donating. Framing price reductions as matches, in contrast, yields a perceptual focus on the benefits for beneficiaries of donations. However, other studies cast doubt on the generality (Fraser & Hite, 1989) and validity (Davis, Millner, & Reilly, 2005) of the framing effect.

That the subjective perception of costs is important also becomes apparent from the "low ball-effect." The low ball technique refers to the practice of revealing hidden costs after people have expressed willingness to comply with a request (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller, 1978). For instance, people are first asked to donate a small amount (they are thrown the low ball), for example, a donation to a museum of US\$0.75. After they have agreed to do so, an additional amount is requested, for example US\$0.25 for the museum's children's program (Brownstein & Katzev, 1985). Another set of findings illustrating that it matters how costs are perceived concern the "door-in-the-face effect." This effect refers to the observation that people are more likely to comply with a request after they received a more sizeable request that they find unacceptable. Compared to the first, excessive request, the second appears as a small concession (Abrahams & Bell, 1994; Cialdini et al., 1975; Reingen, 1978). In a study by Brownstein and Katzev (1985), visitors to a museum were asked to donate US\$1 "to cover reduced funding." In a control group, 73% did so; in an experimental group that first received a request to donate US\$5, 87% did so (though this difference

is not statistically significant, pp. 570-571). Fundraisers who want to use this technique should be aware that the first request should be perceived as legitimate. If not, a boomerang effect may occur (Schwarzwald, Raz, & Zvibel, 1979). The Door-in-the-face effect can be enhanced by having a person make the request whose approval the potential donor finds more important (Williams & Williams, 1989).

National context. There are substantial differences between countries in the price of giving as well as in the price effect. Wong, Chua, and Vassoo (1998) find much stronger price effects for donations in Singapore (varying from -2.0 to -5.5) than commonly found in U.S. studies; Wu, Huang, and Kao (2004) find price effects ranging from -2.2 to -3.3 in Taiwan. However, UK residents seem to be less responsive to tax incentives (A. Jones & J. Posnett, 1991; A. M. Jones & J. W. Posnett, 1991). In addition, there are also large differences in the extent that people choose to itemize their gifts. For example, in the Netherlands, religious groups use tax deductions extensively (Wiepking, 2007). But those religiously affiliated in Canada itemize rarely (Kitchen, 1992). Nonitemizers are less sensitive to changes in tax price (Duquette, 1999; Eaton, 2001). One reason may be that they don't know about the deduction (McGregor-Lowndes, Newton, & Marsden, 2006). Obviously, if households do not know about the possibility of deducting donations from their tax income, they are unlikely to respond to tax incentives. In such cases, publicizing favorable tax treatment of charitable contributions is likely to increase the donor pool and/or the amount contributed (Boatright, Green, & Malbin, 2006).

Subsector. Different studies find different price effects for different types of organizations. Widely different estimates are reported by Schiff (1990). Religious donations appear less price sensitive than donations to nonreligious organizations in three studies (Feldstein, 1975b; McClelland & Kokoski, 1994; Taussig, 1967) but more price sensitive in another (Reece, 1979). Price effects on donations to international relief and development organizations appear to be larger than on donations to other organizations (Ribar & Wilhelm, 1995).

Personal characteristics. Personal characteristics moderating the price effect include marriage and income. Married males are found to be more sensitive to the price of giving than married females (Andreoni & Payne, 2003). Price effects usually increase with income (G. E. Auten, Cilke, & Randolph, 1992; Duquette, 1999; Feldstein & Taylor, 1976; O'Neill, Steinberg, & Thompson, 1996; Robinson, 1990); some studies find that among the highest income groups price effects decline again (Boskin & Feldstein, 1977; Feldstein, 1975a; Taussig, 1967). A study of philanthropy in Singapore found that the tax price effect declined with education (Chua & Wong, 1999).

Mechanism 4: Altruism. Effects of altruism vary with the awareness of need and the efficacy of donations, the information about donations of others provided to potential donors, beliefs about changes in contributions by others; the size of contributions of others; fundraising activities by nonprofit organizations. Also, altruism effects differ between sectors receiving donations and between donors with different levels of income.

Awareness of need and efficacy. If the nonprofit organization publicizes donations received, donors may react in several ways. If the need for contributions is perceived as lower because of the increase in contributions by others, donors may lower their own contribution. This tendency, however, may be offset by the quality signal sent out by the donations of others. If high status individuals made a contribution, donors may take that contribution as a signal that the charity is of a good quality, enhancing the organizations' perceived trustworthiness and efficacy.

Amount contributed by others. Contributions by others may have decreasing marginal utility: studies of American theatres (Borgonovi, 2006) and symphony orchestras (Brooks, 2000b) reveal that small increases in public funding have a stronger crowding-in effect than large increases.

Subsector. Crowding out estimates appear to be stronger in the human services sector with a number of studies finding considerable crowding out (Amos, 1982; Ferris & West, 2003; Hungerman, 2005; Payne, 1998; Schiff, 1990), whereas other studies find smaller or no crowding out effects (Brooks, 2002; Lindsey & Steinberg, 1990; Long, 2000; Reece, 1979; Steinberg, 1985). One study from the United Kingdom found slight crowding in (Posnett & Sandler, 1989). Bielefeld, Rooney & Steinberg (2005) find that higher state social service spending is associated with a lower likelihood of households donating but find no link with the amount contributed. For organizations in the health sector, several studies find some crowding out (Brooks, 2000a; Khanna, Posnett, & Sandler, 1995). State funding for research has been found to crowd in private contributions (Connolly, 1997). Results for nonprofit organizations in the arts and culture sector have been mixed (Brooks, 1999, 2000a; Hughes & Luksetich, 1999).

Obviously, the effect of a third party contribution depends on the information about the third party contribution given to other potential donors. In many cases, donors do not know about changes in the contributions of others (Horne, Johnson, & Van Slyke, 2005). In most cases when government grants are announced, it is unclear to individuals that the grants are financed with taxes ultimately paid by citizens themselves. When this is made clear to individuals, third party contributions crowd out individual contributions (Eckel, Grossman, & Johnston, 2005). In "crowding out" experiments, information about the behavior of others is explicitly provided to participants. Hence it should come as no surprise that laboratory experiments usually find larger crowd-out estimates than studies using survey or tax data (Andreoni, 1993; Vesterlund, 2006).

Fundraising activities. The net effect of a change in contributions from third parties depends on the reaction by the nonprofit organization. One potential reaction is to reduce fundraising efforts (Andreoni & Payne, 2003). Another potential reaction is to increase the number or quality of services rendered to donors. A study of American theatres revealed that government funding at both the state and federal level had a crowding in-effect on private contributions (Borgonovi, 2006), a finding potentially caused by the provision of more or better services paid for by government grants.

Group size. The weight of altruistic concerns decreases with group size. In a large economy, individual contributions have little impact on the provision of public goods.

Because most philanthropic organizations raise funds from a large audience, altruism is likely to be only a minor force (Ribar & Wilhelm, 2002).

Income. One characteristic of donors examined as a moderator of crowding out effects is income. Altruism seems to decrease with income until US\$100,000, after which it increases (Andreoni, 1990).

Mechanism 5. Reputation. The effect of reputation on giving increases with the value of approval received by donors. The value of approval depends on the strength of ties with persons who may observe donation acts, liking of the solicitor, group size, social norms, and social status of the donor and solicitor.

Strong ties. Approval has a more pronounced effect when third parties with whom the potential donor has a stronger social bond (a “strong tie”) are able to observe the act of giving. In this condition, a mix of social and psychological benefits enhances the effect of reputation. When a complete stranger can observe giving, there is less social pressure than when a friend or family member is present. Social pressure is especially strong when a strong tie makes a request for a donation. A survey study on giving intentions showed that solicitations by persons at a closer social distance are more likely to be honored (Bekkers, 2004). Evidence on the impact of relationship strength on donations from surveys is mixed. While Sokolowski (1996) found that being asked to contribute by a significant other does not increase the total amount donated, Schervish and Havens (1997) find that people who are asked to give by a relative or a friend donate a larger percentage of their income. Booth, Higgins, and Cornelius (1989) find that per capita United Way contributions are higher in communities with stable populations and higher voter turnout. Not giving in social contexts where peers value giving and are important in daily life would not only endanger one’s reputation but also the relationship with these peers.

Psychological benefits: liking of solicitor. The value of approval increases with liking of the solicitor, which increases the psychological benefits of donating. One way to increase liking is through similarity (Byrne, 1971). Requests by similar persons are more likely to be honored because we like them better. Field experiments on helping behavior have found similarity effects for religion (Yinon & Sharon, 1985), race (Bryan & Test, 1967; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1977), gender (Bryan & Test, 1967; Lindskold, Forte, Haake, & Schmidt, 1977), social attitudes (Sole, Marton, & Hornstein, 1975), educational institution (Aune & Basil, 1994; Howard, Gengler, & Jain, 1995), and personal characteristics such as sharing a birthday or name (Burger, Messian, Patel, del Prado, & Anderson, 2004).

Even when total strangers solicit contributions, familiarity with these strangers created by a brief unrelated dialogue increases the likelihood of contributions, possibly because familiarity increases liking (Dolinski, Grzyb, Olejnik, Prusakowski, & Urban, 2005; Dolinski, Nawrat, & Rudak, 2001; Macaulay, 1975). Increased liking is also a likely explanation for the finding that students tend to give more to professors who remember their name (Howard et al., 1995).

Another mundane factor that promotes liking is beauty. A few studies have found that people are more likely to give to physically attractive people (Landry, Lange, List,

Price, & Rupp, 2006; West & Brown, 1975; Wiesenthal, Austrom, & Silverman, 1983). One study found this to be the case more strongly for males answering the door (Landry et al., 2006). This may be a reason why female solicitors are sometimes more successful than male solicitors (Lindsfold et al., 1977). One survey study on alumni giving found an opposite sex-effect (Belfield & Beney, 2000) but an experimental study did not (Bekkers, 2007a).

Attire may also moderate the effect of approval. Well-dressed solicitors raised more money in two studies, (Levine, Bluni, & Hochman, 1998; Williams & Williams, 1989) but not in two others (Bull & Gibson-Robinson, 1981; McElroy & Morrow, 1994).

Group size. The value of approval increases with the number of persons recognizing the gift. One study found that people give more when accompanied by others, especially by females (Jiobu & Knowles, 1974). Another study we found tested the effect of multiple solicitors. When requests for donations are made by two solicitors, people are more likely to give—though less than twice (Jackson & Latané, 1981).

Social norms. The value of approval also increases with the perceived desirability of giving among one's peers. Religious persons are expected to be more generous than the nonreligious (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008). A failure to give has a more negative effect on the reputation of religious persons than on that of nonreligious persons (Bailey & Young, 1986).

Social status. Social status of both the donor and the solicitor enhance the value of approval. When people are solicited for a donation by a person of higher social status, they are more likely to give (Jackson & Latané, 1981; Pandey, 1979; Vriens, Scheer, Hoekstra, & Bult, 1998). One study found that Baptists in the Netherlands donated more when ministers recommend an offering (Soetevent, 2005). Also when the potential donor has a higher social status she is more likely to give, probably because the norm to give is stronger. The expression "noblesse oblige" represents this observation. The elite are given a special obligation to look after those lower on the status rank of society. Not giving would endanger one's elite position (Odendahl, 1990; Ostrower, 1997).

Need for social approval. Some individuals may be more sensitive to social approval for helping, and react more strongly to the observability of a donation (Satow, 1975). Such individuals are likely to have an altruistic self-image, which will be discussed below (Mechanism 6).

Overall strength of effect. Reputation has a strong effect on giving. It may easily overpower effects by other mechanisms. This holds for the costs mechanism, for instance. When asked for a contribution to a charitable cause by one's spouse, the amount requested does not matter (Bekkers, 2004). Spouses also draw each other into volunteering (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006). One study found reputation to have a stronger effect than awareness of need. In this study, the effect of reputation in face-to-face solicitations, even by unknown solicitors, was so strong that it took away the effect of a picture of beneficiaries. In a direct-mail campaign for the same cause, the picture increased donations (Thornton et al., 1991).

Mechanism 6. Psychological Benefits. In the discussion of moderators of the other mechanisms, we have included psychological benefits. From the perspective of the other mechanisms, psychological benefits enhance the effects of these mechanisms. Viewed from the perspective of the psychological benefits, one could also say that the other mechanisms enhance the effects of psychological benefits.

We have not yet discussed the interaction between psychological benefits and solicitation. Such an interaction occurs in the foot-in-the-door effect (DeJong, 1981; Gueguen & Fischer-Lokou, 1999; Pliner, Hart, Kohl, & Saari, 1974; Reingen, 1978; Rittle, 1981; Seligman, Bush, & Kirsch, 1976; Williams & Williams, 1989). It is believed that the initial small request creates or activates a self-image of helpfulness, which creates pressure to behave in a helpful manner on a subsequent occasion. In line with the self-image explanation, the effect of an initial request is reduced when pay is offered in return for compliance with the initial request (Zuckerman, Lazzaro, & Waldgeir, 1979). Another study found that when the first request is too small to activate a helpful self-image, it does not increase compliance with the second request (Seligman et al., 1976). However, it should be noted that alternative explanations for the Foot-in-the-door effect are possible (Kilbourne & Kilbourne, 1984). One alternative explanation is that the first request heightens awareness of need.

However, the foot in the door-technique does not always work. Brownstein and Katzev (1985) found that first asking to sign a petition in support of an art institution did not increase compliance with a subsequent request for a donation for this art institution. Allison, Messick and Samuelson (1985) found that sending a flyer with a questionnaire actually reduced the amount contributed subsequently. Weyant (1996) found a negative effect of the foot-in-the-door technique in a door-to-door collection for the American Cancer Society.

Mechanism 7. Values. Very few studies have tested for moderators in relationships of values with philanthropy. An exception is Fong (2007), showing that humanitarianism/egalitarianism is only positively related to donations to welfare recipients when the recipients appeared more worthy of support. Another exception is a recent study of guilt appeals, showing that feelings of responsibility are increased by the presence of others who may approve of donations (Basil, Ridgway, & Basil, 2006). Also, a survey study revealed that contributions to religion are less strongly related to social values than contributions to other organizations (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008).

Mechanism 8. Efficacy. We have not found any experimental studies showing how effects of efficacy are moderated by other factors. One survey study shows that perceived efficacy is more strongly related to donations to religious causes, international relief, and domestic public benefit organizations among people with stronger altruistic values (Bekkers, 2006).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the audiences for helpful comments and suggestions. Thanks to various colleagues who provided articles they could not find and who clarified their findings. They

thank the editor and two anonymous referees of NVSQ for useful comments. Thanks to Esra Dursun and Barry Hoolwerf for research assistance.

Author's Note

A previous version of this article was presented at the 35th Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action, November 16-18, 2006, Chicago, the Civil Society Congress, May 31, 2007, Utrecht, and the WWAV Academy, June 4, 2007, Woerden.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared that they had no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article. **[AQ: 1]**

Funding

The author(s) disclosed that they received the following support for their research and/or authorship of this article: John Templeton Foundation and Grant No. 451-04-110 of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to René Bekkers **[AQ: 2]**

References

- Abrams, B. A., & Schmitz, M. D. (1978). The "crowding-out" effect of governmental transfers on private charitable contributions. *Public Choice*, 33(1), 29-39.
- Abrams, B. A., & Schmitz, M. D. (1984). The "crowding-out" effect of governmental transfers on private charitable contributions: Cross-section evidence. *National Tax Journal*, 37, 563-568.
- Abrahams, M. F., & Bell, R. A. (1994). Encouraging charitable contributions: An examination of three models of door-in-the-face compliance. *Communication Research*, 21, 131-153.
- Adams, W. C. (1986). Testing geographical bias in international news whose lives count? TV coverage of natural disasters. *Journal of Communication (1986-1998)*; Spring 1986; 36, 2, 36(2), 113-123.
- Allison, S. T., Messick, D. M., & Samuelson, C. D. (1985). Effects of soliciting opinions on contributions to a public good. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 201-206.
- Alpizar, F., Carlsson, F., & Johansson-Stenman, O. (2007). *Anonymity, reciprocity and conformity: Evidence from voluntary contributions to a natural park in Costa Rica*. Department of Economics Working Papers in Economics, Göteborg University, (245). Göteborg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg.
- Amato, P. R. (1985). An investigation of planned helping behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 232-252.
- Amos, O. M. (1982). Empirical analysis of motives underlying individual contributions to charity. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 10(4), 45-52.
- Appelbaum, L. D. (2002). Who deserves help? Students' opinions about the deservingness of different groups living in Germany to receive aid. *Social Justice Research*, 15, 201-225.
- Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with impure altruism: Applications to charity and ricardian equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97, 1447-1458.

- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: A theory of warm-glow giving. *Economic Journal*, 100, 464-477.
- Andreoni, J. (1993). An experimental test of the public-goods crowding-out hypothesis. *American Economic Review*, 83, 1317-1327.
- Andreoni, J. (2006). Philanthropy. In L.-A. Gerard-Varet, S.-C. Kolm & J. M. Ythier (Eds.), *Handbook of giving, reciprocity and altruism* (pp. 1201-1269). North-Holland: Elsevier.
- Andreoni, J., & Miller, J. (2002). Giving according to GARP: An experimental test of the consistency of preferences for altruism. *Econometrica*, 70, 737-753.
- Andreoni, J., & Payne, A. A. (2003). Do government grants to private charities crowd out giving or fundraising? *American Economic Review*, 93, 792-812.
- Andreoni, J., & Petrie, R. (2004). Public goods experiments without confidentiality: A glimpse into fund-raising. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1605-1623.
- Apinunmahakul, A., & Devlin, R. A. (2004). Charitable giving and charitable gambling: An empirical investigation. *National Tax Journal*, LVII(1), 67-88.
- Arumi, A. M., Wooden, R., Johnson, J., Farkas, S., Duffett, A., & Ott, A. (2005). *The charitable impulse*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Aune, R. K., & Basil, M. D. (1994). A relational obligations approach to the foot-in-the-mouth effect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 546-556.
- Auten, G. E., Cilke, J., & Randolph, W. (1992). The effects of tax reform on charitable contributions. *National Tax Journal*, 45, 267-290.
- Auten, G. E., & Joulfaian, D. (1996). Charitable contributions and intergenerational transfers. *Journal of Public Economics*, 59, 55-68.
- Auten, G. E., Sieg, H., & Clotfelter, C. T. (2002). Charitable giving, income and taxes: An analysis of panel data. *American Economic Review*, 92, 371-382.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996a). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77, 789-803.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996b). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review*, 15(1), 75-81.
- Bac, M., & Bag, P. K. (2003). Strategic information revelation in fund-raising. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87, 659-679.
- Bailey, R. C., & Young, M. D. (1986). The value and vulnerability of perceived religious involvement. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 693-694.
- Banks, J., & Tanner, S. (1999). Patterns in household giving: Evidence from UK data. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10, 167-178.
- Barclay, P. (2004). Trustworthiness and competitive altruism can also solve the tragedy of the commons. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 25, 209-220.
- Barrett, K. S. (1991). Panel-data estimates of charitable giving: A synthesis of techniques. *National Tax Journal*, 44, 365-381.
- Barrett, K. S., McGuirk, A. M., & Steinberg, R. S. (1997). Further evidence on the dynamic impact of taxes on charitable giving. *National Tax Journal*, 50, 321-334.
- Basil, D. Z., Ridgway, N. M., & Basil, M. D. (2006). Guilt appeals: The mediating effect of responsibility. *Psychology & Marketing*, 23, 1035-1054.

- Batson, M., Nettle, D., & Roberts, G. (2006). Cues of being watched enhance cooperation in a real world setting. *Biology Letters*, 2, 412-414.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 282-316). New York: Random House.
- Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2(2), 107-122.
- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32, 596-615.
- Bekkers, R. (2004). *Giving and volunteering in the Netherlands: Sociological and psychological perspectives*. PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands.
- Bekkers, R. (2005a). *It's not all in the ask. Effects and effectiveness of recruitment strategies used by nonprofits in the Netherlands*. Paper presented at the 34rd Annual ARNOVA-Conference, Washington, DC.
- Bekkers, R. (2005b). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26, 439-454.
- Bekkers, R. (2005c, November 19, 2005). *When and why matches are more effective subsidies than rebates*. Paper presented at the 34th Arnova Annual Conference, Washington, DC.
- Bekkers, R. (2006a, September 13-14, 2006). *Keeping the faith: Origins of confidence in charitable organizations and its consequences for philanthropy*. Paper presented at the the NCVO/VSSN Researching the Voluntary Sector Conference 2006, Warwick University, UK.
- Bekkers, R. (2006b). Traditional and Health Related Philanthropy: The Role of Resources and Personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 349-366.
- Bekkers, R. (2007a). *George gives to Geology Jane: The name letter effect and other similarities in fundraising*. Working paper, Department of Sociology, Utrecht University.
- Bekkers, R. (2007b). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1(3).
- Bekkers, R. (2008). Straight from the heart. In S. Chambré & M. Goldner (Eds.), *Advances in medical sociology, Volume 10: Patients, consumers and civil society: US and international perspectives* (pp. 197-221): Emerald Group.
- Bekkers, R., & Crutzen, O. (2007). Just keep it simple: A field experiment on fundraising letters. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 371-378.
- Bekkers, R., & Schuyt, T. (2008). And who is your neighbor? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review Of Religious Research*, 50(1), 74-96.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2006). To give or not to give, that's the question. How methodology is destiny in Dutch data. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35, 533-540.
- Belfield, C. R., & Beney, A. P. (2000). What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 8(1), 65-80.
- Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 12-29.
- Bennett, R., & Gabriel, H. (2003). Image and reputational characteristics of UK charitable organizations: An empirical study. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6, 276-289.

- Bennett, R., & Kottasz, R. (2000). Emergency fund-raising for disaster relief. *Disaster Prevention and Management, 9*, 352-359.
- Benson, P. L., & Catt, V. L. (1978). Soliciting charity contribution: The parlance of asking for money. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 84-95.
- Berezkei, T., Birkas, B., & Kerekes, Z. (2007). Public charity offer as a proximate factor of evolved reputation-building strategy: An experimental analysis of a real-life situation. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 28*, 277-284.
- Berkowitz, L. (1968). Responsibility, reciprocity, and social distance in help-giving: An experimental investigation of English social class differences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4*, 46-63.
- Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. (1964). Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm: Effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68*, 275-281.
- Berman, G., & Davidson, S. (2003). Do donors care? Some Australian evidence. *Voluntas, 14*, 421-429.
- Bielefeld, W., Rooney, P., & Steinberg, K. (2005). How do need, capacity, geography, and politics influence giving? In A. C. Brooks (Ed.), *Gifts of money in Americas communities* (pp. 127-158). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boatright, R. G., Green, D. P., & Malbin, M. J. (2006). Does publicizing a tax credit for political contributions increase its use? Results from a randomized field experiment. *American Politics Research, 34*, 563-582.
- Booth, A., Higgins, D., & Cornelius, R. (1989). Community influences on funds raised by human service volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 18*(1), 81-92.
- Borgonovi, F. (2006). Do public grants to American theatres crowd-out private donations? *Public Choice, 126*, 429-451.
- Boskin, M. J., & Feldstein, M. (1977). Effects of the charitable deduction of contribution by low and middle income households: New evidence of the national survey of philanthropy. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 59*, 351-354.
- Bowman, W. (2006, June). Should donors care about overhead costs? Do they care? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 288*-310.
- Brickman, P., & Bryan, J. H. (1975). Moral judgment of theft, charity, and third-party transfers that increase or decrease equality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 156-161.
- Brockner, J., Guzzi, B., Kane, J., Levine, E., & Shaplen, K. (1984). Organizational fundraising: Further evidence on the effect of legitimizing small donations. *Journal of Consumer Research, 11*, 611-614.
- Brooks, A. C. (1999). Do public subsidies leverage private philanthropy for the arts? Empirical evidence on symphony orchestras. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 28*(1), 32-45.
- Brooks, A. C. (2000a). Is there a dark side to government support for nonprofits? *Public Administration Review, 60*, 211-218.
- Brooks, A. C. (2000b). Public subsidies and charitable giving: Crowding out, crowding in, or both? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 19*, 451-464.

- Brooks, A. C. (2002). Welfare receipt and private charity. *Public Budgeting & Finance*, 22(3), 101-114.
- Brooks, A. C. (2003a). Do government subsidies to nonprofits crowd out donations or donors? *Public Finance Review*, 31, 166-179.
- Brooks, A. C. (2003b). Taxes, subsidies, and listeners like you: Public policy and contributions to public radio. *Public Administration Review*, 63, 554-561.
- Brown, E. (1997). Altruism toward groups: The charitable provision of private goods. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26, 175-184.
- Brown, E., & Lankford, H. (1992). Gifts of money and gifts of time: Estimating the effects of tax prices and available time. *Journal of Public Economics*, 47, 321-341.
- Brownstein, R. J., & Katzev, R. D. (1985). The relative effectiveness of three compliance techniques in eliciting donations to a cultural organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 564-574.
- Bryan, J. H., & Test, M. A. (1967). Models and helping: Naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 400-407.
- Bryant, W. K., Slaughter, H. J., Kang, H., & Tax, A. (2003). Participating in philanthropic activities: Donating money and time. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 26(1), 43-73.
- Bull, R., & Gibson-Robinson, E. (1981). The influences of eye-gaze, style of dress, and locality on the amounts of money donated to a charity. *Human Relations*, 34, 895-905.
- Buraschi, A., & Cornelli, F. (2002). *Donations*. CEPR discussion paper. (3488).
- Burger, J. M., Messian, N., Patel, S., del Prado, A., & Anderson, C. (2004). What a coincidence! The effects of incidental similarity on compliance. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(1), 35-43.
- Burgoyne, C. B., Young, B., & Walker, C. M. (2005). Deciding to give to charity: A focus group study in the context of the household economy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 383-405.
- Charities Aid Foundation. (2005). UK Giving 2004/05. Kent, UK: Author.
- Callen, J. L. (1994). Money donations, volunteering and organizational efficiency. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 5, 215-228.
- Carlsmith, J. M., & Gross, A. E. (1969). Some effects of guilt on compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 11, 232-239.
- Carroll, J., McCarthy, S., & Newman, C. (2006). An econometric analysis of charitable donations in the Republic of Ireland. *Economic and Social Review*, 36, 229-249.
- Chen, Y., Li, X., & MacKie-Mason, J. K. (2006). Online fund-raising mechanisms: A field experiment. *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy*, 5(2).
- Cheung, C. K., & Chan, C. M. (2000). Social-cognitive factors of donating money to charity, with special attention to an international relief organisation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23, 241-253.
- Chinman, M. J., Wandersman, A., & Goodman, R. M. (2005). A benefit-and-cost approach to understanding social participation and volunteerism in multilevel organizations. In A. M. Omoto (Ed.), *Processes of community change and social action* (pp. 99-118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Choe, Y. S., & Jeong, J. (1993). Charitable contributions by low- and middle income taxpayers: further evidence with a new method. *National Tax Journal*, 46(1), 33-39.
- Chua, V. C. H., & Wong, C. M. (1999). Tax incentives, individual characteristics and charitable giving in Singapore. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 26, 1492-1504.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., & Miller, J. A. (1978). Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 436-476.
- Cialdini, R. B., Vincent, J. E., Lewis, S. K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., & Darby, B. L. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 206-215.
- Clark, J. (2002). Recognizing large donations to public goods: An experimental test. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 23, 33-44.
- Clark, P. B., & Wilson, J. Q. (1961). Incentive system: A theory of organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 6, 129-166.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (1997). The Economics of Giving. In J. W. Barry & B. V. Manno (Eds.), *Giving better, giving smarter: Working papers of the national commission on philanthropy and civic renewal* (pp. 31-55). Washington, DC: National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2003). Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 109-120.
- Connolly, L. S. (1997). Does external funding of academic research crowd out institutional support? *Journal Of Public Economics*, 64, 389-406.
- Cunningham, M. R., Steinberg, J., & Greu, R. (1980). Wanting to and having to help: Separate motivations for positive mood and guilt-induced helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 181-192.
- Daneshvary, N., & Luksetich, W. A. (1997). Income sources and declared charitable tax deductions. *Applied Economics Letters*, 4, 271-274.
- Davidson, J. D., & Pyle, R. E. (1994). Passing the plate in affluent churches: Why some members give more than others. *Review of Religious Research*, 36, 181-196.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Empathic concern and the muscular dystrophy telethon. Empathy as a multidimensional construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 223-229.
- Davis, D. D., Millner, E. L., & Reilly, R. J. (2005). Subsidy schemes and charitable contributions: A closer look. *Experimental Economics*, 8(2), 85-106.
- DeJong, W. (1981). Consensus information and the foot-in-the-door-effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 423-430.
- Desmet, P. (1998). The impact of mail order on subsequent donations: An experiment. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 14, 203-214.
- Desmet, P. (1999). Asking for less to obtain more. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 13(3), 55-65.
- Diamond, A. M. (1999). Does federal funding "crowd in" private funding of science? *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 17, 423-431.

- Diamond, W. D., & Gooding-Williams, S. (2002). Using advertising constructs and methods to understand direct mail fundraising appeals. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 12*(3), 225-242.
- Diamond, W. D., & Kashyap, R. K. (1997). Extending models of prosocial behavior to explain university alumni contributions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 915-928.
- Diamond, W. D., & Noble, S. M. (2001). Defensive responses to charitable direct mail solicitations. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 15*(3), 2-12.
- Dolinski, D., Grzyb, T., Olejnik, J., Prusakowski, S., & Urban, K. (2005). Let's dialogue about penny: Effectiveness of dialogue involvement and legitimizing paltry contribution techniques. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 1150-1170.
- Dolinski, D., Nawrat, M., & Rudak, I. (2001). Dialogue involvement as a social influence technique. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1395-1406.
- Doob, A. N., & McLaughlin, D. S. (1989). Ask and you shall be given: request size and donations to a good cause. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 1049-1056.
- Duncan, B. (2004). A theory of impact philanthropy. *Journal of Public Economics, 88*, 2159-2180.
- Duquette, C. M. (1999). Is charitable giving by nonitemizers responsive to tax incentives? New evidence. *National Tax Journal, 52*, 195-206.
- Dyck, E. J., & Coldevin, G. (1992). Using positive vs negative photographs for third-world fund raising. *Journalism Quarterly, 69*, 572-579.
- Eaton, D. H. (2001). Charitable contributions and tax price elasticities for nonitemizing taxpayers. *International Advances in Economic Research, 7*, 432-442.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. (2004). Giving to secular causes by the religious and nonreligious: An experimental test of the responsiveness of giving to subsidies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 271-289.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2000). Volunteers and pseudo-volunteers: The effect of recruitment method in dictator experiments. *Experimental Economics, 3*, 107-120.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2003). Rebate versus matching: Does how we subsidize charitable contributions matter? *Journal of Public Economics, 87*, 681-701.
- Eckel, C. C., Grossman, P. J., & Johnston, R. M. (2005). An experimental test of the crowding out hypothesis. *Journal Of Public Economics, 89*, 1543-1560.
- Edlund, J. E., Sagarin, B. J., & Johnson, B. S. (2007). Reciprocity and the belief in a just world. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 589-596.
- Eschholz, S. L., & Van Slyke, D. M. (2002). New evidence about women and philanthropy: Findings from Metro Atlanta: United way of metropolitan Atlanta's women's legacy.
- Farmer, S. M., & Fedor, D. B. (2001). Changing the focus on volunteering: An investigation of volunteers' multiple contributions to a charitable organization. *Journal of Management, 27*, 191-211.
- Feenberg, D. (1987). Are tax price models really identified: The case of charitable giving. *National Tax Journal, 40*, 629-633.
- Feldman, D., & Feldman, B. (1985). The effect of a telethon on attitudes toward disabled people and financial contributions. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 51*, 42-45.

- Feldman, N. E. (2007). *Time is money: Choosing between charitable activities*. Working paper, Ben-Gurion University, Israel.
- Feldstein, M. (1975a). The income tax and charitable contributions: Part I—Aggregate and distributional effects. *National Tax Journal*, 28, 81-99.
- Feldstein, M. (1975b). The income tax and charitable contributions: PART II—The impact on religious, educational, and other organizations. *National Tax Journal*, 28, 209-226.
- Feldstein, M., & Taylor, A. (1976). The income tax and charitable contributions. *Econometrica*, 44, 1201-1222.
- Ferris, J. S., & West, E. G. (2003). Private versus public charity: Reassessing crowding out from the supply side. *Public Choice*, 116, 399-417.
- Finke, R., Bahr, M., & Scheitle, C. P. (2006). Toward explaining congregational giving. *Social Science Research*, 35, 620-641.
- Fisher, R. J., & Ackerman, D. (1998). The effects of recognition and group need on volunteerism: A social norm perspective. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 25, 262-275.
- Fong, C. M. (2007). Evidence from an experiment on charity to welfare recipients: Reciprocity, altruism, and the empathic responsiveness hypothesis. *Economic Journal*, 117, 1008-1024.
- Francia, P. L., Green, J. C., Herrnson, P. S., Powell, L. W., & Wilcox, C. (2005). Limousine liberals and corporate conservatives: The financial constituencies of the democratic and republican parties. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86, 761-778.
- Frank, R. H., Gilovich, T., & Regan, D. (1996). Do economists make bad citizens? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10, 187-192.
- Fraser, C., & Hite, R. E. (1989). The effect of matching contribution offers and legitimation of paltry contributions on compliance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1010-1018.
- Fraser, C., Hite, R. E., & Sauer, P. L. (1988). Increasing contributions in solicitation campaigns: The use of large and small anchorpoints. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 284-287.
- Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1996). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 195-202.
- Freedman, J. L., Wallington, S. A., & Bless, E. (1967). Compliance without pressure: The effect of guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7(2), 117-124.
- Furnham, A. (1995). The just world, charitable giving and attitudes to disability. *Personal and Individual Differences*, 19, 577-583.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1977). The subtlety of white racism, arousal, and helping behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 691-708.
- Gittell, R., & Tebaldi, E. (2006). Charitable giving: Factors influencing giving in the U.S. States. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35, 721-736.
- Glazer, A., & Konrad, K. A. (1986). A signaling explanation for charity. *American Economic Review*, 86, 1019-1028.
- Glenday, G., Gupta, A. K., & Pawlak, H. (1986). Tax incentives for personal charitable contributions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 68, 688-693.
- Gneezy, U., & List, J. A. (2006). Putting behavioral economics to work: Testing for gift exchange in labor markets using field experiments. *Econometrica*, 74, 1365-1384.
- Grace, D., & Griffin, D. (2006). Exploring conspicuousness in the context of donation behavior. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11, 147-154.

- Greenwood, D. T. (1993). Price and income elasticities of charitable giving: How should income be measured? *Public Finance Quarterly*, 21, 186-209.
- Gruber, J. (2004). Pay or pray? The impact of charitable subsidies on religious attendance. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 2635-2655.
- Gueguen, N., & Fischer-Lokou, J. (1999). Sequential request strategy: Effect on donor generosity. *Journal Of Social Psychology*, 139, 669-671.
- Haley, K. J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2005). Nobody's watching? Subtle cues affect generosity in an anonymous economic game. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 245-256.
- Harbaugh, W. T. (1998). What do donations buy? A model of philanthropy based on prestige and warm glow. *Journal of Public Economics*, 67, 269-284.
- Harbaugh, W. T., Mayr, U., & Burghart, D. R. (2007). Neural responses to taxation and voluntary giving reveal motives for charitable donations. *Science*, 316, 1622-1624.
- Harris, M. B., Benson, S. M., & Hall, C. L. (1975). The effects of confession on altruism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 96, 187-192.
- Harris, M. B., Liguori, R. A., & Stack, C. (1973). Favors, bribes, and altruism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 47-54.
- Harrison, W. B., Mitchell, S. K., & Peterson, S. P. (1995). Alumni donations and college's development expenditures: Does spending matter? *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 54, 397-412.
- Havens, J. J., O'Herlihy, M. A., & Schervish, P. G. (2007). Charitable giving: How much, by whom, to what, and how? In W. W. Powell & R. S. Steinberg (Eds.), *The non-profit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 542-567). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hibbert, S., Chatzidakis, A., & Smith, A. (2005, 24 June 2005). *Help? Who . . . Me? Building Understanding of non-donors: An application of neutralisation*. Paper presented at the ESRC and NCVO Seminar on Charitable Giving and Donor Motivation.
- Hoffman, E., McCabe, K., & Smith, V. L. (1996). Social distance and other-regarding behavior in dictator games. *American Economic Review*, 86, 653-660.
- Hood, R. D., Martin, S. A., & Osberg, L. S. (1977). Economic determinants of individual charitable donations in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 10, 653-669.
- Horne, C. (2003). The internal enforcement of norms. *European Sociological Review*, 19, 335-343.
- Horne, C. S., Johnson, J. L., & Van Slyke, D. M. (2005). Do charitable donors know enough—and care enough—about government subsidies to affect private giving to nonprofit organizations? *Nonprofit And Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(1), 136-149.
- Howard, D. J. (1990). The influence of verbal responses to common greetings on compliance behaviour: the foot-in-the-mouth effect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 1185-1196.
- Howard, D. J., Gengler, C., & Jain, A. (1995). Whats in a name—A complimentary means of persuasion. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 22, 200-211.
- Hughes, P. N., & Luksetich, W. A. (1999). The relationship among funding sources for art and history museums. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10(1), 21-37.
- Hungerman, D. M. (2005). Are church and state substitutes? Evidence from the 1996 welfare reform. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 2245-2267.
- Ickes, W. J., Kidd, R. F., & Berkowitz, L. (1976). Attributional determinants of monetary help-giving. *Journal of Personality*, 44, 163-178.

- Irvin, R. (2005). State regulation of nonprofit organizations: Accountability regardless of outcome. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34, 161-178.
- Isen, A. M., & Noonberg, A. (1979). The effect of photographs of the handicapped on donation to charity: When a thousand words may be too much. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 9, 426-431.
- Jackson, E. F., Bachmeier, M. D., Wood, J. R., & Craft, E. A. (1995). Volunteering and charitable giving: Do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 24, 59-78.
- Jackson, J. M., & Latané, B. (1981). Strength and number of solicitors and the urge toward altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 415-422.
- Jackson, N. C., & Mathews, R. M. (1995). Using public feedback to increase contributions to a multipurpose senior center. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28, 449-455.
- Jiobu, R. M., & Knowles, E. S. (1974). Norm strength and alms giving: An observational study. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 94, 205-211.
- Jonas, E., Schimel, J., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2002). The scrooge effect: Evidence that mortality salience increases prosocial attitudes and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1342-1353.
- Jones, A. M., & Posnett, J. W. (1991a). Charitable donations by UK households: Evidence from the Family Expenditure Survey. *Applied Economics*, 23, 343-351.
- Jones, A. M., & Posnett, J. W. (1991b). The impact of tax deductibility on charitable giving by covenant in the UK. *Economic Journal*, 101, 1117-1129.
- Joulfaian, D. (2004). Gift taxes and lifetime transfers: Time series evidence. *Journal Of Public Economics*, 88, 1917-1929.
- Karlan, D., & List, J. A. (2006). *Does price matter in charitable giving? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment*. Working paper, Yale University.
- Karremans, J., Lange, P. A. M. v., & Holland, R. W. (2005). Forgiveness and its associations with prosocial thinking, feeling, and doing beyond the relationship with the offender. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1315-1326.
- Katz, S. N. (1999). Where did the serious study of philanthropy come from, anyway? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 8(1), 74-82.
- Katzev, R. D. (1995, December 15, 1995). *Applying social psychology to charitable donations: Three experiments on nonprofit fundraising*. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from www.nonprofitresearch.org/usr_doc/16167.pdf
- Kerr, N. L. (1989). Illusions of efficacy: The effects of group size on perceived efficacy in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 287-313.
- Kerr, N. L., Garst, J., A., D., & Harris, S. E. (1997). That still, small voice: Commitment to cooperation as an internalized versus a social norm. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 1300-1311.
- Keyt, J. C., Yavas, U., & Riecken, G. (2002). Comparing donor segments to a cause-based charity: The case of the American Lung Association. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 10(2), 117-134.
- Khanna, J., Posnett, J., & Sandler, T. (1995). Charity donations in the UK: New evidence based on panel data. *Journal of Public Economics*, 56, 257-272.

- Khanna, J., & Sandler, T. (2000). Partners in giving: The crowding-in effects of UK government grants. *European Economic Review* 44, 1543-1556.
- Kilbourne, B. K., & Kilbourne, M. T. (1984). Norms of social conduct and the foot-in-the-door. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 123(1), 13-20.
- Kingma, B. (1989). An accurate measurement of the crowd-out effect, income effect and price effect for charitable contributions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97, 1197-1207.
- Kitchen, H. (1992). Determinants of charitable donations in Canada: A comparison over time. *Applied Economics Letters*, 24, 709-713.
- Knoke, D. (1981). Commitment and detachment in voluntary associations. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 141-158.
- Kogut, T., & Ritov, I. (2005a). The "Identified victim" effect: An identified group, or just a single individual? *Journal Of Behavioral Decision Making*, 18, 157-167.
- Kogut, T., & Ritov, I. (2005b). The singularity effect of identified victims in separate and joint evaluations. *Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 106-116.
- Komter, A. (1996). The social and psychological significance of gift giving in the Netherlands. In A. Komter (Ed.), *The gift: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 107-117). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Konečki, V. J. (1972). Some effects of guilt on compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23(1), 30-32.
- Kraut, R. E. (1973). Effects of social labeling on giving to charity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 551-562.
- Kropf, M., & Knack, S. (2003). Viewers like you: Community norms and contributions to public broadcasting. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56, 187-197.
- Kumru, C., & Vesterlund, L. (2005). *The effect of status on voluntary contribution*. Working paper, Department of Economics, University of Pittsburgh.
- Landry, C., 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. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 747-782.
- Lankford, R. H., & Wyckoff, J. H. (1991). Modeling charitable giving using a box-cox standard tobit model. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73, 460-470.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesnt he help?* New York: Meredith.
- Lee, B. A., & Farrell, C. R. (2003). Buddy, can you spare a dime? Homelessness, panhandling, and the public. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38, 299-324.
- Lee, L., Piliavin, J. A., & Call, V. R. A. (1999). Giving time, money, and blood: Similarities and differences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62, 276-290.
- Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 203-210.
- Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2), 115-132.
- Levine, L. R., Bluni, T. D., & Hochman, S. H. (1998). Attire and charitable behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 83(1), 15-18.

- Levitt, L., & Kornhaber, R. C. (1977). Stigma and compliance. A re-examination. *Journal of Social Psychology, 103*(1), 13-18.
- Lincoln, A. J. (1977). Effects of the sex of the model and donor on donating to Amsterdam organ grinders. *Journal of Social Psychology, 103*(1), 33-37.
- Lindahll, W. E., & Conley, A. T. (2002). Literature review: Philanthropic fundraising. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 13*(1), 91-112.
- Lindsey, L., & Steinberg, R. S. (1990). *Joint crowdout: An empirical study of the impact of federal grants on state government expenditures and charitable donations*. NBER Working Paper Series, No. 3226.
- Lindskold, S., Forte, R. A., Haake, C. S., & Schmidt, E. K. (1977). The effects of directness of face-to-face requests and sex of solicitor on streetcorner donations. *Journal of Social Psychology, 101*, 45-51.
- 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*, 215-234.
- List, J. A., & Rondeau, D. (2003). The impact of challenge gifts on charitable giving: An experimental investigation. *Economics Letters, 79*, 153-159.
- Long, J. E. (2000). Omitted-variable bias when using state tax rates to estimate the tax price effect on itemized deductions. *Public Finance Review, 28*(2), 120-133.
- Long, S. H. (1976). Social pressure and contributions to health charities. *Public Choice, 28*, 55-66.
- Lunn, J., Klay, R., & Douglass, A. (2001). Relationships among giving, church attendance, and religious beliefs: The case of the Presbyterian Church (USA). *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*, 765-775.
- Macaulay, J. (1975). Familiarity, attraction, and charity. *Journal of Social Psychology, 95*, 27-37.
- Marcuello, C., & Salas, V. (2000). Money and time donations to Spanish non-governmental organizations for development aid. *Investigaciones Económicas, 24*(1), 51-73.
- Marcuello, C., & Salas, V. (2001). Nonprofit organizations, monopolistic competition, and private donations: Evidence from Spain. *Public Finance Review, 29*, 183-207.
- Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Siegfried, J. J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 45*, 123-143.
- Marx, J. D. (2000). Women and human services giving. *Social Work, 45*(1), 27-38.
- Mathur, A. (1996). Older adults' motivations for gift giving to charitable organizations: An exchange theory perspective. *Psychology & Marketing, 13*(1), 107.
- McClelland, R. (2002). *Effects of allowing nonitemizers to deduct charitable contributions*: Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office.
- McClelland, R., & Kokoski, M. F. (1994). Econometric issues in the analysis of charitable giving. *Public Finance Quarterly, 22*, 498-517.
- McElroy, J. C., & Morrow, P. C. (1994). Personal-space, personal appearance, and personal selling. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 425-426.
- McGregor-Lowndes, M., Newton, C., & Marsden, S. (2006). Did tax incentives play any part in increased giving? *Australian Journal Of Social Issues, 41*, 493-509.

- Meier, S. (2007a). Do subsidies increase charitable giving in the long run? matching donations in a field experiment. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 5, 1203-1222.
- Meier, S. (2007b). A survey of economic theories and field evidence on pro-social behavior. In B. S. Frey & A. Stutzer (Eds.), *Economics and Psychology: A Promising New Cross-Disciplinary Field*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Miller, D. T. (1977). Personal deserving versus justice for others: An exploration of the justice motive. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*(13), 1-13.
- Miller, D. T. (1999). The norm of self-interest. *American Psychologist*, 54, 1053-1060.
- Milofsky, C., & Blades, S. D. (1991). Issues of accountability in health charities: A case study of accountability problems among nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20, 371-393.
- Moll, J., Krueger, F., Zahn, R., Pardini, M., De Oliveira-Souza, R., & Grafman, J. (2006). Human fronto-mesolimbic networks guide decisions about charitable donation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103, 15623-15628.
- Muehleman, J., Bruker, C., & Ingram, C. (1976). The generosity shift. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 344-351.
- Odendahl, T. (1990). *Charity begins at home: Generosity and self-interest among the philanthropic elite*. New York: Basic Books.
- O'Neill, C. J., Steinberg, R. S., & Thompson, G. R. (1996). Reassessing the tax-favored status of the charitable deduction for gifts of appreciated assets. *National Tax Journal*, 49, 215-233.
- Okten, C., & Weisbrod, B. A. (2000). Determinants of donations in private nonprofit markets. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75, 255-272.
- Okunade, A. A., & Berl, R. L. (1997). Determinants of charitable giving of business school alumni. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 201-214.
- Olsen, J. A., & Eidem, J. I. (2003). An inquiry into the size of health charities: The case of Norwegian patient organizations. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 32, 457-466.
- Olson, D. V. A., & Caddell, D. (1994). Generous congregations, generous givers: Congregational contexts that stimulate individual giving. *Review of Religious Research*, 36, 168-180.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ostrower, F. (1997). *Why the wealthy give: The culture of elite philanthropy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pancer, S. M., McMullen, L. M., Kabatoff, R. A., Johnson, K. G., & Pond, C. A. (1979). Conflict and avoidance in the helping situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1406-1411.
- Pandey, J. (1979). Effects of benefactor and recipient status on helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 108, 171-176.
- Park, T. K., & Park, S. B. (2004). *An economic study on charitable giving of individuals in Korea: Some new findings from 2002 survey data*. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://www.istr.org/conferences/toronto/workingpapers/park.tae-kyu.pdf>
- Parsons, L. M. (2003). Is accounting information from nonprofit organizations useful to donors? A review of charitable giving and value-relevance. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 22, 104-129.

- Parsons, L. M. (2007). The impact of financial information and voluntary disclosures on contributions to not-for-profit organizations. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 19, 179-196.
- Payne, A. A. (1998). Does the government crowd-out private donations? New evidence from a sample of non-profit firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 69, 323-345.
- Payton, R. L., Tempel, E. R., & Rosso, H. A. (1991). Taking fund raising seriously: An agenda. In D. F. Burlingame & L. J. Hulse (Eds.), *Taking fund raising seriously*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pelozo, J., & Steel, P. (2005). The price elasticities of charitable contributions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 24, 260-272.
- Pharoah, C., & Tanner, S. (1997). Trends in charitable giving. *Fiscal Studies*, 18, 427-433.
- Piersma, N., & Jonker, J.-J. (2004). Determining the optimal direct mailing frequency. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 158, 173-182.
- Piferi, R. L., Jobe, R. L., & Jones, W. H. (2006). Giving to others during national tragedy: The effects of altruistic and egoistic motivations on long-term giving. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 171-184.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (Eds.). (1991). *Giving blood: The development of an altruistic identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H.-W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27-65.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Piliavin, I. M. (1972). Effect of blood on reactions to a victim. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23, 353-361.
- Pitts, R. E., & Skelly, G. U. (1984). Economic self-interest and other motivational factors underlying charitable giving. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 13(2), 93-109.
- Pliner, P., Hart, H., Kohl, J., & Saari, D. (1974). Compliance without pressure: Some further data on the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 17-22.
- Polonsky, M. J., Shelley, L., & Voola, R. (2002). An examination of helping behavior—Some evidence from Australia. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 10(2), 67-82.
- Posnett, J., & Sandler, T. (1989). Demand for charity donations in private non-profit Markets—The case of the UK. *Journal of Public Economics*, 40, 187-200.
- Potters, J., Sefton, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2005). After you—Endogenous sequencing in voluntary contribution games. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 1399-1419.
- Pronin, E., Lin, D. Y., & Ross, L. (2002). The bias blind spot: Perceptions of bias in self versus others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 369-381.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Radley, A., & Kennedy, M. (1992). Reflections upon charitable giving: A comparison of individuals from business, “manual” and professional backgrounds. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 2, 113-129.
- Radley, A., & Kennedy, M. (1995). Charitable giving by individuals: A study of attitudes and practice. *Human Relations*, 48, 685-709.
- Randolph, W. C. (1995). Dynamic income, progressive taxes, and the timing of charitable contributions. *Journal of Public Economy*, 103, 709-738.

- Reece, W. S. (1979). Charitable contributions: New evidence on household behavior. *American Economic Review*, 69, 142-151.
- Reece, W. S., & Zieschang, K. D. (1985). Consistent estimation of the impact of tax deductibility on the level of charitable contributions. *Econometrica*, 53, 271-293.
- Reece, W. S., & Zieschang, K. D. (1989). Evidence on taxation and charitable giving from the 1983 U.S. treasury tax model file. *Economics Letters*, 3(1), 49-53.
- Reed, P. B., & Selbee, L. K. (2002). *Is there a distinctive pattern of values associated with giving and volunteering? The Canadian case*. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://www.canadawhocares.ca/pdfs/ARNOVA%20Ethos%20Paper%20Nov.pdf>
- Regan, D. T., Williams, M., & Sparling, S. (1972). Voluntary Expiation of Guilt: A Field Experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(1), 42-45.
- Reingen, P. H. (1978). On inducing compliance with requests. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5, 96-102.
- Reingen, P. H. (1982). Test of a list procedure for inducing compliance with a request to donate money. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 110-118.
- Ribar, D. C., & Wilhelm, M. O. (1995). Charitable Contributions To International Relief And Development. *National Tax Journal*, 48, 229-244.
- Ribar, D. C., & Wilhelm, M. O. (2002). Altruistic and joy-of-giving motivations in charitable behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110, 425-457.
- Ricketts, R. C., & Westfall, P. H. (1993). New evidence on the price elasticity of charitable contributions. *Journal of the American Taxation Association*, 15(2), 1-25.
- Rittle, R. H. (1981). Changes in helping behavior: Self- versus situational perceptions as mediators of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 431-437.
- Robinson, J. (1990). Estimates of the price elasticity of charitable giving: A reappraisal using 1985 itemizer and nonitemizer charitable deduction data. *Journal of the American Taxation Association*, 12, 39-50.
- Romney-Alexander, D. (2002). Payroll giving in the UK: Donor incentives and influences on giving behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(1), 84-92.
- Rotolo, T., & Wilson, J. (2006). Substitute or complement? Spousal influence on volunteering. *Journal Of Marriage And The Family*, 68, 305-319.
- Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behavior. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15, 215-238.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J., & West, D. C. (2000). Widening the appeal of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 5, 318-332.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J. B., & West, D. C. (2006). Perceptual determinants of nonprofit giving behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 155-165.
- Sargeant, A., & Jay, E. (2004). *Fundraising management analysis, planning and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Trust and relationship commitment in the United Kingdom voluntary sector: Determinants of donor behavior. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21, 613-635.
- Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2005). The antecedents of donor commitment to voluntary organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 16(1), 61-78.

- Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Individual giving behaviour: A multi-disciplinary review. In A. Sargeant & W. Wymer (Eds.), *The nonprofit marketing companion*. London: Routledge.
- Satow, K. L. (1975). Social approval and helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11*, 501-509.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (1997). Social participation and charitable giving: A multivariate analysis. *Voluntas, 8*, 235-260.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2002). The Boston area diary study and the moral citizenship of care. *Voluntas, 13*(1), 47-71.
- Schiff, J. (1985). Does government spending crowd out charitable contributions? *National Tax Journal, 38*, 535-546.
- Schiff, J. (1990). *Charitable giving and government policy: An economic analysis* (Vol. 102). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Schlegelmilch, B. B., Diamantopoulos, A., & Love, A. (1997). Characteristics affecting charitable donations: Empirical evidence from Britain. *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science, 3*(1), 14-28.
- Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1997). Responses to different charity appeals: The impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations. *European Journal of Marketing, 31*, 548-560.
- Schroeder, D. A., Dovidio, J. F., Penner, L. A., & Piliavin, J. A. (1995). *The social psychology of helping and altruism*. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities.
- Schuyt, T. N. M., Smit, J., & Bekkers, R. (2010, January 2010). *The Philanthropy Scale: A sociological perspective in measuring new forms of pro social behaviour* (Philanthropic Studies Working Paper Series, 2010). Working Paper Department of Philanthropic Studies, VU University Amsterdam. Retrieved August 1, 2010 from http://gevenin nederland.nl/uploads/doc/WP13_Schuyt_Bekkers_Smit_jan2010.pdf
- Schwartz, R. A. (1970). Personal philanthropic contributions. *Journal of Political Economy, 78*, 1264-1291.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9*, 349-364.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1974). Awareness of interpersonal consequences, responsibility denial, and volunteering. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(1), 57-63.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1975). The justice of need and the activation of humanitarian norms. *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 111-136.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Howard, J. (1984). Internalized values as motivators of altruism. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Development and maintenance of pro-social behavior: International perspectives on positive morality* (pp. 229-255). New York: Plenum.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Howard, J. A. (1980). Explanations of the moderating effect of responsibility denial on the personal norm-behavior relationship. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 43*, 441-446.
- Schwarzwald, J., Raz, M., & Zvibel, M. (1979). The applicability of the door-in-the face technique when established behavioral customs exist. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9*, 576-586.

- Seligman, C., Bush, M., & Kirsch, K. (1976). Relationship between compliance in the foot-in-the-door paradigm and size of first request. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 517-520.
- Silverman, W. K., Robertson, S. J., Middlebrook, J. L., & Drabman, R. S. (1984). An investigation of pledging behavior to a national charitable telethon. *Behavior Therapy*, 15, 304-311.
- Simmons, W. O., & Emanuele, R. (2004). Does government spending crowd out donations of time and money? *Public Finance Review*, 32, 498-511.
- Simon, A. F. (1997). Television news and international earthquake relief. *Journal of Communication*, 47(3), 82-93.
- Skitka, L. J., Mullen, E., Griffin, T., Hutchinson, S., & Chamberlin, B. (2002). Dispositions, scripts, or motivated correction? Understanding ideological differences in explanations for social problems. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 83, 470-487.
- Slemrod, J. (1989). Are estimated tax elasticities really just tax evasion elasticities? the case of charitable contributions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71, 517-522.
- Small, D. A., & Loewenstein, G. (2003). Helping a victim or helping the victim: Altruism and identifiability. *Journal Of Risk And Uncertainty*, 26(1), 5-16.
- 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, 143-153.
- Small, D. A., & Simonsohn, U. (2006). *Friends of victims: Personal experience and prosocial behavior*.
- Smith, D. H. (1975). Voluntary action and voluntary groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1, 247-270.
- Smith, J. R., & McSweeney, A. (2007). Charitable giving: The effectiveness of a revised theory of planned behaviour model in predicting donating intentions and behaviour. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 363-386.
- Smith, V. H., Kehoe, M. R., & Cremer, M. E. (1995). The private provision of public goods: Altruism and voluntary giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 58, 107-126.
- Soetevent, A. R. (2005). Anonymity in giving in a natural context—A field experiment in 30 churches. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 2301-2323.
- Sokolowski, S. W. (1996). Show me the way to the next worthy deed: Towards a microstructural theory of volunteering and giving. *Voluntas*, 7, 259-278.
- Sole, K., Marton, J., & Hornstein, H. A. (1975). Opinion similarity and helping: Three field experiments investigating the bases of promotive tension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 1-13.
- Staub, E., & Baer, R. S. (1974). Stimulus characteristics of a sufferer and difficulty of escape as determinants of helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 279-284.
- Steinberg, R. S. (1985). Empirical relations between government spending and charitable donations. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 14(2-3), 55-64.
- Steinberg, R. S. (1990). Taxes and giving: New findings. *Voluntas*, 1, 61-79.
- Steinberg, R. S. (1991). Does government spending crowd out donations? *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 62, 591-617.

- Stonebraker, R. J. (2003). Allocating local church funds to benevolence: The impact of congregational size. *Review of Religious Research, 45*(1), 48-58.
- Strahilevitz, M., & Myers, J. G. (1998, March). Donations to charity as purchase incentives: How well they work may depend on what you are trying to sell. *Journal of Consumer Research, 24*, 434-446.
- Sullivan, D. H. (1985). Simultaneous determination of church contributions and church attendance. *Economic Inquiry, 23*, 309-320.
- Sweeney, J. W. (1973). An experimental investigation of the free-rider problem. *Social Science Research, 2*, 277-292.
- Swinyard, W. R., & Ray, M. L. (1979). Effects of praise and small requests on receptivity to direct-mail appeals. *Journal of Social Psychology, 108*, 177-184.
- Tam Cho, W. K. (2002). Tapping motives and dynamics behind campaign Contributions: Insights From the Asian American case. *American Politics Research, 30*, 347-383.
- Tankersley, D., Stowe, C. J., & Huettel, S. A. (2007). Altruism is associated with an increased neural response to agency. *Nature Neuroscience, 10*, 150-151.
- Taormina, R. J., Messick, D. M., Iwawaki, S., & Wilke, H. (1988). Cross-cultural perspectives on foreign-aid deservingness decisions. *Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19*, 387-412.
- Taussig, M. K. (1967). Economic Aspects of the personal income tax treatment of charitable contributions. *National Tax Journal, 20*(1), 1-19.
- Thornton, B., Kirchner, G., & Jacobs, J. (1991). Influence of a photograph on a charitable appeal: A picture may be worth a thousand words when it has to speak for itself. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 433-445.
- Tiehen, L. (2001). Tax policy and charitable contributions of money. *National Tax Journal, 54*, 707-723.
- Todd, S. J., & Lawson, R. W. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the financial donor: An examination of donor behavior in terms of value structure and demographics. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 4*, 235-244.
- Trussell, J. M., & Parsons, L. M. (2007). Financial factors affecting donations to charitable organizations. *Advances in Accounting, 23*, 265-287.
- Twenge, J. M., Ciarocco, N. J., Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., & Bartels, J. M. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 56-66.
- Unger, L. S. (1991). Altruism as a motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 12*, 71-100.
- Van Diepen, M., Donkers, B., & Franses, P. H. (2009). Does irritation induced by charitable direct mailings reduce donations? *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 26*, 180-188.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., Van Vugt, M., Bekkers, R., & Schuyt, T. N. M. (2007). From games to giving: social value orientation predicts donations to noble causes. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 375-384.
- Veblen, T. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. New York: Macmillan.

- Vesterlund, L. (2006). Why do people give? In W. E. Powell & R. S. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed, pp. 568-590). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Vriens, M., Scheer, H. R. V. d., Hoekstra, J. C., & Bult, J. R. (1998). Conjoint experiments for direct mail response optimization. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32, 323-339.
- Wagner, C., & Wheeler, L. (1969). Model, need, and cost effects in helping behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12(2), 111-116.
- Warren, P. E., & Walker, I. (1991). Empathy, effectiveness and donations to charity—Social-psychology contribution. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 325-337.
- Warwick, M. (2001). *How to write successful fundraising letters*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Weerts, D. J., & Ronca, J. M. (2007). Profiles of supportive alumni: Donors, volunteers, and those who “do it all.” *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(1), 20-34.
- Weisbrod, B. A., & Dominguez, N. D. (1986). Demand for collective goods in private non-profit markets: Can fundraising expenditures help overcome free-rider behavior? *Journal of Public Economics*, 30, 83-95.
- West, P. (2004). *Conspicuous compassion: Why sometimes it really is cruel to be kind*. London: Civitas Institute of the Study of Civil Society.
- West, S. G., & Brown, T. J. (1975). Physical attractiveness, the severity of the emergency and helping: A field experiment and interpersonal simulation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 531-538.
- Weyant, J. M. (1996). Application of compliance techniques to direct-mail requests for charitable donations. *Psychology & Marketing*, 13, 157-170.
- Weyant, J. M., & Smith, S. L. (1987). Getting more by asking less: The effects of request size on donations to charity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 392-400.
- Wiepking, P. (2007). The philanthropic poor: In search of explanations for the relative generosity of lower income households. *Voluntas*, 18, 339-358.
- Wiepking, P. (2008a). *For the love of mankind. A sociological study on charitable giving*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Philanthropic Studies, VU University Amsterdam: Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Wiepking, P. (2008b). Picturing generosity: National campaigns for charitable causes in the Netherlands. *For the love of mankind. A sociological study on charitable giving* (pp. 73-94). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Philanthropic Studies, VU University Amsterdam: Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Wiepking, P. (2009, January 19, 2010). *Democrats support international relief and the upper class donates to art? How opportunity, incentives and confidence affect donations to different types of charitable organizations*. Retrieved January 19, 2010, from http://gevenin nederland.nl/uploads/doc/WP6_Wiepking_Sep2008.pdf
- Wiepking, P., & Breeze, B. (2009). *Feeling poor, acting stingy: The effect of money perception on charitable giving*. Retrieved January 21, 2010, from http://gevenin nederland.nl/uploads/doc/WP7_Wiepking_Breeze_Jun2009.pdf
- Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009, June). Resources that make you generous: Effects of human and social resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 86, 1973-1996.
- Wiepking, P., Madden, K., & McDonald, K. (2010). Leaving a legacy: Bequest giving in Australia. *Australasian Marketing Journal* 18, 15-22.

- Wiesenthal, D. L., Austrom, D., & Silverman, I. (1983). Diffusion of responsibility in charitable donations. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 4(1), 17-27.
- Wilhelm, M. O., & Bekkers, R. (2010). Helping behavior, dispositional empathic concern, and the principle of care. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(1), 1-22.
- Will, J. A., & Cochran, J. K. (1995). God helps those who help themselves—The effects of religious affiliation, religiosity, and deservedness on generosity toward the poor. *Sociology of Religion*, 56, 327-338.
- Williams, K. D., & Williams, K. B. (1989). Impact of source strength on 2 compliance techniques. *Basic And Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 149-159.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 215-240.
- Wong, C. M., Chua, V. C. H., & Vasoo, S. (1998). Contributions to charitable organizations in a developing country: The case of Singapore. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25(1), 25-42.
- Wu, S.-Y., Huang, J.-T., & Kao, A.-P. (2004). An analysis of the peer effects in charitable giving: The case of Taiwan. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 25, 483-505.
- Wunderink, S. (2000). The economics of consumers gifts and legacies to charitable organisations. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 5, 268-287.
- Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yavas, U., Riecken, G., & Parameswaran, R. (1981). Personality, organization-specific attitude, and socio-economic correlates of charity giving behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 9(1), 52-65.
- Yinon, Y., & Sharon, I. (1985). Similarity in religiousness of the solicitor, the potential helper, and the recipient as determinants of donating behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 726-734.
- Zaleski, P. A., & Zech, C. E. (1992). Determinants of contributions to religious organizations. Free riding and other factors. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 51, 459-472.
- Zaleski, P. A., & Zech, C. E. (1994). Economic and attitudinal factors in Catholic and Protestant religious giving. *Review of Religious Research*, 36, 158-167.
- Zaleski, P. A., Zech, C. E., & Hoge, D. R. (1994). Determinants of religious giving in urban presbyterian congregations. *Review of Religious Research*, 36, 197-206.
- Zuckerman, M., Lazzaro, M. M., & Waldgeir, D. (1979). Undermining effects of the foot-in-the-door technique with extrinsic rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 9, 292-296.

Bios

René Bekkers is head of research and associate professor at the Department of Philanthropic Studies at VU University Amsterdam. His research focuses on causes and consequences of the prosocial behavior.

Pamala Wiepking is an assistant professor at the Department of Philanthropic Studies at the VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands. Her research is focused on socioeconomic determinants of charitable giving.