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1b. Title of research proposal
Global Giving

1c. Scientific summary of research proposal
Why do citizens in some countries take more responsibility for the well-being of others than in other countries? This project seeks to understand the genesis of prosociality, investigating its biological foundations, the influence of cultural traditions, and effects of political, economic and legal structure.

The dominant theory in economics views philanthropy as a solution to social illnesses that the market and the state are not solving, a view complementary to political science theory on preferences for government provision. Sociologists focus on social norms emerging from religious traditions. Cultural evolutionary theory highlights the instrumental value of trust. Still other theories have suggested a role for natural selection of genes. However, these theories have not been tested stringently nor simultaneously. Also the project includes a very important factor largely ignored thus far: political, legal and economic institutions also affect the level of giving as well as who gives to which causes.

Therefore, the objectives of Global Giving are (1) to map country differences in the size and nature of philanthropy across the world; (2) to develop and test multidisciplinary theories explaining these differences; (3) to facilitate international collaboration across disciplinary boundaries in research on philanthropy. The research draws upon 200 surveys recently harmonized by the PI and on new data on philanthropy to be collected among large samples in 145 countries across all continents. Collaboration with international networks of academics safeguards the validity of the questionnaires and experiments. Appropriate multilevel regression models will be used, the lack of which caused biases in previous research.

An integrated understanding of philanthropy is useful not only for theory development, but also for government policy makers and practitioners in nonprofit organizations seeking to mobilize philanthropic contributions and make them more effective. The application in practice is ensured through collaboration with a large network of practitioners.
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**Explanation of the multidisciplinary character of the proposal**
Societies do not neatly observe the boundaries between academic disciplines, and neither do people. Giving can be a political act; it can be religiously motivated; it can be a form of conspicuous consumption; and it may spring from humanitarian concerns. The same gift can result from all of these. Yet different disciplines have focused on explanations at different levels, and with particular clusters of determinants. Political science has understood philanthropy as political behavior based on liberty and democratic institutions. Sociology has emphasized cultural traditions, trends and social influences at the national and social group level; social and organizational psychology has studied group processes and the behavior of individual citizens. Biologists have explained philanthropy as an extreme form of altruism resulting from evolutionary processes selecting for certain genetic polymorphisms. In reality, these factors are all interwoven in a complex web of determinants. To explain cross-national differences in philanthropy, monodisciplinary explanations are incomplete. We need to understand how individual motivations and societal circumstances interact. For instance, personality and self-identity theories explain giving as the result of individual traits with genetic underpinnings, while institutional theories suggest that such traits matter only for individuals in groups that are actively mobilized.
### 1. Public summary of your research proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Giving, René Bekkers, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why do citizens in some countries like the Netherlands give more time and money to charitable causes than in other countries? This research in 145 countries examines influences of biological factors, cultural traditions, economic conditions, government support, legal regulation, fiscal compensation and nonprofit organizations on the generosity of citizens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Giving, René Bekkers, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waarom geven mensen in sommige landen zoals Nederland meer tijd en geld aan goede doelen dan in andere landen? Dit onderzoek in 145 landen gaat na welke invloed biologische factoren, culturele tradities, economische omstandigheden, de overheid, wetgeving, belastingvrijstelling en goededoelenorganisaties zelf hebben op de vrijgevigheid van burgers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why do citizens in some nations give more money, time and other resources to the benefit of society than citizens in other nations? How can these differences between nations be explained? *Global Giving* moves the frontier of research beyond the focus on western countries and narrow mono-disciplinary accounts that dominate the literature today. Going beyond micro-level theories that explain who gives what and why, *Global Giving* will provide an integrative multidisciplinary explanation of cross-national differences in generosity, adding institutionalization and organization of the non-profit sector as macro-level context factors. Also the research will improve the methods and statistics currently used in behavioral social science research.

To do so, *Global Giving* will (1) map country differences in the size and nature of philanthropy among large \((n > 1,000)\) representative samples across a large number (145) of countries; (2) develop, operationalize, and test theories explaining differences in philanthropy between countries; (3) facilitate international collaboration across disciplinary boundaries in research on philanthropy and provide methodological innovations that will benefit researchers in the social sciences as a whole.

Philanthropy – the voluntary contribution of private resources to collective welfare\(^1\) – is an increasingly important social behavior contributing to the well-being of citizens in nations across the world. Governments are calling upon citizens and corporations to take responsibility for society as a whole. Engagement in philanthropy has been linked to better health and well-being of the giver\(^2-5\) but more importantly, society benefits from generosity. Recent history provides dramatic examples of the contribution of philanthropy to a better world. Long before the international community came to a coordinated response, nonprofit organizations such as Unicef and Doctors Without Borders provided emergency shelter, food, and health care to victims of the civil war in Syria. The first Ebola vaccine was produced in a lab funded by the Wellcome Trust. Through coordinated efforts supported by a coalition of the WHO, Unicef, and the Rotary International Foundation, polio was eradicated from Africa. The Ocean Cleanup system was recently launched to remove plastic waste from the oceans. In countries like Greece, still suffering from the economic downturn, volunteers in churches and welfare organizations provide for basic needs through soup kitchens and food banks.

Across the globe, countries differ markedly in the prevalence of philanthropy, as Figure 1 shows. Such behavioral differences in prosociality are at the heart of *Global Giving*. Countries with high levels of engagement in philanthropy are the Netherlands, Ireland and the UK (75-80% giving to charity), Australia and New Zealand (around 70%), and the US and Canada (60-65%). Much lower levels of engagement in philanthropy are found in Russia and China (5-10%), India and Japan (~25%). Also within Europe we find considerable differences, where citizens in the Netherlands, the UK and Ireland, are 8 times more likely to engage in philanthropy than citizens in Lithuania, Russia or Greece. Where do these differences come from? How can they be explained? Are the differences...
indicative of generosity, or do they merely reflect economic prosperity? Due to a lack of
data these questions cannot be answered. The data in Figure 1 say nothing about the
amounts donated. In the Netherlands, the only country beyond the US where such a
figure is available, philanthropy amounts to about 0.8% of GDP. So while the
Netherlands may seem to be a generous country in Figure 1, the amounts donated in
acts of giving tend to be small for most households. In the US, philanthropy amounts
to about 2% of GDP.

Figure 1. Country differences in the incidence of charitable giving (% of population
donating to charity, 2010-2017 average). Source: CAF (own computation)

An attempt to harmonize existing data on philanthropy from various countries in the
world in the International Philanthropy Database (IPD) concluded that a comparative
analysis of amounts donated is difficult. As a result, previous comparative research on
philanthropy is limited to analyses of the likelihood that citizens donate money to
charity.

Theoretical models of philanthropy discussed below have focused at the individual level
and have been developed in western countries. They suggest that different motivations
underlie the decision to give money and the amount donated. However, it is unclear how
prevalent these motivations are in different countries. This is important to know because
academic research on philanthropy has been conducted primarily in western countries.
While philanthropy is an increasingly global phenomenon, the use of ‘WEIRD’ samples of
WESTern, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic participants limits the generalizability of
existing research. The generalizability of research on philanthropy is also limited
because of the overwhelming influence of seemingly trivial context factors.
Experiments with charitable giving as an outcome variable have produced widely different results as a function of minimal differences in the design of these experiments. Motivations for giving are likely to differ between countries. But before we can even begin to answer the question how characteristics of countries affect motivations for giving, it is important to know the basic numbers: where do which citizens give what to which causes?

The global increase in charitable giving in the wake of the economic recovery after the financial crisis suggests that improvements in the economy can increase giving across societies.[6] However, even long periods of economic growth and strong increases of wealth have not increased philanthropy in China, India and Russia by much, and the ranking of countries has remained about the same. Why are people living in countries such as the Netherlands, the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand much more likely to give to charity? What proportion of income and wealth are donated in these countries? Are relative levels of generosity there also higher than in other countries?

Overview
The research I propose on country differences in philanthropy is based on an integrated model of giving behavior involving determinants at three levels, displayed in Figure 2.[14] The model departs from macro-level differences between countries in values and institutions in the top left corner, which affect meso-level differences in the activities of nonprofit organizations about mobilization strategies (arrow A). The strategies of nonprofit organizations, in turn, are attuned to and affect the likelihood that individual citizens will be asked to contribute, and the characteristics of the situations in which they are asked (arrow B). For individual citizens, the decision to give is influenced by the characteristics of the giving situation and their resources and prosocial values (arrow C). Both the organizations that solicit contributions (arrow B) as well as the national context in which individual giving decisions are made (arrow D) affect the nature and level of giving. They also affect the influence of situational and individual donor characteristics (arrows E and F).

Figure 2. Three level model of giving behavior

The simultaneous consideration of factors at three levels is a novel contribution to the field of research on philanthropy. While the three-level model is commonly used in
research on education, stratification and health, most of the academic research on giving behavior has been limited to characteristics at the micro-level.\cite{15, 16} For social scientists, however, the enormous differences between countries in the proportion of the population engaging in philanthropy that the map in Figure 1 shows pose intriguing questions. Why do some countries have much lower proportions engaging in philanthropy than others? How much do people give as a proportion of their income and wealth in countries around the world? How can country differences in generosity be explained? Could situational characteristics that increase generosity in western countries be leveraged in non-western countries? The research I propose is the first to answer these questions. It is also relevant for practitioners in nonprofit organizations. Knowledge on situational characteristics and organizational strategies that make people give are obviously of interest to organizations that collect contributions. Global Giving will show how factors that drive giving differ between countries.

**Theory**

Philanthropy is a unique form of human cooperation. It poses a puzzle: in contrast to informal helping, it cannot be explained from principles of reciprocity.\cite{17} People help their neighbors, friends and family, both in their current country of residence and in their country of origin through remittances. People even help strangers by doing things for them, or indirectly by giving them access to their resources. These are examples of informal giving because there is no formal organization involved. Informal giving can be explained by kinship altruism,\cite{18, 19} direct reciprocity and exchange.\cite{20, 21} However, people also engage in cooperation by giving time to nonprofit organizations by volunteering, donating money to charitable organizations and giving blood to blood banks. These examples of giving all involve an intermediary organization that channels the help offered by individuals to the beneficiaries. Even though friends and family often raise funds for charitable causes in their direct social environment, acts of philanthropy cannot be driven entirely by direct reciprocity, and require different explanations.\cite{22-24} Global Giving focuses on such acts of formal giving. In these acts people usually do not have direct contact with the beneficiaries, and they cannot be sure that their efforts will be compensated in the future. In these cases, philanthropy does not hold the promise to the donor that once she will be the beneficiary of an act of reciprocated giving. Because direct reciprocity is unlikely to explain formal giving it poses an intriguing puzzle for social science.

That said, there is no dearth of theories explaining philanthropic behavior, especially at the micro-level. Philanthropy is so multi-faceted that it cannot be explained by a single theory, but requires a multidisciplinary perspective.\cite{25, 26} Therefore, an important aim of the current research is to synthesize the theories that purport to explain philanthropy in different disciplines. In addition, we draw special attention to theories that identify factors at the meso- and macro-levels of analysis, because they have been ignored in previous research and hold the key to explain cross-national differences.

**Micro-level theories: Who Gives When?**

Researchers have tried to solve the puzzle of philanthropy in two different ways, each with its own type of explanation and methodology. The first type of explanation uses as evidence answers to the question ‘who gives?’ In this strand of research, random sample
surveys are often used to measure the tendency of a large number of people to engage in philanthropy through a series of questions on various forms of giving, including donations to charity and volunteering. The second type draws upon answers to the question ‘when do people give?’ In this strand of research, specific examples of giving are observed among small samples of participants in experiments that manipulate situational characteristics. An important contribution of *Global Giving* is that these two types of explanations will be combined, and investigated in conjunction with explanations for country differences.

1. Who gives?
Broadly speaking, two groups of factors dominate the literature on characteristics of charitable donors and countries: resources and values. At the individual level, citizens with more resources at their disposal in the form of human and social capital and with stronger prosocial values give more.

*Resources.* As charitable giving is costly, those with more resources at their disposal will be more likely to engage in it.[27] There is a broad consensus in research relying on surveys that education, status and income are positively correlated to charitable giving.[28-30] The level of education is one of the ubiquitous correlates of charitable giving. In all countries where this relation has been investigated, higher educated citizens are more likely to contribute and give more.[28] Analyses of donations using data from income tax returns and longitudinal panel surveys in the Netherlands and the USA show that as their income and wealth increase citizens spend higher amounts on giving, but a lower proportion of income.[31, 32] Results from several other countries tend to be similar.[30] In my previous research I have used life course data and genetically informed designs to examine how the relationship between the level of education and philanthropy can be explained within countries.[33, 34] To some extent, the correlation between the level of education and the amount donated is due to higher levels of income and wealth accumulated[35] but controlling for them does not diminish the relationship to zero.[28] Charitable giving is also dependent on resources of others accessed through social networks.[35, 36] To some extent, social capital explains why human capital is associated with charitable giving.[35] Also the relation between religious affiliation and philanthropy is reduced when social capital is taken into account.[37]

*Prosocial values.* While resources increase the budgets that constrain the giving behavior of individual citizens, they do not give a positive explanation of why they give, and how generously they give relative to their budgets. Charitable giving will only occur when people prioritize helping others and collective welfare. The moral principle of care, the internalized value that citizens attach to helping others [38, 39] is thus an important correlate of charitable giving and a variety of prosocial behaviors in daily life.[40] The principle of care may also be able to explain why some people are more generous than others and why members of religious groups give more. As all major religions stress the moral value of helping others, it is likely that the principle of care explains a part of the remaining relationship between religious affiliation and charitable giving. The *Global Giving Survey* will be the first survey to study the giving behavior of members of non-western religious groups in conjunction with the moral principle of care. In addition, generalized social trust is an important trait of citizens who engage in prosocial behavior.[41, 42]
2. When do people give and why?
Research on philanthropy commonly contrasts purely altruistic motivations to give with 'impure' or 'egoistic' motives, sometimes labeled 'warm glow'.[43] The hypothesis of pure altruism states that the desire to help others, if aware and given the opportunity to have an impact, leads individuals to adapt their level of giving to the societal need for contributions. Experiments finding that most participants do not do so proportionally is taken as evidence for non-altruistic motivations for giving, as if people derive utility from the act of giving and not so much from the increase in well-being among recipients of donations.[44-46] The reasons why people enjoy the act of giving more so than the increase in the well-being of recipients include social image concerns (the anticipated reputational benefits of giving), the anticipation of guilt, and the desire to express support for certain values by giving time or money to a specific cause.[47, 48] While these motivations were found in experimental research on charitable giving, they can also be identified in research on volunteering[49] and blood donation.[50]

In addition to these motives, there are also external factors that are largely beyond the control of individual citizens, but have an influence on giving. One particularly strong finding is that a vast majority of acts of giving occur in response to a specific solicitation to contribute.[51, 52] However, even though solicitations are strongly related to the likelihood that people contribute, they do not explain much variance in the amount contributed. These decisions seem to be governed by other circumstances and motivations. Strategies employed by nonprofit organizations and the level of professionalism in mobilization are important meso-level factors that influence private contributions.[53-56] The defaults that nonprofit organizations use and the suggestions they make about potential contributions strongly affect individual giving.[57-65] Another external factor is the price of giving.[66] When donations to nonprofit organizations are tax-deductible, the effective price of giving is reduced, and giving increases.[67]

3. Integration of research on who gives and when and why people give
Theories on when and why people give can be used to explain who gives because some citizens are more likely to encounter situations that include mechanisms and motivations that drive giving.[28, 30] Thus far, few studies have explicitly tested arguments using measures or manipulations of the mechanisms that drive giving, simply because there are virtually no survey datasets on charitable giving that also include such measures. The Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (GINPS) is an exception to this rule.[68] An important contribution of Global Giving is that mechanisms theoretically predicted to drive giving behavior will be measured explicitly. I will build on the GINPS to include measures and manipulations of the mechanisms driving philanthropy.

Macro-level theories: where do people give?
The preceding discussion has focused on giving at the individual level of citizens. Global Giving extends the research within countries discussed above to a comparative analysis across countries. The basic tenet of comparative research is that it is the location of citizens in a certain nation that influences their giving, regardless of their individual characteristics. Giving is shaped directly by the resources and values that countries influence (arrow D in Figure 2 above) and indirectly through the presence of nonprofit organizations and their activities (arrows A and B). Arrows E and F visualize the exciting possibility that characteristics of countries and nonprofit organizations also affect who
gives what and when.

Previous comparative research has often used aggregate measures of characteristics of individual citizens. It is striking that some of the relations between characteristics of citizens and philanthropy consistently found at the individual level do not emerge at the country level. While religion and education are positively associated with engagement in philanthropy within countries, this is not the case across countries. More educated countries are not more charitable on average and the average level of religiosity of a country is not consistently related to engagement in philanthropy. For education we see a pattern of equalization. In countries with a high average level of education, the difference between lower and higher educated citizens is smaller as the higher educated become less likely to contribute than in countries with a low average level of education. For religiosity, it has been found that religious citizens are more likely to give when their religious group forms a minority in that country. The finding that individual levels of education and religiosity are positively related to giving while aggregate levels are not, can be explained by a single hypothesis: that the norm of giving is observed less by the groups in which it originated, as it is adopted widely by other groups. As it spreads from the religious to the non-religious, and from the higher to the lower educated. The Global Giving Survey allows for a test of this hypothesis, using both self-reported data on giving in the past year as well as prosocial choices observed in abstract social dilemmas.

Global Giving moves beyond an investigation of the characteristics of citizens and investigates characteristics of countries that affect giving by citizens in these countries. Obviously, it is important to take the influence of the composition of the population in the countries investigated into account. Without the presence of citizens who are able and willing to give the establishment of institutions that facilitate giving does not make much sense. But because the composition of the population cannot be influenced by policy makers and nonprofit organizations it may not be very useful to know which characteristics of citizens are correlated with generosity (arrow C in Figure 2). For practical purposes it is much more useful to know which groups of citizens are willing to give but are not yet asked to do so in practice. The Global Giving Survey will produce such knowledge. The research will also reveal which characteristics that are amenable to change influence charitable giving.

The major contribution of Global Giving is that the research answers the question which factors explain why some countries have higher levels of giving, taking population composition effects into account. I build this explanation on a comprehensive review of the literature, identifying six core theories:

1. Three failures theory.[72, 73] This is the dominant theory in economics, in which philanthropy is viewed as a solution to social needs that the market and the state are not meeting successfully.
2. Social origins theory, in which preferences for government provision are key.[74] Nations have different worlds of welfare, depending on the level of de-commodification and universalism.
3. Social integration theory, advocated primarily in sociology, identifying group cohesion and social norms emerging from religious traditions.[37]
4. Cultural evolutionism, highlighting the instrumental value of fairness and trust in areas with high levels of economic integration.[75]
5. **Biological and physical theories**, perhaps the most controversial group of theories that have suggested that natural selection of genes and of the climate determine the level of prosociality in countries.[71, 76-80] In this view, humans are more charitable by nature in some countries than in others.

6. **Institutionalism**, emerging from recent work specifically in the field of philanthropic studies. From this perspective, national institutions affect the level of giving as well as who gives to which causes.[55, 56, 81]

The puzzle that *Global Giving* seeks to solve is how these theories are related to each other and to the facts. I conjecture that geographic and biological conditions determine the prosocial potential of countries, and that cultural traditions and political preferences also provide a fairly stable foundation for prosociality. Economic and legal institutions, however, are more flexible or malleable, open to choice. Societies have developed institutions and different traditions of giving as a result of the accumulation of human and social resources, and specific values and attitudes. *Global Giving* will therefore focus primarily on the institutions that countries have developed to facilitate giving. These explanations involve both national institutions as well as organizational responses. They are largely independent of individual characteristics of citizens.

The core idea of *Global Giving* is that institutions are key not only to how much is given in a country, but also to who gives to which causes, and why. It is the presence of nonprofit organizations, the sophistication and professionalism of strategies of nonprofit organizations that determines whether the willingness and the capacity of citizens to contribute to society is mobilized and transformed into action. A study of blood donation in the European Union in the 1990s showed that the organization of the collection of blood strongly affects the size and composition of the pool of blood donors.[55] Recently, such differential mobilization effects of institutions on the composition of the population of donors have been documented in the UK.[82]

The institutional characteristics of countries are important potential influences explaining philanthropy. Based on the empirical analyses of philanthropy in 26 countries in the International Philanthropy Database, Wiepking & Handy (2015)[81] listed a set of facilitating factors for philanthropy. Specifically, *Global Giving* investigates how philanthropy is related to (1) government support to charitable causes, (2) the regulation of nonprofit organizations, (3) fiscal incentives for nonprofit organizations, and (4) the professionalism of fundraising.

**Government support.** In comparisons between the US and Europe it is often argued that public goods paid by taxes and philanthropy are substitutes and that private donations are crowded out by government subsidies. Are the US more charitable than Europe because taxes and welfare state spending are higher in Europe? Such a ‘crowding-out’ hypothesis would explain why hospitals, universities and cultural nonprofits in the US receive a larger share of their income from donations than in Europe. However, a fair test of the crowding-out hypothesis requires more than just two countries. A recent meta-analysis of research on the crowding-out hypothesis demonstrates that the evidence in favor of the crowding-out hypothesis is rather thin.[45] In fact, the US may be the exception rather than the rule. In Europe, citizens in countries with higher taxes, like the Netherlands and Sweden, are actually more likely to give to charity rather than less.[83]
This result speaks against the crowding-out hypothesis, and suggest that other characteristics of the US explain its high level of philanthropy. Without evidence on the amounts donated and appropriate statistical models, however, these results are not very convincing as a test of the crowding-out hypothesis. Thus it is important that Global Giving will measure amounts donated to charitable causes. Also welfare state provisions may not affect the proportion of the population donating to charitable causes or the amounts donated, but rather the causes supported. Only when government subsidies cover basic needs, education, and health, citizens with prosocial values will direct their giving to overseas causes, including international relief and development, and human rights.[84, 85]

The ‘crowding-out’ hypothesis is part of a broader political debate on the role of government in the provision of public welfare. A seminal contribution to this debate was made by Salamon and Anheier in their social origins theory[86], based on the work of Barrington Moore[87] and Esping-Andersen on welfare states.[74] The theory distinguishes four types of nations, and predicts that giving will be more widespread in liberal democracies, followed by corporatist and social-democratic states. Preferences for provision of public goods by charities rather than the state would be expected to be strongest in liberal welfare states. Citizens in the UK indeed prefer charities in many areas, and do so more strongly than 10 years ago.[82] However, the hypothesis has not been thoroughly tested across countries. The data collected in the IPD and the Johns Hopkins International Comparative Philanthropy project, however, do not give much support for social origins theory. Einolf recently concluded that social origins theory “fails to predict present-day cross-national variation in charitable giving and the size of the nonprofit sector.”[88]

Regulation and fiscal incentives. Countries vary strongly in the legal framework and regulation of nonprofit organizations.[53, 89-91] The regulation of fundraising and the level of transparency of charitable organizations are likely to affect the level of charitable confidence among the general public.[41] In conjunction with the practice of fundraising the aggregate level of charitable confidence may affect charitable giving.[53] Using data on the legal framework for giving across a large number of countries in the world Global Giving will investigate how giving is related to tax laws and regulation.[91] Changes in such tax laws and regulations can be viewed as natural experiments[120-121] that create exogenous shocks in the price of giving for individual citizens. The deductibility of donations in the income tax lowers the price of giving. In more progressive income tax systems, donations are a more attractive way for citizens to reduce taxes.

Resources. At the country level, the proportion of the population engaging in charitable giving increases with GDP.[8, 15] Due to a lack of data, it is unknown whether this relationship holds for the amounts contributed and for relative levels of generosity. As a country becomes more resourceful, it is likely to become more charitable because citizens feel more financially secure. Cultural evolutionism predicts that citizens in more open economies are more likely to give. Henrich et al. found that stronger market integration is positively related to offers in social dilemma games.[75] The number of nonprofit organizations is also likely to be higher in countries with a higher level of trust and with more economic and political freedom, because it is easier for citizens to establish them. As the number of nonprofit organizations increase, citizens are more
likely to be asked for donations. In a study of cadaveric organ procurement in the US, Healy found that donation rates increase with the resources devoted to procurement.\textsuperscript{[56]} In addition to the level of resources, also the distribution of income may indirectly affect charitable giving, because income inequality reduces trust\textsuperscript{[42]} and prosocial values.\textsuperscript{[92]} Trust and civic norms are also stronger in more educated countries.\textsuperscript{[93]}

**Prosocial values.** As a country becomes more trusting and convinced of the value of helping others, it is likely that its citizens become more likely to engage in charitable giving. It is striking that the countries with high levels of engagement in philanthropy in Figure 1 are all countries with a protestant Christian religious tradition or past. Lower levels of engagement in philanthropy are found in countries with a Catholic majority where trust is lower, though Ireland is an exception to this pattern. Also at the individual level, charitable giving is higher among Protestants than among Catholics.\textsuperscript{[47]} Some studies suggest that aggregate levels of trust are indeed positively correlated with the likelihood that citizens engage in philanthropy.\textsuperscript{[36, 94]} Thus far, no studies have examined aggregate levels of prosocial values in relation to philanthropy.

Another unique contribution of Global Giving is that a comparative test of the mechanisms will be conducted across countries. *Global Giving* allows for tests of hypotheses on where these influences are likely to differ. Macro-level factors influence not only the prevalence and nature of collection strategies, but also their effects. The influence of reputation depends on the norm of giving.\textsuperscript{[95]} Who gives what depends not only on the characteristics of donors and decision making situations, but also on how societies have institutionalized the provision of welfare, and on how organizations solicit contributions.\textsuperscript{[55, 56]} Mobilization strategies used by nonprofit organizations affect the likelihood that citizens are asked to give as well as the composition of the donor pool.\textsuperscript{[96]} In the case of blood donation, countries that collect blood through academic research hospitals have a much higher proportion of students as blood donors than countries that collect blood through donor associations.\textsuperscript{[55]} For donations of money, collection systems and mobilization strategies have been described recently.\textsuperscript{[53]} In the Netherlands, I have found that institutions created to raise funds have a strong influence on levels of charitable giving and the composition of the pool of donors and volunteers.\textsuperscript{[97, 98]} *Global Giving* will investigate how institutions and mobilization strategies affect the level of giving and the composition of donor pools in countries across the globe.

**Ground-breaking nature of the project and its innovative and multidisciplinary aspects**

*Global Giving* is ground-breaking because of its multi-disciplinary theoretical perspective, its multi-national scope, its integration of experimental and survey research methods, and its connection with practice. The *theoretical contribution* of Global Giving is the systematic development of a set of hypotheses based on the institutional perspective, and the comparison with the other theories. The *empirical contribution* of Global Giving is that it will provide the best possible test of the six theories. None of these theories have been tested stringently or simultaneously with other theories. The *practical contribution* of Global Giving is that it will provide knowledge that policy makers and executives in the charity and nonprofit sector can apply directly in practice.
Approach
Global Giving uses both existing data, as well as new data from a high quality survey, modeled after the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (GINPS)\(^ {99, 100}\), including experiments with giving behavior, administered to large, random samples. The survey also includes social dilemma games, in which participants make choices about valuable points, which will be converted in local currency after the survey is completed. Appropriate hierarchical multi-level models will be used to analyze differences between countries. To ensure the validity of the module in non-western countries, Global Giving works with an international review board from the Center for Global Generosity (CGG), including experts from the PI’s extensive global network of researchers on philanthropy.

Measuring giving
Cross-national comparative research on philanthropy has lagged behind due to a lack of data. The first objective of Global Giving, to map differences in giving behavior across countries, requires data that are comparable across a large number of countries with very different traditions of philanthropy. The multi-country datasets that are available to researchers are limited to aggregate figures and often used without critical attention to the quality of the data.\(^ {10}\) Funding for Global Giving would solve both these problems, as it includes data collection for the Global Giving Survey using one single methodology among large samples (n > 1,000). The data collected in the Global Philanthropy Survey will enable researchers across the world to test theories on determinants of giving at both the individual and national level, using one single validated methodology.

This objective is difficult to achieve, because different words are used in different countries to talk about giving, and the same words can mean different things to respondents in different countries or even within the same country. As a group of US researchers in a study of different survey modules concluded: ‘methodology is destiny’.\(^ {101}\) The wording of the questionnaire matters not only for the resulting estimates of the size and composition of giving\(^ {101}\), but also for the profile of who is a generous donor.\(^ {10, 102}\) Therefore we develop the questionnaire for the Global Giving Survey in close cooperation with country experts from the Center of Global Generosity. The development of a master questionnaire will start with a critical review of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (GINPS), a high quality survey measuring donations to charitable causes in the Netherlands in an extensive questionnaire module.\(^ {28, 99}\) The module produces estimates which are valid (\(r = .85\) between self-reports and archival records of donations received)\(^ {28}\) and reliable\(^ {103}\), also for non-native Dutch citizens with culturally different norms and traditions for giving.\(^ {152}\)

The GINPS was successfully adapted for comparative research in France.\(^ {104}\) The results for France show that the questionnaire for the Netherlands can also be adapted to other countries, retaining measurement equivalence. The lessons learned in the creation of the Giving in France Survey include that it is important to define giving in behavioral terms, to adapt the examples of organizations for areas in which people can give to the country context, and to tailor the terminology used to national vocabulary and country specific giving traditions. Problems of adaptation are particularly severe for countries beyond western Europe. The questionnaire for the survey will be translated into the primary EU languages, following the TRAPD methodology (Translation, Review, Adjudication, Pretesting and Documentation)\(^ {105}\), which is also used in the European Social Survey. In
the Netherlands, the experience of the adaptation of the GINPS to surveys for members of ethnic minorities has yielded valuable lessons on the formulation of questions about giving in non-western cultures. For instance, respondents with a Muslim affiliation typically do not report donations to their mosque. In Islam, zakat is an important religious duty that is not viewed as a ‘donation’. Not counting such contributions to religious institutions, however, would lead to a serious underestimation of giving for Muslim respondents.

As predictors of giving, in addition to standard questions on demographic and economic indicators, the GINPS includes questions on prosocial values such as trust and the principle of care and a variety of prosocial behaviors, such as informal helping, providing care, blood donation, and remittances. Inclusion of these questions enables a theoretically informed comparison of models of giving of different forms of resources as well as an analysis of a prosocial behavior index.

Measuring prosocial values and behavior
Developmental and personality psychologists have long believed that the internalized moral value attached to helping others is an important motivation for helping behavior. Yet no scale was available to measure this value. Starting from three items in the General Social Survey 2002 in the US, Mark Ottoni-Wilhelm and I have developed such a survey measure which we call the principle of care and validated it in two national sample surveys in the Netherlands, and one in the US.

An alternative approach to measuring prosocial values and preferences is found in social psychology and behavioral economics, in which choice behaviors in abstract situations are observed to measure revealed preferences and perceptions of others. In the online survey, participants will play a variety of games from behavioral economics with other participants. While experimental games have been around for decades, the recent advent of behavioral economics has spurred research on prosocial behavior. In this line of research experimental games are used to study abstract forms of prosocial behavior, typically among convenience samples of students. These experiments include prisoner’s dilemma games, trust games, ultimatum games, dictator games, and common pool resource dilemmas. The dictator game is most often used to model giving behavior. The participant decides about the division of an amount of money between him/herself and ‘another person’, who is not involved in the game and has no power to refuse the amount allocated by the dictator. The participant does not know the other person and will not meet this person after the experiment. The design of the dictator game resembles the situation in which people decide about donations to charitable causes. Choices typically made in these games stand in contrast to the prediction based on a completely self-interested model of man that dictators keep all money for themselves, especially if the recipient is deserving. The amount allocated to the ‘other’ decreases as the decisions of the dictator become more anonymous for third parties such as the experimenters. But even in the absence of strategic concerns participants still give.

Critiques to this line of research are the lack of external validity (generalizability) of abstract game experiments, the use of non-representative samples of participants, and the use of windfall gains (‘house money’ or ‘manna from heaven’).
Participants in experiments are more generous with windfall gains they have received from the experimenters than with earned income.[121-123] The Global Giving Survey lets participants play with windfall gains as well as with earned income. In previous research, I have successfully included a set of hypothetical games to measure social value orientation in the GINPS. Prosocial choices in abstract game situations are positively correlated to amounts donated to charitable causes in real life.[124] In the games token points are at stake. The points earned in these games will be converted into an amount in local currency that will be added to a fixed reward for participation. At the end of the survey, participants enter a dictator game, in which they are paired with either a charity or another participant. The GINPS has incorporated such donation experiments, with high external validity. Correlates of donations observed in these experiments are similar to correlates of self-reported donations.[125] Similar findings have recently been reported in experiments in Germany and other countries.[126, 127]

Context data
Measures of the level of institutionalization and professionalization will be used from existing sources[9] and collected for additional countries. Aggregate data at the country level from the 200 surveys in the Harmonized Trust Database will be used as a measure of trust.[132] Other data on country characteristics such as welfare state spending, legal characteristics, trust, corruption, democracy will be added from established databases and trusted sources including the OECD, Eurostat, the European Social Survey, the World Values Survey, the World Inequality database, the Center for Global Prosperity, the Charities Aid Foundation, Transparency International, the European Foundation Center.

Statistical models
A problem that has plagued comparative research is the use of inadequate statistical models and low statistical power.[10] While many characteristics of countries could explain country differences which are all interrelated, the number of countries for which data are available is typically low. To obtain robust evidence on country-level correlates from multi-level regression analyses, the number of countries included should be as high as possible, but certainly higher than 25.[128] The availability of data from more than 25 countries allows for robust estimates of country differences, provided that country characteristics are not too strongly correlated. The models will not include variables that vary over time, so a standard nesting structure is adequate.[129] Appropriate statistical models typically reduce strong correlations at the country level to very weak relations at the individual level of citizens, explaining only a small proportion of the variance.[8, 10, 69]

2a2. Research plan
Research team and planning of the project
Global Giving consists of four work packages (WPs). With the assistance of a co-PI (postdoc) and a research assistant, I will coordinate Global Giving. We will consult with a carefully selected international advisory board, in teleconferences twice a year, and face-to-face at two project conferences.

In WP1, we will prepare a master questionnaire in English for WP3, based on the mega-analysis. The co-PI will act as daily supervisor of the PhD candidates, who write their dissertation in WP2 and WP3. PhD#1 and PhD#2 will both assist with the development of the survey, and write at least three empirical journal articles on country differences in
giving, one on macro-level institutions, one on organizational strategies, and one analyzing all three levels. PhD#3 will assist with the development of the experiments, and write at least three empirical journal articles on cross-national experiments, one on the behavioral games, one on the donation experiments, and one on the interrelation of these with survey reports on giving in the past calendar year. A research assistant will provide assistance with data management, website design and maintenance, conference organization, and correspondence with a network of experts throughout the project.

**Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and dissemination</td>
<td>Advisory board meetings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term and final conference</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Select 3 PhD candidates</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1: Preparation</td>
<td>WP1.1 Theory development (PI, Co-PI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2: World Giving Index</td>
<td>WP2.1 Prior waves (PI, Co-PI, Phd1, PhD2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3: Global Giving Survey</td>
<td>WP3.1 Pilot (PI, Co-PI, Phd2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4: Experiments</td>
<td>WP4.1 Pilot (PI, Co-PI, PhD3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WP1: Preparations for a new survey through mega-analysis and questionnaire development.** In WP1 the PI and co-PI test the validity of previous surveys including the World Giving Index (WP2) and prepare the methods and materials for the Global Giving Survey (WP3). The general research question answered in WP1 is: How can philanthropic behavior be measured accurately? Specific research questions answered are in WP1.1: How do characteristics of donors vary between surveys as a result of survey design features? and in WP1.2: How can measures of giving practices and giving contexts be optimized to capture country specific giving practices?

In WP1.1, we use a method called **mega-analysis** to estimate the effect of survey methodology on results of survey data analyses on philanthropy and prosocial values. Mega-analysis takes advantage of the fact that in several countries, multiple surveys of varying quality have been conducted at the same time. By using the primary data reported in previous analyses rather than results reported about the data, mega-analysis does not suffer from the key disadvantages of meta-analysis. It can be used for any variable. In an ongoing mega-analysis responses to questions about trust in ‘most people’ are compiled in the Harmonized Trust Database, a big data file including 3.7 million observations from 200 different surveys. WP1.1 applies mega-analysis to the first
comparative research data file of survey data on philanthropy created by Wiepking & Handy, the International Philanthropy Database (IPD). This file compiles data from various surveys in countries across the world that have included questions on charitable giving. Because the methodology used in the different countries varies considerably, it is difficult to interpret country differences without considering methodological differences. In the IPD only one survey for each country is included: the one with the highest quality (e.g., the GINPS for the Netherlands and the Philanthropy Panel Study from the US).

In WP1.1, all available data from surveys that have been conducted at the same points in time as those already included in the IPD, also those of lesser quality, will be added to the database to enable such a mega-analysis. The analyses will demonstrate how conclusions published earlier based on analyses of data of lower quality from existing surveys differ systematically from conclusions based on higher quality data. I have demonstrated the feasibility of this approach in two analyses pooling data from various surveys.

In WP1.2, the questionnaires developed for the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey and the Giving France Survey will be translated in the major world languages and adapted for cross-national use in the Global Giving countries. Also measures of the social, political, economic and legal context in which individual citizens make decisions on giving will be collected and harmonized.

WP2: World Giving Index. The general research question answered in WP2 is: How can differences between countries in generosity be explained? In WP2.1, we analyze data collected through the Gallup World Poll on three forms of prosocial behavior: giving to charity, volunteering, and helping a stranger. Previous analyses of the GWP in the annual World Giving Index reports (CAF, 2010 – 2015) have shown aggregate differences between countries as shown in figure 1. In WP2.1 we apply hierarchical (‘multilevel’) regression models to (1) estimate variance components at the individual and country level, and (2) explain context effects by including data on country characteristics collected in WP1.2. In WP2.2 we collect other context data to measure relevant country characteristics and match these to the individual level data from the GWP, to exhaustively test theories on generosity, both at the individual and national level.

WP3: The Global Giving Survey. Research questions: How much is donated to which causes by citizens in different countries (WP3.1), and how can these differences be explained? (WP3.2) In close collaboration with Kantar Public and a network of experts in Europe (ERNOP) and beyond (Center for Global Generosity), the Global Giving Survey will be conducted in 31 countries with sample sizes of at least 1,000 respondents. The 20 largest EU countries will be included and a selection of 11 countries in three other continents (Canada, the US, Mexico, Chile, Brazil; China, Japan, India; Australia, Russia). This selection maximizes the proportion of the world population represented (57%) as well as the heterogeneity in country characteristics that are theoretically relevant for giving. Africa is excluded because of the high costs for face-to-face surveys. An extension of Global Giving to more countries, including those in Africa, is feasible as soon as the infrastructure is in place. Also it will be possible to collect subsequent waves of data among the same respondents who have participated in the Global Giving Survey, following the example of the GINPS.
WP4: Experiments on philanthropy. The general research question answered in WP3 is: How does philanthropic behavior change in response to changing conditions in the decision situation? To answer this question, the Global Giving Survey includes two types of experiments: behavioral games during the survey[^124], and donation experiments after the survey. The donation experiment is a modification of the ‘All-or-nothing Dictator Game’, which has been validated in the GINPS.[^124, 125, 134] For the behavioral games, the lab will be set up online to enable interactive experiments. Participants in different countries can communicate with each other in real time. In countries where online research is not yet possible among representative samples parts of the fieldwork need to be conducted face-to-face. In these subsamples the strategy method will be used[^135], which rules out communication between participants but produces valid results in social dilemma game experiments.[^136]

An important innovation in the experiments in Global Giving is that they will be conducted by international groups of researchers working together across disciplinary boundaries. I will offer small grants to teams of researchers selected through a request for proposals (RFP). A multidisciplinary international board of advisers will review the proposals following the example of the Science of Philanthropy program at the University of Chicago ([http://spihub.org](http://spihub.org)). Grants awarded entail presentation of the research plans at mid-project and final conferences. All experiments in Global Giving will be piloted through online platforms such as M-Turk, Crowdflower and Prolific, which quickly provides high-quality data from diverse samples.[^137-139] Positive findings dominate the social sciences,[^140] also in experiments on philanthropy.[^146] Publication bias is likely to be an important reason for this.[^141] Therefore the experiments in Global Giving are conducted as registered reports.[^142] The replicability of research on philanthropy has not been assessed previously. Typically, registered reports yield smaller effect sizes and fewer effects below commonly used significance levels.[^143-145] To eliminate publication bias, all experiments in Global Giving are conducted as registered reports.[^142] The design and a power analysis will be made publicly available.

2b. Knowledge utilisation
Global Giving will be the first comparative study of the size and nature of philanthropy ever conducted. Global Giving will have a considerable impact on both practitioners in nonprofit organizations and on academic researchers from a variety of disciplines. A mapping of countries based on the data collected will make philanthropy visible on a global scale, demonstrating which countries are most generous and which are the least generous. Practitioners and policy makers will benefit from insights on what fundraising strategies and legal conditions make people give to charity.

Global Giving will have a significant impact in numerous social science disciplines. The question why people help others at a cost to themselves is a classic in economics, psychology and sociology.[^147-148] The science of philanthropy has grown exponentially[^149-150] in an increasing number of disciplines.[^151] Explanations of cross-national differences in philanthropy originate in a variety of disciplines, including sociology, political science, law, economics, marketing and communication science. The applications of theories from these disciplines are relevant for scholars in these disciplines. The technique of mega-analysis[^132] is applicable in many areas, such as health, happiness, and political interest. The survey will provide the first global data on philanthropy, using one single, validated
Global Giving facilitates international interdisciplinary collaboration by funding proposals for survey experiments, which will encourage researchers in other fields such as behavioral economics and social psychology to implement survey experiments. Finally, the impact of Global Giving will also extend to research on other forms of prosocial behavior than monetary giving, such as volunteering, giving blood, organs and informal helping, because the survey will also include questions on these behaviors.

Global Giving follows the principles of Open Science. The research design, data collected and analyses in Global Giving will be made publicly available through its website. Experiments will be conducted by other researchers, who submit applications in a competitive grant scheme and will be attending the conferences along with practitioners from the global philanthropy sector. In this way, knowledge will be shared on circumstances that influence charitable giving and volunteering.

An international review board consisting of both academics from multiple disciplines, policy makers at the national, European and international level and practitioners from non-profit organizations will be formed to ensure that the research appeals to relevant stakeholders. The research will demonstrate how charitable giving relates to (1) government support to charitable causes, (2) legal regulation of nonprofit organizations, (3) fiscal incentives for nonprofit organizations, and (4) the professionalism of fundraising. The findings in these areas will be discussed with the advisory board, grantees of the RFP and a selective group of researchers at a mid-period and final conference. In conjunction with the European Foundation Centre (EFC, www.efc.be) we organize workshops to discuss the implications of the findings with leaders and executives from the charity and non-profit sector, and with government representatives and public policy makers.

The PI is well-connected to networks of practitioners and philanthropy advisors in the Netherlands as well as in Europe and beyond. The European Research Network on Philanthropy (www.ernop.eu), co-founded by the PI, includes >200 members from almost all countries in Europe. All research institutes on philanthropy across Europe are members of ERNOP and will be involved in the research as co-producers and members of the Advisory Board. Also leaders from other networks and associations of researchers (ASGE, ARNOVA, ISTR) will be invited, also from outside the western world (AROCSA in Africa, the ISTR regional network in Asia). The European Foundation Centre will provide accommodation for a workshop at the Philanthropy House in Brussels. Further dissemination activities include a series of working papers throughout the project, an interactive website with open data, displayed on adaptable world maps. At the conclusion of the project we will publish a book about the results of the Global Giving Survey.

Not only will the research produce substantive research on origins of generosity, but also valuable knowledge on social science research methodology. The research will generate a survey instrument to measure charitable giving and volunteering in a valid and reliable manner across the globe. Knowledge on the effects of survey design is relevant to academics in all disciplines that rely on surveys. The research will demonstrate how behavioural experiments can be included within surveys. Through the RFP (WP4), academic researchers are actively encouraged to conduct field experiments, working with
practitioners from the non-profit sector. The experiments will demonstrate the applicability of the findings in real world settings.

Similar to the World Values Survey, which has had a great influence on our thinking about values systems across the globe, Global Giving has the potential to have a similar impact by providing open access to our thinking about prosocial behavior.

In sum, the knowledge produced by Global Giving will be useful for researchers and policy makers beyond the horizon of the project itself. The data and publications will be available in open access mode through its website and public depositories. The networks formed are likely to generate new research well beyond the project period. The data collected will be available for eternity, providing generations of researchers with a treasure trove of data on prosociality.

2c. Number of words used

section 2a: ___7,957___________ (max. 8,000 words)
section 2b: ___849___________ (max. 1,000 words)
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2e. Data management
1. Will data be collected or generated that are suitable for reuse?

Yes. I am a strong proponent of open science. By default I share the data and code of all of my research projects. I actively encourage reuse of data collected through my blog and Twitter account https://twitter.com/renebekkers (1,500 followers).

A large number of survey responses will be collected in WP 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2. In addition, observations of donation behavior will be made in WP 4.1 and 4.2. A codebook will be created that allows researchers to use, reanalyze and replicate the data collection. All personal information that could be traced back to an individual person will be excluded from the data. The anonymized (depersonalized) data will be made available for reuse in SPSS, Stata and generic database formats. Personal data will not be available for reuse. Aggregated data at the country level will be made publicly available through the project website in generic spreadsheet formats, maps and other graphics.

2. Where will the data be stored during the research?
During the data collection phase, data will be stored at contracted firms, at VU servers and in a shared folder on Surfdrive, protected by passwords and only accessible by project members.

WP1: Data will be stored at VU Amsterdam on a secure server in a folder that can be accessed by project members only.
WP2: The source data are stored at Gallup. They are not publicly available. At VU Amsterdam a de-identified file will be created on a secure server in a folder that can be accessed by project members only.
WP3: At Kantar Public and at VU Amsterdam.
WP4: At locations of grantees and at VU Amsterdam.

3. After the project has been completed, how will the data be stored for the long-term and made available for the use by third parties? To whom will the data be accessible?

All data collected and harmonized in WP1, WP3, and WP4 will be stored on the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/) in public projects. These data will also be provided through Dataverse.nl, using guidelines of DANS/EASY. Personal data will be removed from the datasets that will be deposited. The micro-data collected in WP2 are proprietary, owned by Gallup, and cannot be shared publicly. A public use file will be made available through the OSF.

4. Which facilities do you expect will be needed for the storage of data during the research and after the research? Are these available?

No particular research facilities are needed for this project other than standard computing facilities provided by the VU.

## Cost estimates

### 3a. Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.418</td>
<td>27.577</td>
<td>29.027</td>
<td>30.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.046</td>
<td>46.235</td>
<td>48.774</td>
<td>51.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.259</td>
<td>54.220</td>
<td>59.220</td>
<td>54.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 2</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.413</td>
<td>38.859</td>
<td>55.359</td>
<td>60.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 3</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.413</td>
<td>38.859</td>
<td>55.359</td>
<td>60.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.568</td>
<td>9.769</td>
<td>9.974</td>
<td>10.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff</strong></td>
<td>1122.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Giving Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Giving Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total: 1495.4
3d. Totals

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>€ 1495.4 (=3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget requested from NWO</td>
<td>€ 1495.4 (=3a minus 3b and 3c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3e. Intended starting date

September 1, 2020

3f. Have you applied for any additional grants for this project either from NWO or from any other institution, and/or has the same idea been submitted elsewhere?

No
Curriculum vitae

4a. Personal details
ORCID: 0000-0002-4403-7222, Researcher ID: A-1862-2012, Google Scholar: K4nsiuqAAAAJ, Open Science Framework: 2zmqa

4b. Master's ('Doctoraal')
10/07/97, Radboud University Nijmegen, Sociology of Religion
09/12/98, Radboud University Nijmegen, Political Philosophy

4c. Doctorate

4d. Work experience since completing your PhD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period (date-date)</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor (UD)</td>
<td>03/03 – 09/08</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>Fixed term</td>
<td>Utrecht University (UU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor (UD)</td>
<td>09/08 – 02/10</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>Fixed term</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor (UD)</td>
<td>09/08 – 02/10</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>Fixed term</td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor (UHD)</td>
<td>02/10 – 01/18</td>
<td>0,8 – 1,0</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor by special appointment (bijzonder hoogleraar)</td>
<td>01-13 – 01/18</td>
<td>0,8 – 1,0</td>
<td>Fixed term</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>01/18 – present</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Months spent since completing your PhD
September 2004: Doctorate.
I. September 2004 – August 2008: 0,8 fte position. 80% to be spent on research, 20% on education (i.e., teaching students).
II. September 2008 – January 2010: 0,8 fte position. 70% to be spent on research, 20% on education, 10% on management tasks.
III. February 2010 – December 2013: 0,8 fte position. 60% to be spent on research, 20% on education, 20% on management tasks.
IV. January 2014 – March 2018: 1,0 fte position. 50% to be spent on research, 25% on education, 25% on management tasks.
V. March 2018 – August 2019: 1,0 fte position. 30% to be spent on research, 25% on education, 45% on management tasks.

Calculation months of research
I. 48 months * 0,8 position * 0,8 spent on research = 30,72 months
   48 months * 0,8 position * 0,2 spent on education = 7,68 months
II. 16 months * 0,8 position * 0,7 spent on research = 8,96 months
    16 months * 0,8 position * 0,2 spent on education = 2,56 months
    16 months * 0,8 position * 0,1 spent on management tasks = 1,28 months
III. 34 months * 0,8 position * 0,6 spent on research = 16,32 months
IV. 51 months * 1,0 position * 0,5 spent on research = 25,5 months
     51 months * 1,0 position * 0,25 spent on education = 12,75 months
     51 months * 1,0 position * 0,25 spent on management tasks = 12,75 months

V. 17 months * 1,0 position * 0,3 spent on research = 5,1 months
    17 months * 1,0 position * 0,25 spent on education = 4,25 months
    17 months * 1,0 position * 0,45 spent on management tasks = 7,65 months

Experience | Number of months
---|---
Research activities | (30,72 + 8,96 + 16,32 + 25,5 + 5,1) = 86,60
Education | (7,68 + 2,56 + 5,44 + 12,75 + 4,25) = 32,68
Care or sick leave | 
Management tasks | (1,28 + 5,44 + 12,75 + 5,4) = 27,12
TOTAL | = 146,40

4e. Academic staff supervised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhDs</th>
<th>Promotor</th>
<th>Co-promotor</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>Claire van Teunenbroek (VU, 2014-)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjeerd Piersma (Sanquin, 2015-)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successfully completed</strong></td>
<td>Arjen de Wit (VU, 2013-2018)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal PhDs</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postdocs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pamala Wiepking (VU, 2008-2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Carabain (VU, 2008-2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjen de Wit (VU, 2018-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal postdocs</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal other</strong></td>
<td>~25 researchers at UU (2008-2010) and VU (2008-present) at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4f. Brief summary of your research over the last five years
In 2011, I lead-authored the first comprehensive review of the literature on philanthropy, creating cross-disciplinary awareness and cooperation among scholars from different countries. Earlier I had primarily conducted theory-based empirical research on the foundations of philanthropy at the micro-level with a ‘veni’-grant. I had just moved to the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam to start my own research group at the Center for Philanthropic Studies. I had come to realize that my contribution to the field of philanthropic studies would be much larger by sharing my own knowledge through a systematic review, and by creating international research networks to enable others to share their knowledge as well. As a co-founder of the European Research Network on Philanthropy (ERNOP), I contributed to its development by organizing conferences and
writing successful grant proposals for international consortia. ERNOP now counts ~200 members from more than 25 countries.

Between 2013 and 2018 I was a professor by special appointment of the Van der Gaag Foundation of the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). In my inaugural lecture, I identified the meso-level of nonprofit organizations and the macro-level as terrae incognitae of research on determinants of philanthropy. Then I developed the foundations for international comparative research on philanthropy, by reviewing theories and comparing different surveys and statistical models to analyze multi-country data. The current research proposal aims to explain cross-national differences in philanthropy from the macro-level through the influence of national institutions and from the meso-level through the influence of the actions of nonprofit organizations.

I am an open science advocate. I have published this research proposal at my blog, https://renebekkers.wordpress.com/global-giving.

4g. International activities

Ongoing collaborations:
- With Femida Handy (University of Pennsylvania), Pamala Wiepking (Indiana University), Naoto Yamauchi (Osaka), Beth Breeze (Kent University), Chul Hee Kang (Yonsei University), Angela Bies (University of Maryland) and others: Center for Global Generosity (since 2016)
- With Eric Uslaner (Maryland), Tom van der Meer (UvA), and other collaborators through the Open Science Framework: A Mega-Analysis of Trust (since 2015)
- With David Horton Smith (Boston college) and Irina Krasnapolskaya: HSE Volunteer Motivation Survey (since 2013);
- With Ashley Whillans and Michael Norton (Harvard Business School) and Paul Smeets (Maastricht University): Time Use and Happiness of Millionaires (since 2017);
- With Una O. Osili (Department of Economics, Indiana University, Indianapolis), Cagla Okten (Department of Economics, Bilkent University, Ankara) and Pamala Wiepking (Indiana University): International Comparative Research on Philanthropy (since 2009);
- With Mark Ottoni-Wilhelm (Department of Economics, Indiana University, Indianapolis): Empathy, the Principle of Care and Altruistic Behavior (2004-present).

4h. Other academic activities

Committee memberships
2015 – present  Community Service Steering Group (chair), VU Amsterdam
2015 – present  Ethical Review Board (chair), Faculty of Social Sciences, VU Amsterdam
2013 – present  Research Committee, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU Amsterdam
2012 – 2013  Research Integrity Committee, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU Amsterdam
2014 – 2015  Member of Scientific Steering Committee of Foreign financing of Islamic institutions in the Netherlands (RAND Europe, WODC - Ministry of Security and Justice, Research and Documentation Centre)

Board memberships
2016-present  Secretary of the Association for Research on Voluntary Action (ARNOVA).
2012-2014  Member of the management team of the European study on Foundation Funding for Research and Innovation (EUFORI).
2012-present  Member of the board of the Association for the Study of the Grants
2011-present Regional vice-president for Western Europe of the International Council of Voluntarism Civil Society Social Economy Researcher Association (ICSERA).


2010-present Member of the editorial board of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly.

2010-present Member of the International Advisory Board of Voluntary Sector Review.

2010-2014 Member of the Advisory Board for the ERC project Public Goods through Private Eyes (University of Warsaw).

2010 Member of the publications committee (ARNOVA).

2009-present Member of the Research Committee of the Women’s Philanthropy Institute (WPI) at Indiana University.

2008-present Member of the editorial board of International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing.

2008-2009 Member of the Board of Advisers for the Science of Generosity.

Conference organization
Co-organizer of the 8th ERNOP conference, Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, July 13-14, 2017.

Co-organizer of the Philanthropy and Social Investments (PhiSI) for Research and Innovation Conference, Artis, Amsterdam, April 21-22, 2016.


Co-organizer of the 2014 Van der Gaag Symposium, KNAW, Trippenhuis, Amsterdam, June 24, 2014.

Co-organizer of the 6th ERNOP conference, University of Latvia, Riga, July 11-12, 2013.

Organizer of the 5th ERNOP conference, WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria, June 7, 2011.


Consulting (unpaid)

2014. Consultant for the Volunteer Motivation Survey, Higher School of Economics, Moscow


2014. Consultant for the German Volunteering Survey, DZA, Berlin

2010-2012. Member of Advisory Board for the Hudson Institute (Center for Global Prosperity, Washington DC).


4i. Scholarships, grants and prizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship/Grant/ Prize</th>
<th>Formal applicant</th>
<th>Total budget</th>
<th>Budget own group</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving in the Netherlands 2020 from the Netherlands Ministry of Justice and Security (2019-2020)</td>
<td>€ 120k</td>
<td>€ 120k</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Effects of the Giving Law on Philanthropy in the Netherlands</td>
<td>€ 258k</td>
<td>€ 258k</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the Netherlands Ministry of Security and Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving in the Netherlands 2015 from the Netherlands Ministry of Security and Justice</td>
<td>€ 429k</td>
<td>€ 429k</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National experiment on Altruism, warm glow and generosity from the Science of</td>
<td>€ 27k</td>
<td>€ 27k</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy Initiative, co-applicant: Mark Ottoni-Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits of volunteering from the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Wellbeing</td>
<td>€ 24k</td>
<td>€ 24k</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Sports (VWS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the 'Don't call me' register on recruitment of donors</td>
<td>€ 20k</td>
<td>€ 20k</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the Netherlands Association of Fundraising Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the 'Don't call me' register on recruitment of volunteer fundraisers</td>
<td>€ 20k</td>
<td>€ 20k</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stichting Collecteplan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental influences on service learning experiences among secondary education</td>
<td>€ 10k</td>
<td>€ 10k</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students (2008-2009) from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future of door-to-door fundraising (Stichting Collecteplan)</td>
<td>€ 15k</td>
<td>€ 15k</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of service learning experiences among secondary education students</td>
<td>€ 89k</td>
<td>€ 89k</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Toekomstverkenning vrijwilligerswerk” from the Social and Cultural Planning Office</td>
<td>€ 15k</td>
<td>€ 15k</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with S. Ruiter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review “Generosity and Philanthropy” from the Templeton Foundation</td>
<td>€ 8k</td>
<td>€ 8k</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of service learning experiences among secondary education students</td>
<td>€ 110k</td>
<td>€ 110k</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Veni’-project “Learning to care: explaining the effect of education on prosocial</td>
<td>€ 200k</td>
<td>€ 200k</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior” from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>€1805k</td>
<td>€1805k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Grant/Prize Formal co-applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD project “Donor Careers: the influence of individual, social and</td>
<td>€ 304k</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contextual factors on donor behavior” (PPQC 15-32) with Wim de Kort and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva-Maria Merz (Sanquin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD project “Effective and Efficient Crowdfunding for the Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>€ 294k</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector” (NOW Topsector Creative Industry) with Marcel Veenswijk and Irma Borst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP7 project “The impact of the third sector on socio-economic development in</td>
<td>€2496k</td>
<td>€ 220k</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe” (ITSSOIN), subproject “The impact of volunteering on volunteers and on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society at large” from the European Commission (grant #613177; 2014 - 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender study on European Foundations supporting Research and Innovation (EUFORI)</td>
<td>€ 584k</td>
<td>€ 264k</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EUROPE) from the European Commission, co-applicants: T.N.M. Schuylt and J.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smit (2012 – 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>€3678k</td>
<td>€484k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€5483k</td>
<td>€2289k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Output

5a. Output indicators
Since 2000, I have published proficiently in philanthropic studies, sociology, political science, and social psychology. I published 76 international scientific papers, and 83 publications in Dutch. Publons/Web of Science citations: 1,483; H-Index 17. My current count of citations in Google Scholar is 6,071; H-Index 34 (I-10 index: 75).

5b. Top publications

5c. Output (selection; full CV at https://renebekkers.wordpress.com/about/).
Referred articles (selection; total: 40 EN; 13 NL).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Books** (selection; total: 6 NL)


**Book chapters** (selection; total: 15 EN, 43 NL)


**Other** (selection; total: 21 EN, 21 NL)


Statements by the applicant

Use of extension clause: no

Ethical aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not yet applied for</th>
<th>Applied for</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval from a recognised (medical) ethics review committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval from an animal experiments committee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission for research with the population screening Act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declarations

*By submitting this form I endorse the code of conduct for laboratory animals and the code of conduct for biosecurity/possibility for dual use of the expected results and will act accordingly if applicable.*

- ✔️ I have completed this form truthfully
- ✔️ By submitting this document I declare that I satisfy the nationally and internationally accepted standards for scientific conduct as stated in the [Netherlands-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity](https://example.com) (Association of Universities in the Netherlands)
- ✔️ If applicable: I have submitted a list of non-referees with my pre-proposal.
-☐ If applicable: I have included one or more authorised form co-funding from the host institution (or a third party) guaranteeing to meet part of the costs of this research project.

Name: René Bekkers

Place: Amsterdam

Date: August 27, 2019