



Democrats support international relief and the upper class donates to art? How opportunity, incentives and confidence affect donations to different types of charitable organizations ☆

Pamala Wiepking*

Department Philanthropic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 February 2009

Available online 18 June 2010

Keywords:

Charitable giving
Philanthropy
Donations
Pro-social behavior
Confidence

ABSTRACT

This study is the first to investigate charitable giving to as many as 64 different organizations, predicting what type of charitable organization receives donations from which particular people. We test hypotheses with conditional logistic regression analysis, using the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study ($N_{\text{households}} = 1246$; $N_{\text{organizations}} = 64$). We found that providing people with the opportunity to give increases donations, while which people will donate is conditional on the type of request made. Furthermore, we found some support for the argument that organizations receive more donations from people that have specific incentives (social status motives, religious and political values) to donate to these organizations. Finally, only organizations striving for difficult goals receive more donations from people with higher levels of confidence.

© 2010 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Charitable giving is a wide-spread and frequently recurring form of pro-social behavior in many Western countries. A small selection of research findings shows that especially the Americans are very generous. Over the course of 2002, 66% of the Americans donated an average amount of \$1872 (Giving USA, 2004; Giving USA, 2005). In 2004, 85% of the Canadian population donated on average \$310 to charitable organizations (Imagine Canada, 2006).¹ And 95% of the Dutch donated on average \$301 in 2003 (GINPS04, 2004).²

There is an extensive literature discussing effects of socio-demographic characteristics on charitable giving (Bekkers and Wiepking, in press; Lindahl and Conley, 2002; Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007; Vesterlund, 2006). Researchers have showed repeatedly that the elderly, those who are more religious, have a higher income, and a higher educational level are more frequent and more generous charitable donors (Brown and Ferris, 2007; Regnerus et al., 1998; Schervish and Havens, 1995; Wuthnow, 1991). In contrast with the abundance of research on determinants of general charitable behavior, we know little about the factors that determine the particular charitable organizations people choose to donate to. For example, what

☆ The author thanks Adriaan Hoogendoorn, René Bekkers, Ineke Maas, Mark Wilhelm, Maarten Buis, Jeroen Weesie, Jan Smit, Sarah Borgloh, Eric van Ingen, Kirsten Hollaender, and the anonymous *Social Science Research* reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions on (earlier versions of) this article.

* Fax: +31 20 598 6810.

E-mail address: P.Wiepking@fsw.vu.nl

¹ 1 US dollar = 1.292 Canadian dollars (exchange rate January 2, 2004). Source: http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/H10/Hist/dat00_ca.htm [accessed September 16, 2008].

² 1 US dollar = 0.855 euros (exchange rate June 2, 2003). Source: www.federalreserve.gov/releases/H10/20030609/ [accessed January 12, 2006].

differentiates people deciding to donate to an organization saving stray dogs from people preferring to make a donation to an organization subsidizing cancer research?

Households differ to a great extent in the type of organizations they support with donations. In 2003, 87% of the Dutch households made a donation to organizations active in the health sector. Charities active in the public and social benefits sector receive second most donations, as 53% of the Dutch households made a donation to organizations active in this sector, followed closely by donations to the environment and nature sector, to which 52% of the households gave money. In the Netherlands, organizations in the education and research sector receive donations the least, as only 8% of the Dutch households made a donation to this charitable sector in 2003 (Schuyt and Gouwenberg, 2005).

There is a limited amount of philanthropic research that focuses on charitable giving to particular (types of) organizations. In most cases, these studies focus on giving to one specific charitable sector, for example donations to religious organizations (Bekkers and Schuyt, 2008; Berger, 2006; Jackson and Mathews, 1995; Wuthnow, 1991) or donations to international relief organizations (Atkinson, 2009; Meijer et al., 2005; Micklewright and Schnepf, 2007). Results indicate that there are differences between people who donate to one specific charitable sub-sector rather than another. For instance, a higher education matters more for donating to international relief organizations than for donating to domestic organizations (Micklewright and Schnepf, 2007). Religious involvement is naturally more important for giving to religious organizations, although those belonging to Protestant denominations also have a higher probability of donating to secular causes (Bekkers and Schuyt, 2008).

Notwithstanding these results, research in which donations to several particular organizations are considered simultaneously is more suitable for explaining donations to particular charitable organizations. Up till now, not many attempts have been made to explore this aspect, with the exception of Bennett (2003) and Sargeant et al. (2008). Bennett investigates whether personal values influence charitable giving to particular organizations. In an experimental setup in central London, 250 people were told to suppose that they had been given £100, and that they had to donate this amount to one of three organizations: a cancer care organization, an animal welfare organization, or a human rights organization. Bennett finds that similarities between personal values and organizational values indeed increase the probability for donations to particular organizations. His findings show for example that more individualistic people have a higher probability of donating to the human rights organization, and that more empathic people tend to give to both cancer care and animal welfare.

In an exploratory study, Sargeant et al. (2008) investigate the link between donor ascribed traits of charitable organizations and donating behavior. They show that traits such as emotional engagement, service, voice, and tradition can predict the different charities people choose to donate to. Traits associated with benevolence, progression, and conservatism do not effect donations to the different charity brands included in their study.

The hiatus in the philanthropic literature concerning charitable giving to particular organizations is very likely due to a lack of data on this subject (Micklewright and Schnepf, 2007). However, in the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study (GIN-PS04, 2004; $N = 1316$) data is collected on household donations to 64 particular charitable organizations, ranging from organizations supporting cancer research to evangelical organizations helping drug addicts. In this article we present a first study on donations to this many particular organizations. The specific aim of this article is to find out what type of organization receives donations from which particular people. We believe that the results will not only give information about charitable giving to different types of organizations in the Netherlands, but can also provide insights into giving to different types of organizations in other Western countries. The main reason for this is that we will investigate general hypotheses on which people give to which unique types of charitable organizations. These general mechanisms are assumed to be working in different settings, and these unique types of organizations are active in most Western countries.

2. Theory and hypotheses

In philanthropic literature, there is no all-comprising model of charitable behavior. In order to formulate hypotheses on what type of charitable organization receives donations from which particular people we combine theoretical insights from the interdisciplinary literature reviews composed by Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) and Bekkers and Wiepking (in press). In this article we focus on three mechanisms that influence the particular organizations that people make donations to. First of all, we argue that the *opportunity* people encounter to donate to a particular organization affects the charitable organizations they support. Second, their *incentives* affect the direction of their charitable donation. And finally, people's level of *confidence* influences the specific organizations people are willing to donate to. In this section, we discuss the three mechanisms of opportunity, incentives, and confidence and formulate hypotheses predicting what type of charitable organization receives donations from which particular people.

3. Opportunity

In order to donate money to a charitable organization, people need to encounter the opportunity to make this donation. In most cases, this opportunity is facilitated through solicitation by the charitable organization itself (Bryant et al., 2003; Lindskold et al., 1977; Simmons and Emanuele, 2004). Examples of solicitation methods used by charitable organizations are door-to-door collections, direct mail appeals, church collections, television appeals, and fundraising events. Charitable organizations differ in the solicitation methods they employ. At the same time, people differ in the probability with which they receive solicitations for donations through these different solicitation methods. We will discuss the effects of two

omnipresent solicitation methods in the Netherlands: door-to-door fundraising and direct mail appeals (Schuyt and Gouwenberg, 2005). These two fundraising methods are also used in many other Western countries, such as the United States (Jackson and Latané, 1981; Weyant, 1996), Canada (Imagine Canada, 2006), the United Kingdom (CAF, 2006; Sargeant and Hudson, 2008), and Australia (ACOSS, 2005).

Door-to-door fundraising is a very popular method of fundraising in the Netherlands (Lengkeek, 2001; Schuyt et al., 2007). The main advantages of this solicitation method are relatively small overhead costs due to the large numbers of volunteers who go door-to-door, and a very large potential donor base as many households are solicited. The downside of door-to-door fundraising is that people only donate small amounts. For example, the median donation in door-to-door fundraising in the Netherlands in 2005 is two euros (own calculations GINPS06, 2006).

Although many are at risk of being solicited by means of door-to-door solicitation, not all have the same probabilities of encountering these solicitations (Bekkers, 2005; Sargeant and Hudson, 2008). Those who are more often at home—such as those who don't have paid work and the elderly—have a higher probability of receiving requests for a donation at the door. Conclusively we formulate the hypothesis that charitable organizations using door-to-door solicitations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people who are more often at home.

Direct mail appeals are also a popular way to raise funds in the Netherlands, although not all charitable organizations use direct mail appeals to the same extent (Schuyt et al., 2007). Overhead costs are relatively high for this fundraising method, while response rates are rather low (Bekkers and Crutzen, 2007). However, when people do respond, they donate relatively large amounts, with a median donation of fifteen euros in the Netherlands in 2005 (own calculations GINPS06, 2006). Due to the higher costs, direct mail appeals are in general employed as a fundraising method by larger and more professionalized organizations.

At the individual level, people have different probabilities of receiving and responding to direct mail appeals. It is for example common knowledge among fundraisers that the elderly respond differently to direct mail appeals than younger people.³ Organizations using direct mail appeals for fundraising frequently target older people. Because the elderly tend to take letters more seriously, they are more inclined to open a direct mail letter and respond to it (Diamond and Noble, 2001; Supphellen and Nelson, 2001). Thus we formulate the hypothesis that charitable organizations soliciting money using direct mail appeals have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from older people.

4. Incentives

Not only the opportunity to give can affect the particular charitable organizations people donate to, but also the incentives people experience for making donations. In this study we investigate two incentives for making donations that can influence the particular organizations people donate to: social status incentives and incentives out of the love for mankind (Bekkers and Wiepking, in press; Wiepking, 2008).

4.1. Social status

In his theory of cultural reproduction, Bourdieu (1977) argues that people use cultural and economic capital as a strategy to create and reproduce social inequalities (Ultee et al., 1996). Bourdieu states that elites trying to keep the hierarchical distinctions in place will search for compensating strategies. For example, they can distinguish themselves by displaying refined cultural tastes: attending higher status cultural activities, such as theater, ballet, and opera performances (Bourdieu, 1977). Charitable giving can also be used as a means to display refined cultural tastes. However, in a society where everyone can afford to make donations, the elites will want to distinguish themselves by making donations to organizations that are less accessible to people in lower social strata, such as high-status organizations like cultural institutions (Ostrower, 1997). We formulate the hypothesis that organizations with a cultural focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with a higher socio-economic status.

4.2. For the love of mankind

Some people experience incentives for making donations because they want to make the world a 'better' place. They donate money in order to change the world in a direction more in line with their own values and beliefs (Bennett, 2003; Frank, 1996). Their personal definition of what a better place comprises is paramount in their donations to charitable organizations. In order to make the world a better place, they make charitable donations to specific organizations supporting their cause. We label these incentives for donations as 'For the love of mankind', a literal translation of the Greek word 'philanthropy'. We will focus on the incentives people with different political and religious values experience for their donations.

Left-leaning people are generally more concerned about environmental protection and animal welfare (Neumayer, 2004). At the same time, people with a left-wing political orientation are also more concerned about the economic well-being of needy individuals (Pyle, 1993; Regnerus et al., 1998). Especially organizations with a focus on international development,

³ Own calculations with GINPS04 (2004) indeed show that people over 65 years of age indicate to receive more direct mail requests, and say that they respond more often positively to these requests by making a donation.

environment and animal protection, and community/welfare services attempt to change the world in line with the values of people having a left-wing political orientation. Therefore, we formulate the hypothesis that these organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people.

On the other hand, left-leaning people generally have a stronger believe than right-leaning people that the government is responsible for providing certain public goods and services, rather than charitable organizations. Examples of goods and services left-leaning people feel the government should provide are health services and education, especially in such a strong welfare state as the Netherlands (Wiepking, 2008). We formulate the hypothesis that organizations with a focus on health services and education have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people.

Religious values are more important for people belonging to a religious affiliation. Specifically faith-based organizations will attempt to change the world in line with people's own religious values. We formulate the hypothesis that faith-based organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from religiously affiliated people.

5. Confidence

Next to knowledge and incentives, confidence also affects the specific organizations people donate to. In charitable giving, confidence in the capacities of charitable organizations is very important for people when considering giving money (Bekkers, 2003, 2006; Bowman, 2004; Sargeant et al., 2006). Confidence is more important in social interactions with higher uncertainties. General theory on trust states that when the risk of a certain action is higher, people need higher levels of confidence to engage in that action (Coleman, 1990). The uncertainty of charitable giving varies with donating to different types of organizations. When charitable organizations have goals that are more difficult to accomplish, the uncertainty that the donated money will benefit the intended cause is higher. In that case, confidence in the charitable organization is more important for charitable giving.

Recent research on the origins and consequences of confidence in charitable organizations confirms this argument. Bekkers shows that confidence is only important when giving to organizations striving to solve 'difficult problems' (Bekkers, 2006, p. 8). In general, organizations with an international focus strive for goals that are more difficult to realize. For one, because their good works are carried out from a far distance. But also because many of the organizations with an international focus have goals that are difficult to accomplish, such as the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (UNDP, 2008). We formulate the hypothesis that organizations with an international focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with higher levels of confidence in charitable organizations.

6. Description of the data and methods

6.1. Data

All analyses are conducted using the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2004 (GINPS04, 2004). GINPS04 is the second wave of a bi-yearly longitudinal data collection, mapping charitable giving and volunteering by households in the Netherlands. Respondents for the first wave of GINPS (GINPS02, 2002) were randomly drawn from a pool of 72,000 respondents who regularly participate in survey research. The respondents in this large pool were included through a random sample drawn from population registers and they were contacted through postal mail. Special attention was paid to avoid sample bias with regard to internet use due to stratification based on age, gender and geographical region. Respondents without direct access to a computer were provided with one in exchange for participation in surveys.

In GINPS02, 1964 respondents completed the questionnaire. For GINPS04, in May 2004, 1557 persons were requested to fill out a questionnaire on their household's donating behavior in 2003. 1246 respondents participated in both GINPS02 and GINPS04. GINPS04 includes an additional sample of 70 new respondents. In total, 1316 respondents (85% of 1557) completed the GINPS04 questionnaire, using Computer Assisted Self-Administered Interview procedures (CASI). The data are representative for the Dutch population with regard to age, gender, and geographical region (for more information, see Schuyt and Gouwenberg, 2005). All variables in our analyses are available in GINPS04, except for political right-left self placement, which is only available in the GINPS02 data. This results in a total number of 1246 respondents included in the analyses.

In GINPS04, respondents were questioned about their household's charitable giving over the course of 2003, using an adaptation of the 'Method-Area' module. In this module, questions about methods of donating are followed by questions about donations to different charitable sub-sectors (Rooney et al., 2001). We measure household giving rather than individual giving, which is common in most research on charitable giving (Rooney et al., 2004; Wilhelm, 2007). In many cases, all adult members are involved in a household's charitable giving. Thus, measuring household giving provides a more complete overview of the overall incidence and level of charitable giving.

In addition to questions about giving to charitable sub-sectors, respondents in GINPS04 were also prompted about their household's donations to 64 particular charitable organizations. These organizations were selected either based upon their financial size (over 10 million euros in own fundraising; average own fundraising in the Netherlands is 1.9 million euros in 2003 (CBF, 2004)) or based upon their impact on redistribution of money in the Netherlands.⁴

⁴ The data were originally collected for a project about the redistribution effects of philanthropic donations in the Netherlands.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics for the individual and organizational characteristics.

	Mean	SE	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Dependent variable (N = 36,134):</i>				
Donation	0.11	0.31	0	1
<i>Individual characteristics (n = 1246)</i>				
Unemployed	0.15	0.36	0	1
Female	0.52	0.50	0	1
<i>Age</i>				
Aged under 35 (Ref.)	0.22	0.41	0	1
Aged 35–65	0.58	0.49	0	1
Aged over 65	0.20	0.40	0	1
<i>Socio-economic status</i>				
Low socio-economic status (Ref.)	0.32	0.47	0	1
Average socio-economic status	0.17	0.38	0	1
High socio-economic status	0.51	0.50	0	1
Household income (ln)	10.46	0.55	7.46	12.47
Political left-leaning	2.93	0.84	1	5
Religious	0.55	0.50	0	1
Confidence in charitable organizations	3.06	0.78	1	5
<i>Organizational characteristics (N = 64)</i>				
International focus	0.33	0.47	0	1
Faith-based	0.21	0.41	0	1
Child focus	0.28	0.45	0	1
Culture focus	0.07	0.25	0	1
Community/welfare service focus	0.21	0.41	0	1
Health/disability focus	0.31	0.46	0	1
Environment/animal protection focus	0.10	0.30	0	1
Door-to-door solicitation	0.45	0.50	0	1
Direct mail appeals	0.48	0.50	0	1

Source: GINPS04 (2004), GINPS02 (2002), CBF (2004).

An overview and description of the 64 particular charitable organizations is included in [Appendix A](#). In addition, [Appendix A](#) includes the percentage of Dutch households that donated to the 64 different organizations in 2003. [Table 1](#) presents statistical descriptions of all variables used in this article.

6.2. Dependent variable

Donation is a dichotomous variable indicating a household donation to a unique type of charitable organization.⁵ The mean value of 0.11 in [Table 1](#) indicates that households donated on average to approximately one in every nine unique types of organizations included in the sample.

6.3. Individual characteristics

Individual characteristics in the analyses include *unemployed* if the respondent and – if applicable – the partner have no paid work. *Female* indicates the gender of the respondent. *Age* is included in three categories: aged below 35 (reference category), aged between 35 and 65, and aged over 65. *Socio-economic status* is based upon educational level and occupational status (NIPO, 2002), and included in three categories: low socio-economic status (reference category), average socio-economic status, and high socio-economic status.

In order to obtain annual after-tax *household income*, we multiplied the sum of the exact monthly after-tax income for the respondent and (if applicable) the partner by twelve. For 202 households (16.2%) no information on monthly after-tax income was available. We substituted these answers with information on gross annual household income, multiplied by .69, assuming an average income tax of 31%. After this transformation, we still have missing information on after-tax income for 114 households. We estimated their after-tax income using the mean income of the household's socio-economic status class. In the analyses we used the natural log of annual after-tax household income.

Political right–left self placement is only available in GINPS02. Included in the analyses as *political left-leaning*, it is measured by asking respondents to place their political values on the following 5-point scale: (1) very right; (2) moderate right; (3) neither right nor left; (4) moderate left; (5) very left, with the additional answer possibility “I have no opinion”. 110 respondents (8.8%) indicated having no opinion, and we recoded these to answer category (3) neither right nor left.

⁵ More detailed information on “unique type of charitable organization” can be found in the modeling section.

Respondents were asked whether they belonged to a *religious* denomination. 55% of the respondents indicated being religiously affiliated. The level of *confidence in Dutch charitable organizations* is measured using a five-point Likert scale item asking respondents: “How much confidence do you have in general in Dutch charitable organizations?” Response categories include: (1) none; (2) a little; (3) moderate; (4) quite a lot; (5) very much.

6.4. Organizational characteristics

Most organizational characteristics were obtained studying the organizations' web pages, on which their mission statement, amongst other things, can be found.⁶ Decisions on which organizational characteristics are included in the analyses were made based on the expected relationships between organizational and individual characteristics, as formulated in the hypotheses. Organizational characteristics include having an *international* focus, a focus on *culture, community/welfare services, health/disability, environment/animal protection* and being *faith-based*. Unfortunately, there are no organizations with a focus on education in our sample. However, 27% of the organizations in our sample have a focus on *children*. Therefore we decided to examine *child* focus rather than *education* focus.

We consulted the yearly report from the Dutch Central Bureau on Fundraising (CBF, 2004), which provides information on solicitation methods used by charitable organizations in the Netherlands. In the analyses we included whether organizations used *door-to-door fundraising* as a fundraising method in 2003, as self-reported to the Central Bureau of Fundraising (CBF, 2004). We also included whether they use *direct mail appeals* as fundraising methods, again as self-reported to the Central Bureau of Fundraising (CBF, 2004).⁷

Appendix A shows which organizational characteristics apply to which charitable organizations in the study. Organizations can be described by multiple characteristics, for example “Cordaid” is a Catholic umbrella organization providing international relief. The organizational characteristics for Cordaid are thus “faith-based” and having an “international focus”. The organizational characteristics for “Nationaal Fonds Kinderhulp” (Dutch Fund for Children) are “child focused” and “community/welfare service focused”, applying both “door-to-door solicitation” and “direct mail appeals” as methods for solicitation.

6.5. Modeling

In this study, we want to predict what “unique type of charitable organization” receives donations from which particular people. We specified nine characteristics (international focus, faith based, child focus, culture focus, community/welfare service focus, health/disability focus, environment/animal protection focus, using door-to-door solicitation and direct mail appeals) indicating different organizational characteristics. Our sample of 64 organizations includes 29 unique combinations of these organizational characteristics: e.g., organizations with an international focus, organizations with an international focus which are faith based, organizations with an international focus which are faith based and solicit money using direct mail appeals, etc. We will further refer to these 29 combinations of organizational characteristics as “unique types of [charitable] organizations”.

In order to test our assumptions, we use conditional logistic regression analysis (McFadden, 1974; Stata Manual, 2004). Conditional logistic regression analysis is an estimation method for analyzing grouped data with a binary dependent variable. Conditional logistic regression analysis is sometimes also referred to as fixed effects logistic regression. Our application differs from the usual application by allowing for more than one positive outcome. Typically, fixed effects logistic regression is used to study one positive outcome over time (e.g., employed or not). In another familiar application, conditional logistic regression is applied to study several choices at the same time, where only one choice is selected (e.g., types of transportation). We use conditional logistic regression analysis to predict the probability that unique types of organizations with particular characteristics receive a donation from people with other particular characteristics, in the case where donations to multiple types of organizations are possible. We have been unable to find – and thus provide references to – research that applies conditional logistic regression analyses in a similar way.

To explain this unique modeling in some more detail: The data that is input to the analyses contain 29 rows per respondent: one row for a donation to each unique type of organization. We have valid responses for 1246 respondents, which leads to a total of $(1246 \times 29) = 36,134$ cases, clustered in 1246 groups (= individuals). 223 respondents (6467 cases) did not donate to any of the unique types of organizations and were excluded from the analysis. This brings the total number of cases used in the analyses to 29,667, clustered in 1023 groups.⁸

⁶ The organizations' web pages were consulted in the period between July 2006 and October 2006.

⁷ The CBF's “[...] task is to promote trustworthy fundraising and expenditures by reviewing fundraising organizations and giving information and advice to government institutions and the public” (CBF 2008). In order to fulfill its task, the CBF closely reviews organizations, their fundraising procedures, and formal financial statements. Therefore, although self-reported, we believe that the information on fundraising methods included in the CBF report can be considered trustworthy.

⁸ The question is what type of unique charitable organization receives donations from which particular people. With the conditional logistic regression model, we estimate the likelihood that people with particular individual characteristics donate to charitable organizations with a unique combination of organizational characteristics. People that did not make a donation to any of the 29 unique types of charitable organizations are excluded from the analyses automatically, as they do not contribute to the log-likelihood. In order to contribute to the log-likelihood, at least one positive outcome is necessary. In other words: non-donating respondents cannot help to explain what types of charitable organizations have a higher probability of receiving donations.

Table 2

Conditional logistic regression analysis on donations to different types of charitable organizations.

	Model 1		Model 2	
	B	SE	B	SE
International focus (o)	0.270**	0.053	-2.737*	1.286
× unemployed (i)			-0.064	0.164
× female (i)			-0.171	0.110
× aged 35–65 (i)			0.399*	0.156
× aged over 65 (i)			0.817**	0.186
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.452**	0.165
× high socio-economic status (i)			0.263	0.137
× household income (i)			0.048	0.119
× political left-leaning (i)			0.158*	0.068
× religious (i)			0.579**	0.116
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.351**	0.078
Faith based (o)	-1.139**	0.058	-1.371	1.374
× unemployed (i)			-0.053	0.180
× female (i)			0.003	0.118
× aged 35–65 (i)			0.260	0.185
× aged over 65 (i)			0.544**	0.207
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.013	0.178
× high socio-economic status (i)			-0.002	0.146
× household income (i)			0.012	0.127
× political left-leaning (i)			-0.095	0.074
× religious (i)			0.374**	0.129
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			-0.056	0.083
Child focus (o)	-0.261**	0.048	0.185	1.132
× unemployed (i)			-0.185	0.146
× female (i)			0.080	0.098
× aged 35–65 (i)			-0.221	0.135
× aged over 65 (i)			-0.638**	0.164
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.181	0.146
× high socio-economic status (i)			-0.004	0.122
× household income (i)			-0.024	0.105
× political left-leaning (i)			0.064	0.060
× religious (i)			-0.011	0.104
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			-0.054	0.070
Culture focus (o)	-1.107**	0.136	1.337	3.207
× unemployed (i)			-1.410**	0.531
× female (i)			-0.119	0.279
× aged 35–65 (i)			-0.404	0.351
× aged over 65 (i)			-0.856	0.459
× average socio-economic status (i)			1.122**	0.416
× high socio-economic status (i)			0.775*	0.366
× household income (i)			-0.341	0.298
× political left-leaning (i)			0.158	0.173
× religious (i)			0.706*	0.295
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.076	0.199
Community/welfare service focus (o)	1.131**	0.053	3.420**	1.267
× unemployed (i)			-0.066	0.163
× female (i)			-0.015	0.110
× aged 35–65 (i)			0.351*	0.153
× aged over 65 (i)			0.379*	0.184
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.075	0.164
× high socio-economic status (i)			-0.047	0.134
× household income (i)			-0.221	0.117
× political left-leaning (i)			-0.122	0.067
× religious (i)			0.271*	0.115
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.000	0.077
Health/disability focus (o)	0.373**	0.058	3.103*	1.366
× unemployed (i)			-0.106	0.175
× female (i)			-0.047	0.118
× aged 35–65 (i)			-0.034	0.162
× aged over 65 (i)			-0.047	0.196
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.131	0.176
× high socio-economic status (i)			0.105	0.146
× household income (i)			-0.243	0.127
× political left-leaning (i)			-0.136	0.072

(continued on next page)

Table 2 (continued)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	B	SE	B	SE
× religious (i)			0.252*	0.124
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.027	0.083
Environment/animal protection focus (o)	0.513**	0.079	1.147	1.883
× unemployed (i)			−0.342	0.246
× female (i)			−0.236	0.162
× aged 35–65 (i)			0.000	0.225
× aged over 65 (i)			0.152	0.269
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.101	0.245
× high socio-economic status (i)			0.008	0.200
× household income (i)			−0.106	0.175
× political left-leaning (i)			0.042	0.099
× religious (i)			−0.208	0.170
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.187	0.115
Door-to-door solicitation (o)	1.294**	0.041	3.750**	0.982
× unemployed (i)			−0.141	0.126
× female (i)			−0.012	0.084
× aged 35–65 (i)			−0.118	0.120
× aged over 65 (i)			−0.294*	0.141
× average socio-economic status (i)			−0.122	0.127
× high socio-economic status (i)			−0.210*	0.104
× household income (i)			−0.124	0.091
× political left-leaning (i)			−0.118*	0.052
× religious (i)			−0.312**	0.089
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			−0.089	0.060
Direct mail appeals (o)	0.301**	0.042	1.209	1.000
× unemployed (i)			−0.114	0.128
× female (i)			0.019	0.086
× aged 35–65 (i)			−0.008	0.119
× aged over 65 (i)			0.049	0.143
× average socio-economic status (i)			0.270*	0.129
× high socio-economic status (i)			0.182	0.106
× household income (i)			−0.126	0.093
× political left-leaning (i)			−0.031	0.053
× religious (i)			0.370**	0.090
× confidence in charitable organizations (i)			0.043	0.061
Cases (groups)	29,667 (1023)			

Source: GINPS04 (2004), GINPS02 (2002).

Notes: (o) = organizational characteristic; (i) = individual characteristic.

* $p \leq .05$.

** $p \leq .01$.

7. Results

In Model 1 in Table 2 we report coefficients (B) for conditional logistic regression analyses, when including only the main effects of organizational characteristics in the analyses. The main effect of a specific organizational characteristic in Model 1 in Table 2 is the likelihood that a unique type of organization with that organizational characteristic receives donations compared to unique types of organizations without this characteristic.

Model 1 in Table 2 shows that organizations with an international focus, a community/welfare service focus, a health/disability focus and an environment/animal protection focus all have a significant increased likelihood of receiving donations, compared with organizations not focussing on these issues. Organizations using door-to-door solicitation and direct mail appeals also have an increased likelihood of receiving donations, compared with organizations not using these solicitation methods. On the other hand, faith based, child focused and culture focused organizations have a significant decreased likelihood of receiving donations.

Next, we performed conditional logistic regression analyses with models that include interactions between individual characteristics and organizational characteristics. With these models, we can formulate statements on the likelihood that different unique types of organizations receive donations from individuals with different characteristics, and thus test our hypotheses. The hypotheses we formulated focus on the effects of organizational characteristics in interaction with individual characteristics. Consider, for example, the direct mail hypothesis: Charitable organizations soliciting money using direct mail appeals have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from older people. Our dependent variable 'donation' indicates whether or not a donation is made to each of the 29 unique types of charitable organizations over the course of 2003. In order to test whether organizations soliciting money using direct mail appeals have an increased likelihood of receiving

Table 3

Overview of the hypotheses and results found in this study.

Hypothesis	Results
<i>Opportunity</i>	
Charitable organizations using door-to-door solicitations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people who are more often at home	0
Charitable organizations soliciting money using direct mail appeals have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from older people	0
<i>Incentives</i>	
Charitable organizations with a cultural focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with a higher socio-economic status	+/- ^a
Charitable organizations with an international focus, a focus on environment and animal protection, and community/welfare services have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people	+ : International focus 0 : environment/animal protection focus 0 : community/welfare service focus
Charitable organizations with a focus on health services and education have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people	0 : Health focus 0 : child focus ^b
Faith-based organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from religiously affiliated people	+
<i>Confidence</i>	
Charitable organizations with an international focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with higher levels of confidence in charitable organizations.	+

Notes: + = hypothesis supported; --- = hypothesis not supported; 0 = no relationship found.

^a We found a positive relationship between organizations with a cultural focus and people's socio-economic status, but cultural organizations have the highest likelihood of receiving donations from people with an average socio-economic status and not from people with a high socio-economic status as hypothesized.

^b The data did not include organizations with an educational focus, we did include organizations with a child focus in the analyses.

donations from older people, we include an interaction between the organizational characteristic 'using direct mail appeals' and the individual characteristic 'aged over 65'. In addition, we include the main organizational characteristic 'using direct mail appeals'. The main effect of the individual 'aged over 65' is not included in the analysis, because the individual characteristics are constant for each respondent. Therefore this effect cannot account for differences in donations to the 29 unique types of charitable organizations (McFadden, 1974). Note that the main organizational effect in model 2 in Table 2 is the likelihood that an organization with a particular characteristic receives a donation, when the specific individual characteristics have value 0 (as well as all other variables in the model).

Model 2 in Table 2 first of all shows that charitable organizations with an international focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from older people, with an average socio-economic status, political left-leaning, religious, and from people with more confidence in charitable organizations. Faith-based organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from those who are religious and from people over 65 years of age, while organizations with a focus on children have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from those over 65 years of age.

Furthermore, the results in model 2 in Table 2 show that culture focused organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people who are employed, religious, and who belong to average or high socio-economic status groups. Community and welfare service organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from older and religious people. Organizations with a focus on health and disability only have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from religious people, and we find no significant relationships between the specified individual characteristics and the likelihood of receiving donations for organizations with a focus on environment and animal protection.

Finally, organizations using door-to-door fundraising have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from people who are over 65, belong to the high socio-economic status group, who are political left-leaning and religious. Organizations using direct mail appeals have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people who are religious and belong to the average socio-economic status group.

8. Conclusion and discussion

This article is one of the first to examine what types of charitable organizations receive donations from which particular people. We formulated hypotheses using three mechanisms that facilitate charitable giving to different types of charitable organizations: The opportunity people encounter to donate, the incentives they experience for making donations, and the level of confidence they have in charitable organizations. We performed conditional logistic regression analysis, using the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study ($N_{\text{households}} = 1246$; $N_{\text{organizations}} = 64$), predicting what types of organizations receive donations from which people. Table 3 gives an overview of the results obtained in this study.

Our results showed that in general, providing people with an opportunity to donate by means of door-to-door solicitation or direct mail appeals does increase donations. However, providing people with an opportunity to donate does not influence which people donate to what unique types of organizations the way we expected. People who are more often at home or older people do not more often make donations to organizations using door-to-door solicitation or direct mail appeals.

Table A1
Description of charitable organizations used in the study and organizational characteristics.

Name organization (US/English equivalent, if available)	Description (organizational characteristics)	Percentage households that donated in 2003 (%)	Inter-national focus	Faith based	Child focus	Culture focus	Community/welfare services focus	Health/disability focus	Environ-ment/animal protection	Door-to-door solicitation	Direct mail appeals
Adullam voor Gehandicaptenzorg	Provides care for disabled people based on Calvinist principles	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Alzheimer Nederland (Alzheimer's Association)	Patients' association. Improving life quality for people with Alzheimer and their families, supporting research on Alzheimer	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Amnesty International (Amnesty International)	Worldwide movement of people who campaign for internationally recognized human rights	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
ANGO Algemene Nederlandse Gehandicaptten Organisatie	Pressure group for disabled people	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Artsen zonder grenzen (Doctors without Borders)	Independent international medical humanitarian organization that delivers emergency aid to people affected by armed conflict, epidemics, natural or man-made disasters, or exclusion from health care in more than 70 countries	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Astma Fonds	Patients' association. Improving life quality for people with asthma, supporting research on asthma	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Bartimeus	Patients' association for the blind and visually handicapped	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
BIO-Kinderrevalidatie	Holidays for disabled children and their families, research on child recovery from brain damage	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cliniclowns Nederland (hospital clown)	Entertainment for seriously ill children, either in hospitals or at home	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cordaid	Catholic umbrella organization providing international relief	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diabetes Fonds Nederland (American Diabetes Association)	Patients' association for diabetics. Supports scientific research on diabetes	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Dierenbescherming	Association fighting for animal rights	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Doe een Wens Stichting Nederland (Make-a-Wish-Foundation)	Granting wishes of children with life threatening medical conditions	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Epilepsie Fonds (Epilepsy Foundation)	Patients' association for people with epilepsy. Supports scientific research on epilepsy	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Greenpeace (Greenpeace)	International organization focussing on combating the most crucial worldwide threats to our planet's biodiversity and environment	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hartstichting (American Heart Association)	Patients' association for people with cardiovascular diseases. Supports scientific research on cardiovascular diseases	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Hendrick de Keyser	Association for the preservation of architectural or historically valuable houses in the Netherlands	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hersenstichting Nederland	Patients' association for people with brain diseases. Supports scientific research on brain diseases	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Humanistisch Verbond	Association striving for more humanism in society	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jantje Beton	Enabling children to play in their own neighbourhood	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Kerkinactie	Missionary organization of the Protestant churches in the Netherlands	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kika Kankerfonds	Supporting research on cancer and children, funding seven child cancer centres in the Netherlands	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Koninklijk Concertgebouworkest	Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra is generally regarded as one of the best symphony orchestras in the world.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
KWF Kankerbestrijding (American Cancer Society)	Patients' association for people with cancer. Supports scientific research on cancer.	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Leger des Heils (Salvation Army)	International movement for the advancement of the Christian religion... of education, the relief of poverty, and other charitable objects beneficial to society or the community of mankind as a whole	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Liliane Fonds	Improving life of disabled children in Africa, Asia, and South-America.	6	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Maag Lever Darm Stichting	Patients' association for people with diseases on stomach, liver, and intestine. Supports scientific research on diseases on stomach, liver, and intestine	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Memisa	Roman Catholic international relief organization for improving health care in Third World countries	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Mensen in Nood	Roman Catholic international relief organization providing emergency relief	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth)	Pressure group for environmental issues and animal welfare.	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
MS Research (National MS Society)	Patients' association for people with MS disease. Supports scientific research on MS disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nationaal Fonds Kinderhulp (Dutch Fund for Children)	Organization giving Dutch children living in difficult situations (for example in an orphanage) a present or a vacation	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Nationaal Fonds Sport Gehandicapten (NFSG)	Organization promoting sport for disabled people	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Nationaal Fonds tegen Kanker	Patients' association for people with cancer, specifically providing information on different regular and alternative treatments. Supports scientific research on these different treatments of cancer	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nationale Collecte Verstandelijk Gehandicapten	Involvement, effort, and support for people with a mental handicap and their families	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Natuurmonumenten	Independent organization preserving Dutch nature, landscape, and cultural history	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Nederlands Kanker Instituut (NKI)	Cancer Association of the Antonie van Leeuwenhoek hospital in Amsterdam, specialized in the care for people with cancer	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Nederlandse Stichting voor het Gehandicapte Kind (NSGK)	Providing disabled children with funds in order to live a normal life	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Nierstichting	Patients' association for people with kidney diseases. Supports scientific research on kidney diseases	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Oxfam Novib (Oxfam)	International relief organization striving for a just world without poverty	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan Nederland	International relief organization supporting children and the surroundings in Third World countries	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds	Fund supporting culture and nature preservation in the Netherlands.	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Prinses Beatrix Fonds	Patients' association for people with muscular diseases. Supports scientific research on muscular diseases	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Rembrandt Vereniging	Providing museums with financial aid in order to enable these institutions to acquire new objects of art	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

(continued on next page)

Table A1 (continued)

Name organization (US/English equivalent, if available)	Description (organizational characteristics)	Percentage households that donated in 2003 (%)	Inter-national focus	Faith based	Child focus	Culture focus	Community/welfare services focus	Health/disability focus	Environment/animal protection	Door-to-door solicitation	Direct mail appeals
Reumafonds	Patients' association for people with rheuma. Supports scientific research on rheuma	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Revalidatie Fonds	Pressure group for disabled people	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Rode Kruis (Red Cross)	Organization providing national and International disaster services	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Ronald McDonald Kinderfonds	Organization supporting families with a child which needs professional care	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Slachtofferhulp Nederland	Organization providing support and care for victims of a traffic accident or crime	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
SOS-Kinderdorpen	International relief organization for the care of orphans	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Spieren voor Spieren	Patients' association for people with muscular diseases. Supports scientific research on muscular diseases	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Stichting Aids Fonds	Active in the fight against AIDS and in supporting people with HIV/AIDS	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Terre des Hommes	International relief organization striving for the rights of children	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unicef	International relief organization for children, focussing on providing healthcare, education, equality, and protection for all children	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Vluchteling	International relief organization helping international refugees	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Vluchteling Studenten UAF	Organization financially supporting student asylum seekers in the Netherlands	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland (VVN)	Organization supporting and helping asylum seekers in the Netherlands	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Vrienden van de Hoop	Evangelic centre for helping drug addicts	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Waddenvereniging	Environmental organization for preservation of De Wadden, unique part of the Netherlands	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
War Child	International relief organization giving child victims of war creative workshops	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds WKOF (American Institute for Cancer Research)	Patients' association for people with cancer. Supports scientific research on cancer. Special focus on the relation between food and cancer	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Wereld Natuur Fonds (World Wildlife Fund)	Wildlife protecting agency leads international efforts to protect endangered species and their habitats.	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Woord en Daad	Poverty relief in Third World Countries, based on biblical assignment.	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Zonnebloem	Association helping those who are disabled by sickness, handicap or age	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Source: GINPS04 (2004), CBF (2004).

Contrary to our expectations, organizations using door-to-door solicitations have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from those who are over 65, who are religious (but the religious donate more often to organizations using direct mail appeals), political right-leaning, and who belong to the high socio-economic status group. One post hoc explanation for why the elderly do not donate in door-to-door campaigns is that many older people do not open the door for strangers, possibly out of fear. Another explanation could be that it takes older people longer to reach their door. In that case, the solicitor might have already moved onto the next house, before they had the opportunity to answer the door. The religious might choose to not donate in door-to-door campaigns because of competing opportunity for making donations: the religious will often be asked to make donations in church and through direct mail appeals.

Regarding the incentives people have for making donations, we can conclude that some organizations do receive donations from people based on their incentives for making donations. Charitable organizations with an international focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people. Faith-based organizations have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from religiously affiliated people. In line with our hypothesis, we found that both people with an average socio-economic status and people with a high socio-economic status donate more often to cultural organizations. However, from Bourdieu's (1977) theory of cultural reproduction, we would expect that organizations with a cultural focus specifically have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with the highest socio-economic status.

We found no support for the incentive hypotheses stating that organizations with a focus on community and welfare services or a focus on environment and animal protection have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people. This is interesting, as we expected that left-leaning people would donate more often to organizations striving for either community and welfare services or environment and animal protection, because they tend to be more concerned about the issues these organizations are striving for. We also found no support for the hypothesis that organizations with a focus on health services and children have a decreased likelihood of receiving donations from left-leaning people. We argued that, in a welfare state, left-leaning people have a stronger belief that the government is responsible for providing public goods and services in these realms. Our results show that this is not the case. Political values do not influence donations made to organizations supporting community and welfare services, environment and animal protection, health and disability services and organizations with a focus on children.

Finally, we found support for the confidence hypothesis: Charitable organizations with an international focus have an increased likelihood of receiving donations from people with higher levels of confidence in charitable organizations. We argued that this is because organizations with an international focus have goals that are more difficult to accomplish, and the uncertainty that the donated money will benefit the intended cause is higher. In that case, confidence in the charitable organization is needed for making a charitable donation.

Building on Putman's (2000) ideas of trust as element in the construction of social capital, recent studies in philanthropy have put great emphasis on the importance of confidence in charitable organizations for making donations (Bekkers, 2003; Uslaner, 2002). In this light, it is very interesting to learn that only in the case of giving to organizations with an international focus, confidence in charitable organizations matters for making donations. Especially since cross-sectional analyses of our data do show that confidence in charitable organizations significantly relates to making donations to all types of organizations included in this study (results available from author).⁹ Just like Bekkers and Bowman (2009) find that a decline in charitable confidence is unlikely to affect levels of volunteering, we find that charitable confidence is only important when people donate to organizations striving for difficult goals, such as international relief organizations. For all other types of organizations included in our study, the level of confidence in charitable organizations does not affect incidence of giving. It could be that charitable confidence affects the level of donations to different types of organizations. Further study is necessary to show whether this is the case.

Although there are many interesting and novel findings in this article, it is also important to note the limitations. First of all, the results in this article are conditional on the sample of organizations, which is to some extent selective. This is especially likely to be a problem when an organizational characteristic can only be found in a few organizations in our sample, which is the case for cultural and faith-based organizations. Which and how many organizational characteristics, and hence how many unique types of organizations were selected to be included in the study also affects the results. The number of cases included in the analyses is driven by the number of unique types of organizations people can make donations to, since a row per respondent is added for each possible donation to a unique type of organization. And an increased sample size leads to greater statistical power, smaller confidence intervals and more sensitive hypothesis testing (Stevens, 2002).

In addition, we measured the dependent variable at the household level (household donations to the 29 unique types of charitable organizations), while we included several individual level characteristics (in interaction with organizational characteristics). These different measurement levels likely have led to a small underestimation of the effect of interaction variables including the individual level characteristics.

This article provides ideas for a variety of new directions for future work. First of all, it would be very interesting to expand on this study by examining the different amounts people donate to particular organizations. This could lead to important new insights into the mechanisms behind charitable giving. Do opportunity, incentives, and confidence also affect level of giving to particular organizations? Or are there different mechanisms that drive the amounts people donate to particular

⁹ We performed cross-sectional logistic regression analyses, predicting the effect of the individual characteristics included in this study on giving to one type of charitable organizations.

organizations? However interesting this aspect may be, it will be challenging to specify statistical models that are appropriate for examining such questions.

Another promising extension to this article would be to investigate the effects of other incentives people experience for donating to particular organizations, such as incentives through material benefits. Although charitable giving is defined as the voluntary donation of money to charitable organizations that mainly benefit people other than oneself, people can still experience material (private) benefits from making donations (Harbaugh, 1998). Think, for example, of donations to the opera, that result in better seats (Buraschi and Cornelli, 2002), or donations to museums that provide entrance to exclusive previews of exhibitions.

And finally, it would also be interesting to use the information on donations to the 64 organizations in GINPS04 to learn more about the effects of reputation on donating, and with that on pro-social behavior in general. The 64 organizations use many different fundraising methods, for example, personal and impersonal solicitation methods, and solicitation over the internet or by telephone. These methods generate different levels of social exposure. How do these different levels of exposure affect incidence and level of giving by different types of donors? This could provide an answer to the more general question how strongly reputation is an incentive for pro-social behavior.

Appendix A

See Table A1.

References

- ACOSS, 2005. Summary of Findings. Giving Australia: Research on Philanthropy in Australia. Department of Family and Community Services, Canberra, Australia.
- Atkinson, T., 2009. Welfare Economics and Giving for Development. Unpublished Paper. Nuffield College Oxford University, United Kingdom. <http://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/users/atkinson/Welfare%20Economics.pdf>.
- Bekkers, R., 2003. Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in The Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32, 596–615.
- Bekkers, R., 2005. It's not all in the ask. Effects and effectiveness of recruitment strategies used by nonprofits in The Netherlands. In: 34rd Annual ARNOVA-Conference. Washington, DC.
- Bekkers, R., 2006. Keeping the faith: origins of confidence in charitable organizations and its consequences for philanthropy. In: The NCVO/VSSN Researching the Voluntary Sector Conference. Warwick University, United Kingdom.
- Bekkers, R., Bowman, W., 2009. The relationship between confidence in charitable organizations and volunteering revisited. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38, 884–897.
- 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 the effect of religion on charitable giving and volunteering. *Review of Religious Research* 50, 74–96.
- Bekkers, R., Wiepking, P., in press. A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
- Bennett, R., 2003. Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8, 12–29.
- Berger, I.E., 2006. The influence of religion on philanthropy in Canada. *Voluntas* 17, 115–132.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977. Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In: Karabel, J., Halsey, A.H. (Eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 487–511.
- Bowman, W., 2004. Confidence in charitable institutions and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33, 247–270.
- Brown, E., Ferris, J.M., 2007. Social capital and philanthropy: an analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, 85–99.
- Bryant, W.K., Slaughter, H.J., Kang, H., Tax, A., 2003. Participating in philanthropic activities: donating money and time. *Journal of Consumer Policy* 26, 43–73.
- Buraschi, A., Cornelli, F., 2002. Donations. CEPR Discussion Paper 3488, Centre for Economic Policy Research. London, United Kingdom.
- CAF, 2006. UK Giving 2005/06. Results of the 2005/06 Survey of Individual Charitable Giving in the UK. CAF, London, United Kingdom.
- CBF, 2004. Fondsenwerving in Nederland 2003. Stichting Centraal Bureau Fondsenwerving, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Coleman, J.S., 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Diamond, W.D., Noble, S.M., 2001. Defensive responses to charitable direct mail solicitations. *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 15, 2–12.
- Frank, R., 1996. Motivation, cognition, and charitable giving. In: Schneewind, J.B. (Ed.), *Giving. Western Ideas of Philanthropy*. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, IN, pp. 130–152.
- GINPS02, 2002. Giving in The Netherlands Panel Study 2002. [machine-readable data file]. Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T.N.M., Gouwenberg, B.M., Wiepking, P. [principle investigator(s)]. *Philanthropic Studies* [distributor]. VU University, Amsterdam.
- GINPS04, 2004. Giving in The Netherlands Panel Study 2004. [machine-readable data file]. Meijer, M.M., Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T.N.M., Gouwenberg, B.M., Wiepking, P. [principle investigator(s)]. *Philanthropic Studies* [distributor]. VU University, Amsterdam.
- GINPS06, 2006. Giving in The Netherlands Panel Study 2006. [machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, P., Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T.N.M., Gouwenberg, B.M. [principle investigator(s)]. *Philanthropic Studies* [distributor]. VU University, Amsterdam.
- Giving USA, 2004. *The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2003*. AAFRC, New York.
- Giving USA, 2005. *The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2004*. Giving USA Foundation, New York.
- 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.
- Canada, Imagine., 2006. *Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Canada.
- 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.
- Lengkeek, F.W., 2001. Werven en geven voor het goede doel in de periode 1948–1998. In: van Veen, W.J.M., Struikema, J. (Eds.), *Inzamelen Voor Het Goede Doel*. Boom Juridische Uitgevers, Utrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 31–55.
- Lindahl, W.E., Conley, A.T., 2002. Literature review: philanthropic fundraising. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 13, 91–112.
- 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 street corner donations. *Journal of Social Psychology* 101, 45–51.

- McFadden, D., 1974. Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior. In: Zarembka, P. (Ed.), *Frontiers in Economics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 105–142.
- Meijer, M.M., Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T.N.M., 2005. *Tsunami En Internationale Hulp: De Gevers in Kaart Gebracht*. NCDO, Amsterdam.
- Micklewright, J., Schnepf, S.V., 2007. Who Gives for Overseas Development? Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute Applications and Policy Working paper A7/06.
- Neumayer, E., 2004. The environment, left-wing political orientation and ecological economics. *Ecological Economics* 51, 167–175.
- NIPO, 2002. *Beschrijving Sociaal Economische Klasse (SES) [Description Socio-Economic Status]*. NIPO, Amsterdam.
- Ostrower, F., 1997. *Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Putnam, R., 2000. *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon and Schuster, New York, NJ.
- Pyle, R.E., 1993. Faith and commitment to the poor: theological orientation and support for government assistance measures. *Sociology of Religion* 54, 385–401.
- Regnerus, M.D., Smith, C., Sikkink, D., 1998. Who gives to the poor? The influence of religious tradition and political location on the personal generosity of Americans toward the poor. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37, 481–493.
- Rooney, P., Steinberg, K., Schervish, P., 2001. A methodological comparison of giving surveys: Indiana as a test case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30, 551–568.
- Rooney, P., Steinberg, K., Schervish, P.G., 2004. Methodology is destiny: the effect of survey prompts on reported levels of giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33, 628–654.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J.B., Hudson, J., 2008. Charity brand personality: the relationship with giving behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37, 468–491.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J.B., West, D.C., 2006. Perceptual determinants of nonprofit giving behavior. *Journal of Business Research* 59, 155–165.
- Sargeant, A., Hudson, J., 2008. Donor retention: an exploratory study of door-to-door recruits. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 13, 89–101.
- Sargeant, A., Woodliffe, L., 2007. Individual giving behaviour: a multi-disciplinary review. In: Sargeant, A., Wymer, W. (Eds.), *The Nonprofit Marketing Companion*. Routledge, London, United Kingdom.
- Schervish, P.G., Havens, J.J., 1995. Do the poor pay more: is the U-shaped curve correct? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 24, 79–90.
- Schuyt, T.N.M., Gouwenberg, B., 2005. *Geven in Nederland 2005*. Elsevier Overheid, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Schuyt, T.N.M., Gouwenberg, B., Meijer, M.-M., Bekkers, R., Wiepking, P., 2007. *Geven in Nederland 2007. Giften, Legaten, Sponsoring en Vrijwilligerswerk*. Reed Business, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Simmons, W.O., Emanuele, R., 2004. Does government spending crowd out donations of time and money? *Public Finance Review* 32, 498–511.
- Stata Manual, 2004. *Clogit – Conditional (Fixed Effects) Logistic Regression*. Stata Manual, pp. 216–235.
- Stevens, J.P., 2002. *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Supphellen, M., Nelson, M.R., 2001. Developing, exploring, and validating a typology of private philanthropic decision making. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 22, 573–603.
- Ultee, W.C., Arts, W., Flap, H., 1996. *Sociologie. Vragen Uitspraken Bevindingen*. Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, The Netherlands.
- UNDP, 2008. *Millennium Development Goals*. UNDP, New York.
- Uslaner, E.M., 2002. *The Moral Foundations of Trust*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Vesterlund, L., 2006. Why do people give? In: Powell, W.E., Steinberg, R. (Eds.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, pp. 568–590.
- Weyant, J.M., 1996. Application of compliance techniques to direct-mail requests for charitable donations. *Psychology and Marketing* 13, 157–170.
- Wiepking, P., 2008. *For the Love of Mankind. A Sociological Study on Charitable Giving*. VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Wilhelm, M.O., 2007. The Quality and Comparability of Survey Data on Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, 65–84.
- Wuthnow, R., 1991. *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.