

VU Research Portal

Philanthropy in the welfare state

de Wit, A.

2018

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

de Wit, A. (2018). *Philanthropy in the welfare state: Why charitable donations do not simply substitute government support*. [PhD-Thesis - Research and graduation internal, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam].

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Acknowledgements

I could not have wished for a better supervising team than the one I had for this dissertation. René Bekkers inspired me with his intelligent views on giving and volunteering in the Netherlands and abroad. His views on responsible research and open science guided this dissertation research. Marjolein Broese van Groenou was always there to comment on pieces of research, even if she was not involved as a co-author. Her comments on theoretical angles, methodological choices and writing styles were always sharp and constructive. Beate Völker immediately decided to help me out by creating a collaboration between her university and ours, which guaranteed the continuations of the project. With great enthusiasm and useful comments she provided daily supervision from February to July 2016.

Besides me and my supervising team, many colleagues contributed to the work in this dissertation.

I thank René Bekkers, Evelien Boonstoppel, Floor de Nooij, Suzanne Felix, Saskia Franssen, Barbara Gouwenberg, Barry Hoolwerf, Danique Karamat Ali, Elly Mariani, Tjeerd Piersma, Brigitte Schouten, Theo Schuyt, Claire van Teunenbroek, Dave Verkaik and other (former) colleagues at Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam for all the conversations, outings and great work atmosphere.

Colleagues at the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) provided an inspiring place to work during the first half of 2016. Despite the unusual situation, the two directors of operations Hanneke Reuling (VU) and José Komen (UvA) did a great job in making the collaboration between the two universities work.

Although the results did not end up in this dissertation, Jochem Miggelbrink, Mireille van der Meij and Christina Ceulemans at the Amsterdam University Fund generously helped us with developing a field experiment among alumni.

Years earlier, Brian Burgoon and Tom van der Meer pushed me in the right direction when supervising my Bachelor and Master thesis, respectively.

I am grateful to Femida Handy and her colleagues at the School of Social Policy & Practice at the University of Pennsylvania for their great hospitality from September to November 2016. A special thanks to Andrea Nurse for helping me out with the practical issues around my research visit.

Pamala Wiepking not only provided great substantive and personal sup-

port, I also benefited from her important work on the Individual International Philanthropy Database (IIPD) which is used in Chapter 1. With this project, Pamala and Femida made an important contribution to the field and were awarded ARNOVA's Virginia A. Hodgkinson Research Book Prize. The IIPD was created with the help of René Bekkers, Steffen Bethman, Oonagh Breen, Beth Breeze, Chris Einolf, Chulhee Kang, Hagai Katz, Michael D. Layton, Kuang-Ta Lo, Irina Mersianova, Michaela Neumayr, Una Osili, Anne Birgitta Pessi, Karl-Henrik Sivesind, Wendy Scaife, and Naoto Yamauchi. A large part of the data coding and synchronizing was done by Sohyun Park.

Michaela Neumayr contributed a lot to Chapter 1, and was a great colleague to work with. I consider Michaela and myself both as first authors on this article.

I benefited a lot from conversations at different occasions with Rich Steinberg, Mark Ottoni-Wilhelm and other colleagues from the Lilly School of Philanthropy at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis.

I thank Peter Frumkin for the great pieces of advice on my work and career, and the other 2014 Penn Social Impact Doctoral Fellows, Sabith Khan, Mirae Kim, Bethany Slater, Amanda Stewart and Rachel Wright, for their extensive and useful comments.

Roza Meuleman, Gerbert Kraaykamp, Marion Wittenberg and other participants of the 5th Dutch ESS Workshop provided a great platform to think about cross-national studies like the one in Chapter 1.

Michael Berbaum and other teachers in the ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Methods of Social Research considerably contributed to improving my skills and knowledge.

Mark Koetse and Boris van Zanten helped us with developing the meta-analysis in Chapter 2.

Ad Graaman from the Dutch Central Bureau on Fundraising (CBF) provided the organizational data for Chapter 3.

Other colleagues who generously devoted time to comment on my work include Jeff Brudney, Maria Radyati, Adalbert Evers, Judith van der Veer and Hans Keman.

Last but not least, a special word for Theo Schuyt. Although he was not part of my team of supervisors, his views on the relationship between the state and the nonprofit sector inspired the context of this dissertation. As founder, former director and part-time professor, his never-lasting enthusiasm makes the Center for Philanthropic Studies work.

Funding

Arjen de Wit was partly supported by different travel grants from the Graduate School of Social Sciences at Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam.

Femida Handy received partial support for this research from the School of Social Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania.

Pamala Wiepking was partly supported by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

René Bekkers received support from the Van der Gaag Foundation of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences.

Funding for the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey was provided by the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Health, Wellbeing and Sports, and various other Ministries of the Netherlands.

Appendix

Table A1: Possible moderators of the crowding-out effect

	Tested in meta-analysis	Not tested in meta-analysis
Often distinguished in empirical studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data source (experimental/non-experimental) • Sample country • Beneficiary of government support (subsidies to organizations/direct expenditures) • Regression specification (FE/FD/other) • Use of instrumental variables 	
Sometimes distinguished in empirical studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of government (central/lower) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonprofit sectors • Non-linear effect of government support • Private donor (individual/company/foundation/other)
Often not distinguished in empirical studies		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of government support (lump-sum grants/matching grants/contracts/purchase of services/vouchers) • Tax salience • Number of other donors • Different types of public goods • Linearity of public good cost function • Number of initial non-donors • Substitution between organizations

Table A2: Studies in the meta-analysis

Reference	#	Data	Country	Sector(s)	Government support	Level of government	Finding(s)	Mean effect size est.
Abrams & Schmitz, 1978	3	Archival	USA	Combined	Expenditures	Federal/lower	Crowding-out	-0.300
Abrams & Schmitz, 1984	3	Archival	USA	Combined	Expenditures	Lower	Crowding-out	-0.280
Andreoni, 1993	21	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.716
Andreoni & Payne, 2011	14	Archival	USA	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.760
Becker & Lindsay, 1994	3	Archival	USA	Education	Subsidies	Lower	Crowding-out	-0.870
Blanco et al., 2012	6	Lab exp.	Spain	Environment	Tax	n/a	Mixed	-0.470
Bolton & Katok, 1998	2	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	n/a
Bönke, Massarrat-Mashhadi, & Stelaff, 2013	2	Archival	Germany	Combined	Expenditures	Combined	Crowding-out	n/a
Borgonovi, 2006	11	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Federal/lower/combined	Crowding-in	n/a
Brooks, 1999	1	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	0.075
Brooks, 2000a	5	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	n/a
Brooks, 2000b	7	Archival	USA	Mixed	Expenditures	Federal/lower	Mixed	0.089
Brooks, 2003a	2	Archival	USA	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	1.535
Brooks, 2003b	3	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	0.433
Brunner, 1997	1	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	-0.075
Brunner & Sonstelie, 2003	6	Archival	USA	Education	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.135
Callen, 1994	3	Archival	Canada	Health	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	n/a
Chan et al., 1996	16	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.574
Chan et al., 2002	5	Lab exp.	Canada	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.715

Table A2 (continued)

Reference	#	Data	Country	Sector(s)	Government support	Level of government	Finding(s)	Mean effect size est.
Duncan, 1999	1	Survey	USA	Combined	Expenditures	Lower	Crowding-out	-0.234
Eckel et al., 2005	2	Lab exp.	USA	Combined	Mixed	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.678
Ferris & West, 2003	3	Archival	USA	Social	Expenditures	Combined	Crowding-out	n/a
Galbiati & Vertova, 2008	16	Lab exp.	Italy	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.628
Galbiati & Vertova, 2014	2	Lab exp.	Italy	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.791
Garrett & Rhine, 2010	41	Archival	USA	Health/education/social/combined	Expenditures	Federal/lower/combined	Crowding-out	n/a
Gronberg et al., 2012	1	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.900
Güth et al., 2006	3	Lab exp.	Austria	Social	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.300
Herzer & Nunnenkamp, 2013	2	Archival	USA	International	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	0.128
Hsu, 2008	6	Lab exp.	Taiwan	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-2.188
Hughes & Luksetich, 1999	8	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Federal/lower	Mixed	3.011
Hughes et al., 2014	4	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	1.590
Hungerman, 2005	2	Archival	USA	Combined	Expenditures	Lower	Crowding-out	-0.036
Isaac & Norton, 2013	2	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Mixed	-0.906
Khanna & Sandler, 2000	8	Archival	UK	Mixed	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	0.956
Khanna et al., 1995	5	Archival	UK	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	0.070
Kim & Van Ryzin, 2014	4	Survey exp.	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Federal/combined	Mixed	n/a

Table A2 (continued)

Reference	#	Data	Country	Sector(s)	Government support	Level of government	Finding(s)	Mean effect size est.
Kingma, 1989	10	Survey	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.017
Kingma & McClelland, 1995	3	Survey	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	-0.000
Konow, 2010	1	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Expenditures	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.175
Korenok et al., 2012	2	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Expenditures	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.223
Korenok et al., 2014	3	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.261
Kropf & Knack, 2003	1	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	0.040
Lilley & Slonim, 2014	2	Lab exp.	Australia	International	Tax	n/a	Mixed	-0.237
Lucasen, 2012	1	Lab exp.	USA	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.972
Luksetich & Lange, 1995	6	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.138
Manzoor & Straub, 2005	3	Survey	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	0.059
Marcuello & Salas, 2000	2	Archival	Spain	International	Subsidies	Federal/lower	Crowding-in	0.039
Marcuello & Salas, 2001	8	Archival	Spain	International	Subsidies	Federal/lower	Mixed	n/a
Nelson & Gazley, 2014	6	Archival	USA	Education	Expenditures	Federal/lower	Mixed	n/a
Nunnenkamp & Öhler, 2012	7	Archival	USA	International	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	n/a
Okten & Weisbrod, 2000	10	Archival	USA	Culture/social/health/education	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	n/a
O'Regan & Oster, 2002	2	Archival	USA	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	n/a

Table A2 (continued)

Reference	#	Data	Country	Sector(s)	Government support	Level of government	Finding(s)	Mean effect size est.
Paqué, 1986	4	Archival	Germany	Combined	Expenditures	Combined	Mixed	n/a
Payne, 1998	10	Archival	USA	Social	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.408
Payne, 2001	29	Archival	USA	Education	Subsidies	Federal/combined	Mixed	0.346
Posnett & Sandler, 1989	11	Archival	UK	Religion/health/international/combined	Subsidies	Federal/lower	Mixed	n/a
Reece, 1979	7	Survey	USA	Religion/education/social/combined	Expenditures	Combined	Mixed	-0.009
Reeson & Tisdell, 2008	4	Lab exp.	Australia	n/a	Tax	n/a	Mixed	-0.810
Ribar & Wilhelm, 2002	8	Archival	USA	Int. aid	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.079
Sav, 2012	15	Archival	USA	Education	Subsidies	Federal/lower	Mixed	-0.154
Schiff, 1985	5	Survey	USA	Social/combined	Subsidies/tax	Lower	Mixed	-0.060
Smith, 2007	17	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	0.736
Sokolowski, 2013	3	Archival	Cross	Combined	Subsidies	Federal	Crowding-in	n/a
Song & Yi, 2011	2	Archival	USA	Culture	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	-0.500
Steinberg, 1985	3	Survey	UK	Combined	Expenditures	Combined	Crowding-out	-0.006

Table A2 (continued)

Reference	#	Data	Country	Sector(s)	Government support	Level of government	Finding(s)	Mean effect size est.
Sutter & Weck-Hannemann, 2004	15	Lab exp.	Austria	n/a	Tax	n/a	Crowding-out	-0.769
Tinkelman & Neely, 2011	7	Archival	USA	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.053
Weinblatt, 1992	2	Archival	Israel	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-out	-0.400
Yetman & Yetman, 2003	24	Archival	USA	Mixed	Subsidies	Combined	Mixed	-0.150
Yetman & Yetman, 2013	3	Archival	USA	Combined	Subsidies	Combined	Crowding-in	0.019

References

A

- Abraham, K.G., Helms, S., & Presser, S. (2009). How Social Processes Distort Measurement: The Impact of Survey Nonresponse on Estimates of Volunteer Work in the United States 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(4), 1129-1165.
- Abrams, B.A., & Schmitz, M.D. (1978). The 'crowding-out' effect of governmental transfers on private charitable contributions. *Public Choice*, 33(1), 29-39.
- Abrams, B. A., & Schmitz, M.D. (1984). The Crowding-out Effect of Governmental Transfers on Private Charitable Contributions: Cross-Section Evidence. *National Tax Journal*, 37(4), 563-568.
- Andreoni, J. (1988). Privately Provided Public Goods in a Large Economy: The Limits of Altruism. *Journal of Public Economics*, 35(1), 57-73.
- Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with Impure Altruism: Applications to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(6), 1447-1458.
- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving. *Economic Journal*, 100(401), 464-477.
- Andreoni, J. (1993). An Experimental Test of the Public-Goods Crowding-Out Hypothesis. *American Economic Review*, 83, 1317-1327.
- Andreoni, J., & Payne, A.A. (2003). Do Government Grants to Private Charities Crowd Out Giving or Fund-raising? *American Economic Review*, 93, 792-812.
- Andreoni, J., & Payne, A.A. (2011). Is crowding out due entirely to fundraising? Evidence from a panel of charities. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95, 334-343.
- Andress, H.J., & Heien, T. (2001). Four Worlds of Welfare State Attitudes? A Comparison of Germany, Norway and the United States. *European Sociological Review*, 17(4), 337-356.
- Angrist, J.D., & Pischke, J.S. (2009). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Anheier, H.K., & Toepler, S. (1999). Philanthropic Foundations: An International Perspective. In: H.K. Anheier & S. Toepler (Eds.) *Private Funds, Public Purpose: Philanthropic Foundations in International Perspective*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, pp. 3-23.

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
- Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2001). Welfare States, Solidarity and Justice Principles: Does the Type Really Matter? *Acta Sociologica*, 44(4), 283-299.

B

- Barth, A. (2011). Meer marktwerking maakt culturele sector ondernemender. *Reformatorisch Dagblad*, December 29.
- Batson, C.D. (2010). *Altruism in Humans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baumol, W.J. (1996). Children of Performing Arts, the Economic Dilemma: The Climbing Costs of Health Care and Education. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 20(3), 183-206.
- Becker, E., & Lindsay, C.M. (1994). Does the Government Free Ride? *Journal of Law & Economics*, 37(1), 277-296.
- Berbohm, E. (2016). The Free-Provider Problem: Private Provision of Public Responsibilities. In: R. Reich, C. Coredelli & L. Bernholz (Eds.) *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies: History, Institutions, Values*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 207-225.
- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 596-615.
- Bekkers, R. (2005a). *Words and Deeds of Generosity: Are Decisions About Real and Hypothetical Money Really Different?* ICS/Department of Sociology. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Bekkers, R. (2005b). *It's Not All in the Ask: Effects and Effectiveness of Recruitment Strategies Used by Nonprofits in The Netherlands*. Paper presented at the 34th Arnova Annual Conference, Washington DC.
- Bekkers, R. (2007). Measuring Altruistic Behavior in Surveys: The All-Or-Nothing Dictator Game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1(3), 139-144.
- Bekkers, R. (2008). Straight From the Heart. In: S. Chambré and M. Goldner (Eds.) *Advances in Medical Sociology, Volume 10: Patients, Consumers and Civil Society: US and International Perspectives*. Emerald Group Publishing, pp. 197-221.
- Bekkers, R. (2013a). *De maatschappelijke betekenis van filantropie* (inaugural lecture). Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam.
- Bekkers, R. (2013b). De vermogende geveer. In: T. Schuyt, B. Gouwenberg, & R. Bekkers (Eds.) *Geven in Nederland 2013: Giften, Nalatenschappen, Spon-*

- soring en Vrijwilligerswerk. Amsterdam: Reed Business, pp. 205-226.
- Bekkers, R. (2015). When and Why Matches are More Effective Subsidies Than Rebates. In: C. Deck, E. Fatas & T. Rosenblat (Eds.) *Research in Experimental Economics, Volume 18: Replication in Economic Experiments*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Bekkers, R. (2016). Regional Differences in Philanthropy. In: J. Harrow, T. Jung, & S. Phillips (Eds.) *Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. London: Routledge, pp. 124-138.
- Bekkers, R., Boonstoppel, E., & De Wit, A. (2016). *Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey - User Manual (version 2.5)*. Amsterdam: Center for Philanthropic Studies, Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam.
- Bekkers, R. & De Wit, A. (2014). *Look who's crowding-out!* Paper presented at the ISTR Conference, Muenster, Germany.
- Bekkers, R., & Schuyt, T. (2008). And who is your neighbor? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 74-96.
- Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T., & Gouwenberg, B. (2017) *Geven in Nederland 2017*. Amsterdam: Lenthe.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2006). To Give or Not to Give, That Is the Question: How Methodology Is Destiny in Dutch Giving Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), 533-540.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011a). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving part one: religion, education, age and socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011b). A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.
- Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2011c). Accuracy of Self-reports on Donations to Charitable Organizations. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(6): 1369-1383.
- Bekkers, R. & Wilhelm, M.O. (2016). Principle of Care and Giving to Help People in Need. *European Journal of Personality*, 30(3), 240-257.
- Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 12-29.
- Blanco, E., Lopez, M.C., & Coleman, E.A. (2012). Voting for Environmental Donations: Experimental Evidence from Majorca, Spain. *Ecological Economics*, 75, 52-60.
- Bode, I. (2006). Disorganized welfare mixes: Voluntary agencies and new

- governance regimes in Western Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16, 346–59.
- Body, A., & Breeze, B. (2016). What are ‘unpopular causes’ and how can they achieve fundraising success? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21(1), 57–70.
- Bolton, G.E., & Katok, E. (1998). An experimental test of the crowding out hypothesis: The nature of beneficent behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 37(3), 315-331.
- Bönke, T., Massarrat-Mashhadi, N., & Sielaff, C. (2013). Charitable giving in the German welfare state: fiscal incentives and crowding out. *Public Choice*, 154(1-2), 39-58.
- Bonoli, G., George, V., & Taylor-Gooby, P. (2000). *European Welfare Futures*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P.T., & Rothstein, H.R. (2009). *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Borgonovi, F. (2006). Do public grants to American theatres crowd-out private donations? *Public Choice*, 126(3-4), 429-451.
- Bredtmann, J. (2016). *Does Government Spending Crowd Out Voluntary Labor and Donations?* IZA World of Labor Working Paper. Bonn: IZA.
- Brooks, A.C. (1999). Do Public Subsidies Leverage Private Philanthropy for the Arts? Empirical Evidence on Symphony Orchestras. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1), 32-45.
- Brooks, A.C. (2000a). Public Subsidies and Charitable Giving: Crowding Out, Crowding In, or Both? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 19(3), 451–464.
- Brooks, A.C. (2000b). Is There a Dark Side to Government Support for Nonprofits? *Public Administration Review*, 60(3), 211-218.
- Brooks, A.C. (2003a) Do Government Subsidies To Nonprofits Crowd Out Donations or Donors? *Public Finance Review*, 31(2), 166-179.
- Brooks, A.C. (2003b). Taxes, Subsidies, and Listeners Like You: Public Policy and Contributions to Public Radio. *Public Administration Review*, 63, 554-561.
- Brooks, A.C. (2004). The Effects of Public Policy on Private Charity. *Administration & Society*, 36(2), 166-185.
- Brown, E. (2005). College, Social Capital, and Charitable Giving. In: A.C. Brooks (Ed.) *Gifts of Time and Money: The Role of Charity in America’s Communities*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 185-204.
- Brown, E., & Ferris, J. M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis

- of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99.
- Brown, P. H., & Minty, J. H. (2008). Media coverage and charitable giving after the 2004 Tsunami. *Southern Economic Journal*, 75(1), 9-25.
- Brunner, E.J. (1997). An empirical test of neutrality and the crowding-out hypothesis. *Public Choice*, 92, 261-279.
- Brunner, E., & Sonstelie, J. (2003). School finance reform and voluntary fiscal federalism. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(9-10), 2157-2185.
- Bryan, M.L., & Jenkins, S.P. (2016). Multilevel Modelling of Country Effects: A Cautionary Tale. *European Sociological Review*, 32(1), 3-22.
- Burger, A., Dekker, P., Toepler, S., Anheier, H. & Salamon, L. (1999). The Netherlands: Key Features of the Dutch Nonprofit Sector. In L. Salamon, H. Anheier, R. List, S. Toepler & S. W. Sokolowski (Eds.) *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins Centre for Civil Society, pp. 145-162.

C

- Callen, J.L. (1994). Money Donations, Volunteering and Organizational Efficiency. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 5(3), 215-228.
- Camerer, C.F. (2015). The Promise and Success of Lab-Field Generalizability in Experimental Economics: A Reply to Levitt and List. In: G. Frechette, & A. Schotter (Eds.) *Handbook of Experimental Economic Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 249-95.
- Carpenter, J., Connolly, C., & Myers, C.K. (2008). Altruistic Behavior in a Representative Dictator Experiment. *Experimental Economics*, 11(3), 282-298.
- Carroll, D.A., & Stater, K.J. (2009). Revenue diversification in nonprofit organizations: Does it lead to financial stability? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(4), 947-966.
- Cats, R. (2010). Grootscheeps banenverlies op stapel bij hulpclubs; Ontwikkelingssubsidies gekort. *Het Financieele Dagblad*, December 17.
- Central Bureau on Fundraising. (2014). *Neem een kijkje in de financiën van KWF Kankerbestrijding, St.* <http://www.cbf.nl/Instelling-financien/4024/KWF-Kankerbestrijding-St> (Retrieved May 6, 2014).
- Center on Philanthropy. (2011). *Review of Literature on Giving and High Net Worth Individuals*. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy.
- Chan, K.S., Mestelman, S., Moir, R., & Muller, R.A. (1996). The Voluntary Provi-

- sion of Public Goods Under Varying Income Distributions. *Canadian Journal of Economics - Revue Canadienne D Economique*, 29(1), 54-69.
- Chan, K.S., Godbyb, R., Mestelman, S., & Muller, R.A. (2002). Crowding-out voluntary contributions to public goods. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 48, 305-317.
- Civil Exchange (2015). *Whose Society? The Final Big Society Audit*. <http://www.civilexchange.org.uk/whose-society-the-final-big-society-audit> (Retrieved May 17, 2017).
- Cucciniello, M., Porumbescu, G. A., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2017). 25 Years of Transparency Research: Evidence and Future Directions. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 32-44.

D

- Day, K.M., & Devlin, R.A. (1996). Volunteerism and Crowding out: Canadian Econometric Evidence. *The Canadian Journal of Economics - Revue canadienne d'Economique*, 29(1): 37-53.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1970[1840]). *Democracy in America – Part the Second: The Social Influence of Democracy*. New York: Knopf.
- De Swaan, A. (1988). *In Care of the State: Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- De Wit, A. (2016). Mechanisms of crowding-out and crowding-in: Private contributions in 20 European welfare states. In: R. Meuleman, G. Kraaykamp, & M. Wittenberg (Eds.) *Nederland in context: verschillen en overeenkomsten. Proceedings vijfde Nederlandse Workshop European Social Survey*. Den Haag: DANS.
- De Wit, A., & Bekkers, R. (2017). Government Support And Charitable Donations: A Meta-Analysis of the Crowding-out Hypothesis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 27(2), 301-319.
- De Wit, A., Bekkers, R., & Broese Van Groenou, M. (2017). Heterogeneity in Crowding-out: When Are Charitable Donations Responsive To Government Support? *European Sociological Review*, 33(1), 59-71.
- Dokko, J.K. (2009). Does the NEA Crowd Out Private Charitable Contributions to the Arts? *National Tax Journal*, 62(1), 57-75.
- Duncan, B. (1999). Modeling charitable contributions of time and money. *Journal of Public Economics*, 72, 213-242.

E

- Eckel, C.C., & Grossman, P.J. (2003). Rebate versus matching: does how we subsidize charitable contributions matter? *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(3-4), 681-701.
- Eckel, C.C., & Grossman, P.J. (2008). Subsidizing charitable contributions: a natural field experiment comparing matching and rebate subsidies. *Experimental Economics*, 11(3), 234-252.
- Eckel, C.C., Grossman, P.J., & Johnston, R.M. (2005). An Experimental Test of the Crowding Out Hypothesis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 1543-60.
- Einolf, C. (2016). The Social Origins of the Nonprofit Sector and Charitable Giving. In: F. Handy & P. Wiepking (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 509-529.
- Ek, C. (2017). Some Causes Are More Equal than Others? The Effect of Similarity on Substitution in Charitable Giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 136, 45-62.
- Elmelund-Præstekær, C. & Emmenegger, P. (2013). Strategic Re-framing as a Vote Winner: Why Vote-seeking Governments Pursue Unpopular Reforms. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 36(1), 23-42.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, C.A., Evans, G.R. & Mayo, L. (2017). Charitable Giving as a Luxury Good and the Philanthropic Sphere of Influence. *Voluntas*, 28: 556.
- European Commission. (2013). *Communication from the commission to the european parliament, the council, the european economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: Towards social investment for growth and cohesion including implementing the european social fund 2014-2020*. Brussels: COM.

F

- Falk, A., Meier, S., & Zehnder, C. (2013). Do Lab Experiments Misrepresent Social Preferences? The Case of Self-selected Student Samples. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11(4), 839-852.
- Ferragina, E. (2017). The welfare state and social capital in Europe: Reassessing a complex relationship. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 58(1), 55-90.

- Ferris, J.S., & West, E.G. (2003). Private versus public charity: Reassessing crowding out from the supply side. *Public Choice*, 116(3-4), 399-417.
- Foster, W., & Fine, G. (2007). How Nonprofits Get Really Big. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2007.
- Francis, G. (2012). Too good to be true: Publication bias in two prominent studies from experimental psychology. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19, 151-156.
- Franssen, S.E. & Bekkers, R. (2016). *Culturele instellingen in Nederland: Veranderingen in geefgedrag, giften, fondsenwerving en inkomsten tussen 2011 en 2014*. Amsterdam: Center for Philanthropic Studies, Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam.
- Froelich, K.A. (1999). Diversification of Revenue Strategies: Evolving Resource Dependence in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3), 246-268.
- Froelich, K.A., Knoepfle, T.W., & Pollak, T.H. (2000). Financial Measures in Nonprofit Organization Research: Comparing IRS 990 Return and Audited Financial Statement Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(2), 232-254.
- Frumkin, P. (2002). *On being nonprofit: A conceptual and policy primer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

G

- Galbiati, R., & Vertova, P. (2008). Obligations and cooperative behaviour in public good games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 64(1), 146-170.
- Galbiati, R., & Vertova, P. (2014). How laws affect behavior: Obligations, incentives and cooperative behavior. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 38, 48-57.
- Galizzi, M.M., Navarro-Martinez, D. (2015). *On the External Validity of Social-Preference Games: A Systematic Lab-Field Study*. Working Paper.
- Garrett, T., & Rhine, R. (2010). Government growth and private contributions to charity. *Public Choice*, 143(1-2), 103-120.
- Gerber, A.S., Karlan, D., & Bergan, D. (2009). Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Political Opinions, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(2), 35-52.
- Gesthuizen, M., Scheepers, P., van der Veld, W., & Völker, B. (2013). Structural

- aspects of social capital: tests for cross-national equivalence in Europe. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(2), 909-922.
- Gesthuizen, M., Van der Meer, T.W.G., & Scheepers, P. (2008). Education and Dimensions of Social Capital: Do Educational Effects Differ Due to Educational Expansion and Social Security Expenditure? *European Sociological Review*, 24, 617-632.
- Geys, B., & Sørensen, R.J. (2016). Revenue Scarcity and Government Outsourcing: Empirical Evidence from Norwegian Local Governments. *Public Administration*, 94(3), 769-788.
- Glass, G.V. (1976). Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis of Research. *Educational Researcher*, 5(10), 3-8.
- Gordon, C. W., & Babchuk, N. (1959). A typology of voluntary associations. *American Sociological Review*, 22-29.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Klijn, A. (2015). The effects of judicial transparency on public trust: evidence from a field experiment, *Public Administration*, 93(4), 995-1011.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S.G., & Meijer, A.J. (2014). The Effects of Transparency on the Perceived Trustworthiness of a Government Organization: Evidence from an Online Experiment, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(1), 137-157.
- Gronberg, T.J., Luccasen III, R.A., Turocy, T.L., & Van Huyck, J.B. (2012). Are Tax-Financed Contributions to a Public Good Completely Crowded-out? Experimental Evidence. *Journal of Public Economics*, 96, 596-603.
- Güth, W., Sutter, M., & Verbon, H. (2006). Voluntary versus Compulsory Solidarity: Theory and Experiment. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics-Zeitschrift Fur Die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 162, 347-363.

H

- Handy, F. (2000). How We Beg: The Analysis of Direct Mail Appeals. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(3), 439-454.
- Handy, F., Seto, S., Wakaruk, A., Mersey, B., Mejia, A., & Copeland, L. (2010). The Discerning Consumer: Is Nonprofit Status a Factor? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(5), 866-883.
- Harbaugh, W.T., Mayr, U., & Burghart, D.R. (2007). Neural Response to Taxation and Voluntary Giving Reveal Motives for Charitable Donations. *Science*, 316, 1622-1625.

- Heald, D. (2006). Varieties of transparency. In: C. Hood and D. Heald (Eds.) *Transparency: the Key to Better Governance?* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 25-43.
- Hedström, P., & Bearman, P. (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Analytical Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heerma van Voss, L.H., & Van Leeuwen, M. (2012). Charity in the Dutch Republic: an introduction. *Continuity and Change*, 27(2), 175-197.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S.J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The Weirdest People in the World? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-135.
- Herzer, D., & Nunnenkamp, P. (2013). Private Donations, Government Grants, Commercial Activities, and Fundraising: Cointegration and Causality for NGOs in International Development Cooperation. *World Development*, 46, 234-251.
- Heutel, G. (2014). Crowding Out and Crowding In of Private Donations and Government Grants. *Public Finance Review*, 42(2), 143-175.
- Horne, C.S., Johnson, J.L., & Van Slyke, D.M. (2005). Do Charitable Donors Know Enough - And Care Enough - About Government Subsidies to Affect Private Giving to Nonprofit Organizations? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34, 136-149.
- Horne, C.S., Van Slyke, D.M., & Johnson, J.L. (2006). Charitable choice implementation: what public managers should know about public opinion and the potential impact of government funding on private giving. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(10-11), 819-836.
- Hsu, L.C. (2008). Experimental evidence on tax compliance and voluntary public good provision. *National Tax Journal*, 61(2), 205-223.
- Hughes, P.N.H., & Luksetich, W.A. (1999). The Relationship Among Funding Sources for Art and History Museums. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10(1), 21-37.
- Hughes, P., Luksetich, W., & Rooney, P. (2014). Crowding-Out and Fundraising Efforts: The Impact of Government Grants on Symphony Orchestras. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(4), 445-464.
- Hungerman, D.M. (2005). Are church and state substitutes? Evidence from the 1996 welfare reform. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 2245-2267.

I

IIPD (2016). *Individual International Philanthropy Database* [Machine-read-

- able data file]. P. Wiepking & F. Handy [principle investigators]. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Erasmus University Rotterdam [distributor].
- Isaac, R.M., & Norton, D.A. (2013). Endogenous Institutions and the Possibility of Reverse Crowding Out. *Public Choice*, 156(1-2), 253-284.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (2000). Globalization and Postmodern Values. *Washington Quarterly*, 23(1), 215-228.
- Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The Choice-Within-Constraints New Institutionalism and Implications for Sociology. *Annual Reviews of Sociology*, 26, 525-546.

J

- Jæger, M.M. (2006). Welfare Regimes and Attitudes towards Redistribution: The Regime Hypothesis Revisited. *European Sociological Review*, 22(2), 157-170.
- Jones, D.B. (2015). Education's Gambling Problem: Earmarked Lottery Revenues and Charitable Donations to Education. *Economic Inquiry*, 53(2), 906-921.

K

- Kääriäinen J., & Lehtonen, H. (2006). The Variety of Social Capital in Welfare State Regimes – A Comparative Study of 21 Countries. *European Societies*, 8, 27-57.
- Khanna, J., & Sandler, T. (2000). Partners in giving: The crowding-in effects of UK government grants. *European Economic Review*, 44, 1543-1556.
- Khanna, J., Posnett, J., & Sandler, T. (1995). Charity Donations in the UK: New Evidence Based on Panel Data. *Journal of Public Economics*, 56, 257-272.
- Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2012). E-participation, transparency, and trust in local government, *Public Administration Review*, 72(6), 819-828.
- Kim, M., & Van Ryzin, G.G. (2014). Impact of Government Funding on Donations to Arts Organizations: A Survey Experiment. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 910-925.
- Kingma, B.R. (1989). An Accurate Measurement of the Crowdout Effect, In-

- come Effect, and Price Effect for Charitable Contributions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97, 1197–1207.
- Kingma, B.R., & McClelland, R. (1995). Public radio stations are really, really not public goods: Charitable contributions and impure altruism. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 66(1), 65-76.
- Klamer, A. (2004). *Art as a common good*. Paper presented at the 13th conference of the Association of Cultural Economics International.
- Klijn, E.H. (2008). Governance and Governance Networks in Europe. *Public Management Review*, 10(4), 505-525.
- Knowles, S., & Sullivan, T. (2017). Does Charity Begin at Home or Overseas? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Online first, April 11.
- Konow, J. (2010). Mixed feelings: Theories of and evidence on giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 94(3-4), 279-297.
- Korenok, O., Millner, E.L., & Razzolini, L. (2012). Are Dictators Averse to Inequality? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 82(2-3), 543-547.
- Korenok, O., Millner, E.L., & Razzolini, L. (2014). Taking, Giving, and Impure Altruism in Dictator Games. *Experimental Economics*, 17(3), 488-500.
- Koster, F. (2007). Globalization, social structure, and the willingness to help others: A multilevel analysis across 26 countries. *European Sociological Review*, 23(4), 537-551.
- Kropf, M., & Knack, S. (2003). Viewers like You: Community Norms and Contributions to Public Broadcasting. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 187-197.
- Künemund, H., & Rein, M. (1999). There Is More to Receiving than Needing: Theoretical Arguments and Empirical Explorations of Crowding In and Crowding Out. *Ageing and Society*, 19(01), 93-121.

L

- Lassen, D.D. (2005). The Effect of Information on Voter Turnout: Evidence From a Natural Experiment, *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(1), 103-118.
- Lecy, J.D., & Van Slyke, D.M. (2013). Nonprofit Sector Growth and Density: Testing Theories of Government Support. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(1): 189-214.
- Lee, B., Fraser, I., Fillis, I. (2017). Nudging Art Lovers to Donate. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Online first, April 11.

- Lergetporer, P., Schwerdt, G., Werner, K., & Woessmann, L. (2016). *Information and Preferences for Public Spending: Evidence from Representative Survey Experiments*. Bonn: IZA Discussion Paper No. 9968.
- Levitt, S.D., & List, J.A. (2007). What Do Laboratory Experiments Measuring Social Preferences Reveal about the Real World? *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2), 153-174.
- Li, H., & McDougle, L. (2017). Information Source Reliance and Charitable Giving Decisions. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. Published online February 17.
- Lilley, A., & Slonim, R. (2014). The price of warm glow. *Journal of Public Economics*, 114, 58-74.
- Lindsey, L.B., & Steinberg, R. (1990). *Joint crowdout: An empirical study of the impact of federal grants on state government expenditures and charitable donations*. National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. 3226.
- Lobb, A., Mock, N., & Hutchinson, P. L. (2012). Traditional and Social Media Coverage and Charitable Giving Following the 2010 Earthquake in Haiti. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 27(4), 319-324.
- Lu, J. (2016). The Philanthropic Consequence of Government Grants to Non-profit Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 26(4), 381-400.
- Luccasen, R.A. (2012). Individual Differences in Contributions and Crowd-out of a Public Good. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 59, 419-441.
- Luksetich, W.A., & Lange, M.D. (1995). A simultaneous model of nonprofit symphony orchestra behavior. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 19(1), 49-68.

M

- Manzoor, S.H., & Straub, J.D. (2005). The robustness of Kingma's crowd-out estimate: Evidence from new data on contributions to public radio. *Public Choice*, 123, 463-476.
- Marcuello, C., & Salas, V. (2000). Money and time donations to Spanish non-governmental organizations for development aid. *Investigaciones Económicas*, 24(1), 51-73.
- Marcuello, C., & Salas, V. (2001). Nonprofit organizations, monopolistic competition, and private donations: Evidence from Spain. *Public Finance Re-*

view, 29(3), 183-207.

- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McDougle, L., & Handy, F. (2014). The Influence of Information Costs on Donor Decision Making. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(4), 465-485.
- Meier, S. (2006). *A survey of economic theories and field evidence on pro-social behavior*. Working paper series // Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, No. 06-6.
- Milward, H.B., & Provan, K.G. (2003). Managing the Hollow State: Collaboration and Contracting. *Public Management Review*, 5(1), 1-18.
- Morgan, S.L., & Winship, C. (2007). *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Museumvereniging (2015). *Museumcijfers 2014*. Amsterdam: Stichting Museana.

N

- Nelson, A.A., & Gazley, B. (2014). The Rise of School-Supporting Nonprofits. *Education Finance and Policy*, 9(4), 541-566.
- Nguyen, P.A. (2015). The Influence of Government Support for the Nonprofit Sector on Philanthropy across Nations. In: F. Handy & P. Wiepking (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 530-539.
- Nikolova, M. (2015). Government Funding of Private Voluntary Organizations: Is There a Crowding-Out Effect? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(3), 487-509.
- Nisbet, R.A. 1962[1953]. *Community and power* [originally *The quest for community*]. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunnenkamp, P., & Öhler, H. (2012). How to attract donations: the case of US NGOs in international development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 48(10), 1522-1535.

O

- Okten, C., & Weisbrod, B.A. (2000). Determinants of Donations in Private

- Nonprofit Markets. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75(2), 255–272.
- O'Regan, K., & Oster, S. (2002). Does Government Funding Alter Nonprofit Governance? Evidence from New York City Nonprofit Contractors. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(3), 359-379.

P

- Paqué, K.H. (1986). The efficiency of tax incentives to private charitable giving—Some econometric evidence for the Federal Republic of Germany. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 122(4), 690-712.
- Payne, A.A. (1998). Does the Government Crowd-out Private Donations? New Evidence from a Sample of Non-profit Firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 69, 323–345.
- Payne, A.A. (2001). Measuring the Effect of Federal Research Funding on Private Donations at Research Universities: Is Federal Research Funding More than a Substitute for Private Donations? *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(5-6), 731-751.
- Payne, A.A. (2009). Does Government Funding Change Behavior? An Empirical Analysis of Crowd Out. *Tax Policy and the Economy*, 23(1), 159-184.
- Pelozo, J., & Steel, P. (2005). The price elasticities of charitable contributions: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 24(2), 260-272.
- Pennerstorfer, A., & Neumayr, M. (2017). Examining the Association of Welfare State Expenditure, Non-profit Regimes and Charitable Giving. *Voluntas*, 28(2), 532–555.
- Petrovski, E. (2017). Whether and How Much to Give: Uncovering the Contrasting Determinants of the Decisions of Whether and How Much to Give to Charity with Two-Stage Alternatives to the Prevailing Tobit Model. *Voluntas*, 28(2), 594–620.
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Piantadosi, S., Byar, D.P., & Green, S.B. (1988). The Ecological Fallacy. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 127(5), 893-904.
- Piotrowski, S.J., & Van Ryzin, G.G. (2007). Citizen attitudes toward transparency in local government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 37(3), 306-323.

- Pontzen, R. (2011). Zet open die ramen! Beeldende kunst; Terugblik op 2011 Kunstwereld gedwongen tot zelfreflectie. *De Volkskrant*, December 30.
- Posnett, J., & Sandler, T. (1989). Demand for charity donations in private non-profit markets: the case of the UK. *Journal of Public Economics*, 40(2), 187-200.

R

- Randall, R., & Wilson, C. (1989). The Impact of Federally Imposed Stress Upon Local-Government and Nonprofit Organizations. *Administration & Society*, 21(1), 3-19.
- Reece, W.S. (1979). Charitable contributions: New evidence on household behavior. *The American Economic Review*, 142-151.
- Reeson, A.F., & Tisdell, J.G. (2008). Institutions, Motivations and Public Goods: An Experimental Test of Motivational Crowding. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 68, 273–281.
- Reinstein, D. (2006). *Does One Contribution Come at the Expense of Another? Empirical Evidence on Substitution Between Charitable Donations*. University of Essex Discussion Paper Series No. 618.
- Reinstein, D. (2007). *Substitution Between (and Motivations for) Charitable Contributions: An Experimental Study*. University of Essex Discussion Paper Series No. 648.
- Ribar, D.C., & Wilhelm, M.O. (2002). Altruistic and Joy-of-Giving Motivations in Charitable Behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(2), 425-457.
- Rijghard, R. (2010). Wereld van de kunst is onthutst; Er komen protesten aan. *NRC.NEXT*, October 8.
- Rijksoverheid (2011). *Memorie van toelichting Geefwet*. <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2011/09/20/memorie-van-toelichting-geefwet> (Retrieved April 12, 2017).
- Roberts, R.D. (1984). A Positive Model of Private Charity and Public Transfers. *Journal of Political Economy*, 92, 136-48.
- Rodriguez, H.P., Laugesen, M.J., & Watts, C.A. (2010). A randomized experiment of issue framing and voter support of tax increases for health insurance expansion. *Health Policy*, 98(2), 245-255.
- Rooney, P., Osili, U., Thayer, A., Baranwoski, G., Hayat, A., Davis Kalugyer, A., & Hyatte, C. (2014). *The 2014 U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy*. Boston/Indianapolis: U.S. Trust/Indiana University Lilly Family

School of Philanthropy.

- Rooney, P.M., Steinberg, K.S., & Schervish, P.G. (2001). A Methodological Comparison of Giving Surveys: Indiana as a Test Case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 551-568.
- Rooney, P.M., Steinberg, K.S., & 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(4), 628-654.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1981). Do Government Grants to Charity Reduce Private Donations? In: M. White (Ed.) *Nonprofit Firms in a Three Sector Economy*. Washington: The Urban Institute, pp. 95-114.
- Rosenthal, R. (1984). *Meta-Analytical Procedures for Social Research*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Rothstein, B. (1998). *Just Institutions Matter – The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

S

- Salamon, L.M., & Anheier, H.K. (1998). Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. *Voluntas*, 9, 213-248.
- Salamon, L.M., & Sokolowski, W. (2001). *Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Evidence From 24 Countries*. Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, no. 40. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Salamon, L.M., Sokolowski, S.W., & Anheier, H.K. (2000). *Social Origins of Civil Society: An Overview*. Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, no. 38. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Donor trust and relationship commitment in the UK charity sector: The impact on behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-202.
- Sav, G.T. (2012). Government free riding in the public provision of higher education: panel data estimates of possible crowding out. *Applied Economics*, 44(9), 1133-1141.
- Scheepers, P., & Grotenhuis, M. T. (2005). Who cares for the poor in Europe? Micro and macro determinants for alleviating poverty in 15 European countries. *European Sociological Review*, 21(5), 453-465.
- Schervish, P.G., & Havens, J.J. (1995). Wherewithal and beneficence: Charita-

- ble giving by income and wealth. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fund-raising*, 8, 81-109.
- Schiff, J. (1985). Does government spending crowd out charitable contributions? *National Tax Journal*, 535-546.
- Schiff, J. (1990). *Charitable Giving and Government Policy: An Economic Analysis*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Schuyt, T. (2010). Philanthropy in European welfare states: a challenging promise? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 76(4), 774-789.
- Schuyt, T. (2014). Nederland is en blijft een filantropisch land. *De Volkskrant*, 19 november.
- Shah, K.K., Sussex, J., & Hernandez-Villafuerte, K. (2015). Government and charity funding of cancer research: public preferences and choices. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 13(38), 1-14.
- Simmons, W., & Emanuele, R. (2004). Does Government Spending Crowd Out Donations of Time and Money? *Public Finance Review*, 32(5): 498-511.
- Slothuus, R. (2007). Framing deservingness to win support for welfare state retrenchment. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(3), 323-344.
- Smith, T.M. (2007). The Impact of Government Funding on Private Contributions to Nonprofit Performing Arts Organizations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 78(1), 137-160.
- Smith, S.R., & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sokolowski, S.W. (2013). Effects of Government Support of Nonprofit Institutions on Aggregate Private Philanthropy: Evidence from 40 Countries. *Voluntas*, 24(2), 359-381.
- Song, S., & Yi, D.T. (2011). The fundraising efficiency in U.S. non-profit art organizations: an application of a Bayesian estimation approach using the stochastic frontier production model. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 35(2), 171-180.
- Stadelmann-Steffen, I. (2011). Social Volunteering in Welfare States: Where Crowding Out Should Occur. *Political Studies*, 59(1): 135-155.
- Stanley, T.D. (2005). Beyond Publication Bias. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 309-345.
- Steinberg, R. (1985). Empirical Relations Between Government Spending and Charitable Donations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 14(2-3), 54-64.
- Steinberg, R. (1989). The Theory of Crowding Out: Donations, Local Government Spending, and the "New Federalism" In: R. Magat (Ed.) *Philanthropic*

Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Steinberg, R. (1991). Does Government Spending Crowd Out Donations? *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 62(4), 591-612.
- Steinberg, R. (1997). Overall Evaluation of Economic Theories. *Voluntas*, 8(2), 179-204.
- Suanet, B., Broese Van Groenou, M., & Van Tilburg, T. (2012). Informal and Formal Home-Care Use among Older Adults in Europe: Can Cross-national Differences be Explained by Societal Context and Composition? *Ageing and Society*, 32(3), 491-515.
- Sutter, M., & Weck-Hannemann, H. (2004). An experimental test of the public goods crowding out hypothesis when taxation is endogenous. *FinanzArchiv: Public Finance Analysis*, 60(1), 94-110.
- Svallfors, S. (1997). Worlds of Welfare and Attitudes to Redistribution: A Comparison of Eight Western Nations. *European Sociological Review*, 13(3), 283-304.

T

- Teeuwen, D. (2014). *Generating Generosity: Financing poor relief through charitable collections in Dutch towns, c. 1600-1800* (Doctoral thesis, Utrecht University). <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/294327> (Retrieved May 15, 2017).
- Thaler, R.H. (1999). Mental Accounting Matters. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 12(3): 183-206.
- Thomas, W.I., & Thomas, D.S. (1928). *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs*. New York: Knopf.
- Tinkelman, D. (2010). Revenue Interactions: Crowding Out, Crowding In, or Neither? In: B.A. Seaman & D.R. Young (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Nonprofit Economics and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Tinkelman, D., & Neely, D.G. (2011). Some Econometric Issues in Studying Nonprofit Revenue Interactions Using NCCS Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(4), 751-761.
- Tolbert, C.J., & Mossberger, K. (2006). The effects of e-government on trust and confidence in government. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 354-369.

- Tukey, J.W. (1962). The Future of Data Analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33, 1-67.
- Tummers, L., Weske, U., Bouwman, R., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2015). The Impact of Red Tape on Citizen Satisfaction: An Experimental Study. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(3), 320-341.

U

- Uslaner, E.M. (2003) Trust and civic engagement in East and West'. In: G. Badescu & E. Uslaner (Eds.) *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 81-94.

V

- Vamstad, J., & Von Essen, J. (2013). Charitable Giving in a Universal Welfare State: Charity and Social Rights in Sweden. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(2), 285-301.
- Van der Meer, T., Te Grotenhuis, M., & Pelzer, B. (2010). Influential Cases in Multilevel Modeling: A Methodological Comment. *American Sociological Review*, 75(1), 173-178.
- Van Ingen, E., & Van der Meer, T. (2011). Welfare State Expenditure and Inequalities in Voluntary Association Participation. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 21(4), 302-322.
- Van Leeuwen, M.H.D. (1999). Armenzorg en charitas, ca. 1800-2000. Een historische erfenis. In: R. van der Bie & P. Dehning (Eds.) *Nationaal Goed. Feiten en cijfers over onze samenleving ca. 1800-1999*. Amsterdam: CBS, pp. 159-178.
- Van Oorschot, W., & Arts, W. (2005). The Social Capital of European Welfare States: The Crowding Out Hypothesis Revisited. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(1), 5-26.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L. & Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Verschueren, B., & De Corte, J. (2014). The Impact of Public Resource Dependence on the Autonomy of NPOs in Their Strategic Decision Making. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2), 293-313.
- Vos, N. (2011). Kleine kunstinstellingen kunnen wel inpakken; Zijlstra laat

Concertgebouworkest, Nederlandse Opera en beste musea en festivals ongemoeid. *Het Parool*, June 11.

W

- Warr, P.G. (1982). Pareto Optimal Redistribution and Private Charity. *Journal of Public Economics*, 19(1), 131-138.
- Weinblatt, J. (1992). Do Government Transfers Crowd out Private Transfers to Nonprofit Organizations? The Israeli Experience. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 19(2), 60-66.
- Weber, M. (1922[1987]). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Weisbrod, B.A. (1977). *The Voluntary Nonprofit Sector: An Economic Analysis*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Wiepking, P. (2010). Democrats support international relief and the upper class donates to art? How opportunity, incentives and confidence affect donations to different types of charitable organizations. *Social Science Research*, 39(6), 1073-1087.
- Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part Two: Gender, family composition and income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 217-245.
- Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (2015). Introduction. In: F. Handy & P. Wiepking (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3-8.
- Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (2016). *Documentation Individual International Philanthropy Database (IIPD). A Comparative Study of Global Giving*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Wiepking, P., Handy, F., Park, S., Bekkers, R., Bethmann, S., Breen, O., Breeze, B., Einolf, C.J., Kang, C., Katz, H.A., Krasnopolskaya, I., Layton, M.D., Lo, V.K.T., Neumayr, M., Osili, U., Pessi, A.B., Sivesind, K.H., Scaife, W., De Wit, A., Xiulan, Z., Yamauchi, N. (2016). *The Matthew Effect in Philanthropy: How Philanthropic Structure Enables Philanthropic Giving*. Paper presented at the 45th ARNOVA Annual Conference, Washington, DC.
- Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1973-1995.
- Wilhelm, M.O., & Bekkers, R. (2010). Helping Behavior, Dispositional Em-

- pathic Concern, and the Principle of Care. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(1), 11-32.
- Wolf, F.M. (1986). *Meta-Analysis: Quantitative Methods for Research Synthesis*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Worthy, B. (2010). More open but not more trusted? The effect of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 on the United Kingdom central government. *Governance*, 23(4), 561-582.
- Worthy, B. (2015). The Impact of Open Data in the UK: Complex, Unpredictable, and Political. *Public Administration*, 93(3), 788-805.
- Wortmann, M. (1997). Het ontstaan van het Centraal Bureau Fondsenwerving: Lessen voor het heden? In: V. Kingma & M.H.D. Van Leeuwen (Eds.) *Filantropie in Nederland: Voorbeelden uit de periode 1770-2020*. Amsterdam: Aksant, pp. 110-119.

Y

- Yetman, M.H., & Yetman, R.J. (2003). The Effect of Nonprofits' Taxable Activities on the Supply of Private Donations. *National Tax Journal*, 56(1), 243-258.
- Yetman, M.H., & Yetman, R.J. (2013). How Does the Incentive Effect of the Charitable Deduction Vary across Charities? *Accounting Review*, 88(3), 1069-1094.
- Yoruk, B.K. (2012). The Effect of Media on Charitable Giving and Volunteering: Evidence from the "Give Five" Campaign. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 31(4), 813-836.
- Young, D.R. (2000). Alternative Models of Government-Nonprofit Sector Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 149-172.