# **ECONSTOR** Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Adena, Maja; Huck, Steffen

# Article — Published Version Voluntary 'donations' versus reward-oriented 'contributions': two experiments on framing in funding mechanisms

**Experimental Economics** 

**Provided in Cooperation with:** WZB Berlin Social Science Center

*Suggested Citation:* Adena, Maja; Huck, Steffen (2022) : Voluntary 'donations' versus reward-oriented 'contributions': two experiments on framing in funding mechanisms, Experimental Economics, ISSN 1573-6938, Springer Science + Business Media B.V., Dordrecht, Vol. 25, Iss. 5, pp. 1399-1417, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-022-09759-6

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/261835

#### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.



WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

#### Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



### **Online Appendix for**

# Voluntary 'donations' versus reward-oriented 'contributions:' Two experiments on framing in funding mechanisms

Appendix A Additional tables and figures	2
Appendix B Suggestions of $\in 10$ and $\in 20$	10
Appendix C Individual characteristics and heterogenous treatment effects	12
Appendix D E-mail content in the field experiment	17
Appendix E Instructions in the MTurk experiment	22

# **Appendix A Additional tables and figures**



Figure 2 Number of contributors by day



Figure 3 Number of gifts by group by day to party

The figure above shows the numbers of gifts according to the institutional groups to which the contributors belonged (in 10 cases there is doubling as, for example, secretaries belong both to the administration and to their respective departments). For data protection reasons, we do not label the groups. We also do not correct for the size of the groups. While some groups cluster more around certain days, this does not appear to be a general pattern and may have occurred at random.





Figure 5 Fisherian randomization inference test for the treatment effect estimated in Table 2,

Column I



Panel A: only monetary gifts

Panel B: including buffet pledges monetized at €10

Table 7 multilual characteristics in each of the 2x2 fandofinzation cens and t-test p-value
---

Treatment:	Donatio	n	Contribution					Contribution						
Treatment:	10€		20€		10€		20€							
	1		2		3 4		1=2	1=3	2=3	4=2	4=3	1=4		
	N=135		N=137		N=137 N=136									
Share of	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.		Т	wo-sided t	-test p-valu	es	
participants		err.		err.		err.		err.						
pertaining to														
the group of:														
Females	0.504	0.043	0.511	0.043	0.504	0.043	0.511	0.043	0.905	0.999	0.904	0.953	0.951	0.952
Professors	0.044	0.018	0.051	0.019	0.051	0.019	0.051	0.019	0.798	0.798	1.000	0.798	0.798	1.000
Postdocs	0.141	0.030	0.139	0.030	0.146	0.030	0.139	0.030	0.961	0.902	0.863	0.898	0.764	0.860
PhD students	0.207	0.035	0.182	0.033	0.190	0.034	0.182	0.033	0.606	0.717	0.877	0.832	0.953	0.762
Student	0.141	0.030	0.153	0.031	0.161	0.031	0.153	0.031	0.771	0.649	0.869	0.906	0.778	0.863
research														
assistants														
Faculty I	0.185	0.034	0.204	0.035	0.212	0.035	0.204	0.035	0.691	0.585	0.882	0.951	0.931	0.647
Faculty II	0.081	0.024	0.102	0.026	0.095	0.025	0.102	0.026	0.556	0.698	0.840	0.710	0.865	0.828
Faculty III	0.126	0.029	0.117	0.028	0.117	0.028	0.117	0.028	0.818	0.818	1.000	0.450	0.450	0.328
Faculty IV	0.074	0.023	0.044	0.018	0.051	0.019	0.044	0.018	0.291	0.436	0.777	0.979	0.798	0.304
Faculty V	0.096	0.025	0.124	0.028	0.124	0.028	0.124	0.028	0.466	0.466	1.000	0.964	0.964	0.440
Administration	0.081	0.024	0.080	0.023	0.058	0.020	0.080	0.023	0.971	0.458	0.477	0.971	0.458	1.000
IT	0.007	0.007	0.015	0.010	0.015	0.010	0.015	0.010	0.571	0.571	1.000	0.571	0.571	1.000
Library	0.030	0.015	0.022	0.013	0.044	0.018	0.022	0.013	0.689	0.536	0.311	0.689	0.536	1.000
Press unit	0.022	0.013	0.022	0.013	0.015	0.010	0.022	0.013	0.986	0.642	0.653	0.986	0.642	1.000
Secretaries	0.059	0.020	0.073	0.022	0.066	0.021	0.073	0.022	0.650	0.827	0.813	0.650	0.827	1.000

Note: All variables above are dummy variables; there are overlaps between the different categories. Std. err.: standard errors.

# Table 8 Early and late gifts

Early eithe with motels offer of 65							<b>T</b> .		1 66	
		Early gi	its with match o	ner oi €5			Late g	ifts without mate	ch offer	
Treatment	Total	Buffet	Number of	Average	Average	Total	Buffet	Number of	Average	Average
	number of	pledges	monetary	positive	positive	number of	pledges	monetary	positive	positive
	gift givers		gifts	monetary	gift	gift givers		gifts	monetary	gift
				gift	including				gift	including
					buffet					buffet
					pledges					pledges
					monetized					monetized
	Ι	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	Х
Contribution	36	12	33	8.33	11.67	25	4	22	9.44	11.04
				(0.891)	(0.976)				(1.359)	(1.575)
Donation	43	13	40	12.44	15.47	25	5	22	14.4	16.4
				(2.531)	(2.439)				(3.898)	(3.759)

# Table 9 Google Trends searches worldwide (01.01.04–15.12.17)

Donation	<b>Relative frequency</b>	Contribution	<b>Relative frequency</b>
blood	100	ira	100
blood donation	95	ira contribution	100
organ donation	45	401k contribution	75
plasma donation	40	401k	75
plasma	35	what is contribution	55
donate	35	roth contribution	50
goodwill	25	ira contribution limits	50
donation center	25	roth ira	40
goodwill donation	25	roth ira contribution	40
egg donation	20	contribution margin	35
donation letter	20	SSS	35
sperm donation	20	sss contribution	30
salvation army donation	20	hsa contribution	25
salvation army	20	hsa	25
donation request	20	401k limits	25
charity donation	20	401k contribution limits	25
red cross donation	20	roth contribution limits	25
donation pick up	20	cpf	25
red cross	15	cpf contribution	20
car donation	15	roth ira contribution limits	20
hair donation	15	defined contribution	20
clothing donation	15	maximum 401k contribution	20
furniture donation	15	lotto contribution	20
red cross blood donation	10	lotto world contribution	15
clothes donation	10	contribution definition	15

Table 10 Examples of the use of the word 'contribution' by charities and projects at a crowdfunding platform

Charity	Citation	Context	Source
Panel A: E	xamples from charities' own websites		
America	Charitable <b>Contributions</b> . Donations to	Tax	https://www.redcross.org/donations/ways-to-
n Red	the American Red Cross are tax deductible	treatment	donate/charitable-contributions.html
Cross	to the full extent of the law.		
UNICEF	Sweden contributes US\$2.7 million to	Government	https://www.unicef.org/mena/press-
	UNICEF's emergency response for	donations	releases/sweden-contributes-us27-million-
	children in Syria		unicefs-emergency-response-children-syria
United	When you give to United Way, your	Individual	https://www.unitedway.org/get-
Way	contribution helps foster both individual	donations	involved/ways-to-give#
	and collective success.		
APOPO	APOPO Cambodia is deeply grateful for	Corporate	https://www.apopo.org/en/latest/2020/12/AP
	the support and generous <b>contributions</b> of	donations	OPO-and-CMAC-commit-to-another-year-of-
	its partners and donors.		partnership
DNDi	Listed below are supporters who have	Government	https://dndi.org/about/public-donors/
	given a cumulative <b>contribution</b> of over	donations	
	USD or EUR 10,000 since 2003, as well		
	as collaborative funding partners.		
Oxfam	In 2010/11, more than 40 institutional	Institutional	https://www.oxfam.org.uk/about-us/how-we-
UK	donors <b>contributed</b> an all-time high of	donations	work/about-our-partners/
	£173.5 million to our projects worldwide.		
Tree of	you can help by <b>contributing</b> to that	Individual	https://www.treeofhope.org.uk/ways-to-
Hope	campaign fund	donations	donate/donate-to-a-campaign/
Unseen	Just set up a Just Giving page for your	Individual	https://www.unseenuk.org/get-
	friends and family to pay in their	donations	involved/helpline-hero/
	<b>contributions</b> – or pay in lump sums		
	easily yourself.		
Safe	Donate to us Your <b>contribution</b> can	Individual	https://www.safeline.org.uk/support-us/why-
Line	change lives for the better.	donations	support-us/
Panel B: E	xamples from project descriptions on an onlin	e crowdfunding	platform
GoFund	Ramadhan gives each and every one of us	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/7rbym-gift-of-
Me	the opportunity to <b>contribute</b> to charity	donations	water
	and be a part of uniting our Ummah.		
GoFund	please consider <b>contributing</b> to this sweet	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/sza4d-family-
Me	family	donations	in-need-due-to-covid19
GoFund	<b>Contribute</b> to Lifesaving Medical Care in	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/contribute-to-
Me	Lebanon	donations	lifesaving-medical-care
GoFund	If anyone would like to <b>contribute</b> to our	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/p2p29z-
Me	funds please see link below.	donations	kindness-homeless-street-team-glasgow
GoFund	We would love for your support by	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/ghes-staff-
Me	making a <b>contribution</b> to the 2nd annual	donations	appreciation-fund
	Staff Appreciation Fund.		
GoFund	I would be very grateful if anyone is able	Individual	https://www.gofundme.com/f/help-with-
Me	to <b>contribute</b> .	donations	orthopedic-surgery-in-kenyan-hospital

	Donation		Contribution		
	N=474		N= 511		
					t-test p-
	Mean	Std. err.	Mean	Std. err.	value
Interest	63.015	1.274	67.456	1.186	0.011
Amusement	35.565	1.479	41.941	1.425	0.002
Pride	46.219	1.587	47.840	1.463	0.453
Joy	48.276	1.504	47.182	1.412	0.596
Pleasure	50.173	1.463	51.002	1.376	0.680
Contentment	53.479	1.504	55.996	1.352	0.214
Love	37.928	1.550	34.082	1.452	0.070
Admiration	33.850	1.490	34.070	1.394	0.914
Relief	28.992	1.372	33.098	1.323	0.031
Compassion	49.105	1.573	42.965	1.457	0.004
Sadness	7.274	0.704	9.634	0.764	0.023
Guilt	9.439	0.804	12.260	0.882	0.018
Regret	9.338	0.708	12.759	0.884	0.003
Shame	7.968	0.738	10.630	0.850	0.018
Disappointment	7.561	0.655	10.487	0.822	0.005
Fear	8.063	0.700	11.992	0.845	0.000
Disgust	5.589	0.555	8.667	0.773	0.001
Contempt	12.447	1.064	15.415	1.089	0.052
Hate	5.361	0.534	7.159	0.683	0.038
Anger	5.411	0.545	7.675	0.700	0.011

Table 11 MTurk survey and emotion levels by frame

Note: Std. err. = standard errors.

Although we were unable to determine exact participation at the party, it seemed to be similar to previous years. Below, we present the numbers of people who donated, those who were eligible to take part in games, and those who actually took part in the games.

Donated €5 or more	Donated at least €10 or buffet	Donated at least €20 or buffet+€10				
Eligible for participation in games or more	Eligible for only 1 experiment	Eligible for 2 experiments	Maximum possible participation in experiments	Actual participation in experiment 1	Actual participation in experiment 2	sum
130*	57	34	125	49	28	77

Table 12 Participation at the party

Note: \* The exact number of attendees is unknown, though we estimate it to be larger than 130. Some guests brought family members; some employees joined for a short time and went back to work; some came early and left early, while others came and left late. Given the many points of entry and exit and different timings, it was not possible to count the number of attendees. Games and experiment 1 were organized in the form of stations, while experiment 2 took place at one point in time. Not all eligible participants took part in the experiments for various reasons, for example, timing or preferring to chat with others.

# Appendix B Suggestions of $\in 10$ and $\in 20$

# Table 13 Results of suggestions

Treatment	€ 10		€ 20		T-test p-	Test of
					value	proportions
						p-value
Pa	nel A: only	y monetary	gifts		•	
Number of subjects	272		273			
Number of monetary gifts	61		59			
Share of monetary gifts	0.224	(0.025)	0.216	(0.025)		0.8185
Monetary return per mail in €	2.5	(0.472)	2.788	(0.508)	0.679	
Average positive monetary gift in €	11.148	(1.699)	12.898	(1.833)	0.485	
Minimum in €	5		5			
Median in €	5		10			
Maximum in €	100		100			
Share of gifts €5–6 conditional on giving	0.508	(0.064)	0.322	(0.060)		0.0386
Share of gifts €10 conditional on giving	0.279	(0.057)	0.424	(0.064)		0.0958
Share of gifts €15 and more conditional on	0.213	(0.052)	0.254	(0.057)		0.5944
giving						
Panel B: inclu	iding buffe	t pledges n	nonetized a	t €10		·
Number of buffet pledges	18		16			
Share of buffet pledges	0.066	(0.015)	0.059	(0.014)		0.7149
Total number of gift givers	66		64			
Overall response rate	0.243	(0.026)	0.234	(0.026)		0.8220
Return in € per mail including buffet pledges	3.162	(0.515)	3.374	(0.539)	0.776	
monetized at €10						
Average positive gift in € including buffet	13.030	(1.605)	14.391	(1.686)	0.560	
pledges monetized at 10€						

Note: standard error in parenthesis

Figure 6 Frequency of different gift values by donation/contribution frame and different suggestions.



Panel A: only monetary gifts

Panel B: including buffet pledges monetized at €10

Table 13 presents the results by different suggestion levels. While the response rate was almost identical in both treatments, the average positive monetary gift increased by  $\notin 1.75$  or 16% when the higher amount was suggested (not significant). The median increased from  $\notin 5$  in the  $\notin 10$  suggestion treatment to  $\notin 10$  in the  $\notin 20$  suggestion treatment. Since the shares of individuals that contributed to the buffet were similar between the two treatments, we do not see any substitution between monetary and non-monetary donations. Figure 6 presents the distribution of different gift categories by the suggested level ( $\notin 10$  and  $\notin 20$ ) and frame. There is a visible shift in the distribution towards larger amounts with higher suggestions. Moreover, the mode increases from  $\notin 5$  with lower suggestions to  $\notin 10$  with higher suggestions. Table 13 confirms the impression from Figure 6. The giving frequency of  $\notin 5$  is higher with lower suggestions, and this difference is statistically significant. The giving frequency of  $\notin 10$  as well as that of  $\notin 15$  and up are higher with higher suggestions, it is so only by 12%, and this difference is not statistically significant.

### Appendix C Individual characteristics and heterogenous treatment effects

In this section, we explore the available information on the personal characteristics of the participants in our field experiment. However, one must be cautious with the interpretation, since these characteristics are likely related to the actual attendees of the summer party and this, in turn, with participation in the crowdfunding campaign.

In Table 14, we present the results from simple regressions including individual characteristic dummies.<sup>1</sup> Column I shows the monetary return per e-mail by presenting the results from an OLS regression with monetary gifts (including zeros) as the dependent variable. Column II shows the effect of individual characteristics on positive gifts only (OLS regression). Column III analyses the response rate by presenting the marginal effects from a Probit regression. When looking at the dummies professor, postdoc, PhD student, student research assistants, and administrative staff, note that the reference group is the remainder including current guests, alumni, and affiliated researchers not on the institute's payroll. First, we see that the response rate of postdocs, PhD students, and administrative staff is significantly higher. In terms of positive gifts, those given by professors clearly stand out (an increase by  $\epsilon$ 30). The positive gifts by student research assistants are significantly lower (by almost  $\epsilon$ 6). The combined result—the return—is significantly lower for student research assistants.

Next, we present separate and more detailed comparisons between the group of academics and the administrative staff, subgroups of the academics only, and between male and female e-mail recipients that confirm the above results. We also tested for heterogeneous treatment effects and found that females responded more often when the donation framing was used and that the administrative staff members were less responsive to higher suggestions.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We did not control for block fixed effects here because this would only be feasible in Column I.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  We chose gender and administrative status for the heterogeneity analysis since this divides the sample into relatively large groups. Gender differences in positive versus negative frames in public good games have been studied by Fujimoto and Park (2010), who found that gift levels are similar for both genders in the positive frame, while male subjects give significantly lower amounts in the negative frame. With our interpretation of the donation frame being more positive, our results differ from Fujimoto and Park (2010). The results in Table 17 suggest that female participants gave significantly more often than males in the donation frame, but this might have been driven by more females working in administration and thus having lower incomes as well as by higher participation from the administrative staff, which seems in line with the results in Table 18.

Figure 7 shows the average returns in both frames by academic status. This status also corresponds to large income (also age) differences. While in the contribution frame, the gifts seem not to be strongly related to status/income, they are in the donation frame.<sup>3</sup>

	Monetary return	Average	Overall
	-	positive gift	response rate
	OLS	OLS	Probit marginal
	. de de		effects
'Donation'	$1.402^{**}$	$4.265^{*}$	0.030
	(0.676)	(2.311)	(0.036)
€20 suggestion	0 189	1 604	-0.013
	(0.692)	(1.867)	(0.019)
	(0.0)2)	(1.007)	(0.050)
	0.229	-2.576	0.039
Female			
	(0.880)	(2.848)	(0.037)
Professor	6.394	30.731**	0.023
	(4.252)	(13.823)	(0.090)
	(	()	(0.02.0)
Postdoc	1.327	-2.405	$0.148^{***}$
	(0.837)	(2.290)	(0.055)
PhD student	0 528	-3 239*	0 114**
	(0.520)	(1.731)	(0.051)
	(0.044)	(1.751)	(0.031)
Student research	-1.424***	-5.887***	-0.092
	(0.465)	(1.598)	(0.064)
Administrative staff	1.815	1.111	0.154***
	(1.178)	(2.800)	(0.048)
	(1.170)	(2.000)	(0.010)
Constant	0.929	10.293***	
	(0.830)	(2.762)	
Observations	544	119	544
$R^2$ / Pseudo $R^2$	0.050	0.280	0.044

Table 14 Individual characteristics

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; not accounting for buffet contributions; p < 0.10, p < 0.05, p < 0.01.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  Note that there might not be that large of a difference in income between postdocs and doctoral students. These individuals are usually remunerated according to the same pay scale, but doctoral students often hold less than full-time (typically 66–75%) contracts.

### Figure 7 Average unconditional gifts by status



### Only monetary gifts





Note: C - treatment 'contribution', D - treatment 'donation'

Group	Number	Number	Overall	Average	Minimum	Share	Share	Overall
	of	of	return per	positive	Median	monetary	buffet	response
	subjects	monetary	e-mail	gift	Maximum	gift		rate
		gifts						
Academics	325	64	2.354	11.953	5	0.200	0.046	0.203
			(0.429)	(1.731)	10	(0.022)	(0.012)	(0.022)
					100			
Administration	118	36	3.686	12.083	5	0.331	0.085	0.339
			(.958)	(2.675)	10	(0.033)	(0.026)	(0.044)
					100			
T-test p-value			0.147	0.966				
Test of proportions						0.004	0.120	0.003

### Table 15 Academics versus administration

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Group	Number	Number	Overall	Average	Minimum	Share	Share	Overall
	of	of	return per	positive	Median	monetary	buffet	response
	subjects	monetary	mail	gift	Maximum	gift		rate
		gifts						
Male	269	54	2.494	12.426	5	0.204	0.048	0.212
			(0.485)	(1.899)	10	(0.025)	(0.013)	(0.025)
					100			
Female	276	66	2.790	11.667	5	0.261	0.076	0.264
			(0.496)	(1.660)	10	(0.026)	(0.016)	(0.027)
					100			
T-test p-value			0.670	0.763				0.150
Test of proportions						0.119	0.180	0.150

### Table 16 Gender

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

# Table 17 Interaction with gender

	Monetary return	Average	Overall
		positive gift	response rate
	OLS	OLS	Probit marginal
			effects
'Donation'	0.683	6.283	-0.053
	(0.976)	(4.324)	(0.053)
€20 suggestion	-0 720	-2.252	-0.037
20	(0.972)	(3.753)	(0.053)
Female	-1 362	-3 586	-0.053
i ontaio	(0.912)	(2.861)	(0.063)
Female x 'donation'	1 337	-2 698	0.155**
i enhaite it domation	(1.384)	(5.152)	(0.072)
Female x €20 suggestion	1.969	6.918	0.053
	(1.377)	(4.917)	(0.073)
Constant	2.513***	10.676***	
	(0.687)	(2.102)	
Observations	545	120	545
$R^2$ /Pseudo $R^2$	0.013	0.052	0.013

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01.

	Monetary	Average	Overall
_	return	positive gift	response rate
	OLS	OLS	Probit
			marginal
			effects
'Donation'	$1.256^{*}$	$4.830^{*}$	0.017
	(0.704)	(2.562)	(0.042)
€20 suggestion	1.074	3.630	0.011
	(0.707)	(2.586)	(0.042)
	steale		
Administrative	3.086**	3.576	$0.137^{*}$
staff			
	(1.364)	(2.806)	(0.073)
	0 707	0.047	0.050
Administrative	0.787	0.047	0.062
stall x donation	(2,015)	(c 0.19)	(0,094)
	(2.015)	(0.048)	(0.084)
1 dministrativa	4 116*	7 725	0.000
staff $x \in 20$	-4.110	-1.155	-0.099
suggestion			
suggestion	(2 110)	(5.825)	(0.083)
	(2.110)	(5.625)	(0.005)
Constant	$1.160^{**}$	7.395***	
	(0.471)	(1.766)	
Observations	544	119	544
$R^2$	0.024	0.049	
Pseudo $R^2$			0.018

### Table 18 Interaction with administrative staff

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01.

# **Appendix D E-mail content in the field experiment**

First email (Different versions are marked with curly and angle brackets)

Dear (name of the institute)-ers and friends,

This year our (name of the institute) summer party follows the motto

#### There is such a thing like a free lunch.

The party will take place on Tuesday, the 5<sup>th</sup> of July, beginning at 4pm. And so this time we do not want to install a cash box on the day, **however we do need your contributions {donations} to a crowdfunding campaign now**. Below you will find more information.

The (department name) is planning a party with:

[Food & Drinks]: We are planning a BBQ with organic sausages that come from appropriately treated animals as well as the usual assortment of alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages. In addition, there will be the well renowned (name of the institute) potluck buffet of salads and cakes.

**[Special Entertainment]:** We are planning several (team) games and hands-on experiments, music, as well as a small campfire. Childcare and fun activities for children will be organized as usual by the Family Service.

As usual, please send the information regarding the number of children for whom you need child care, and their respective ages to: (e-mail address) by June 24, 2016.

In order to ensure that it will be a wonderful party, we are now starting a

### Contribute {Donate} to our summer party, please!

For our summer party, we need your support with the food and drinks. You can do this through in-kind or money contributions, or preferably both!

So, please, prepare salads and bake cakes for the 5<sup>th</sup> of July, and please also open your wallet (now)!

For each contribution {donation} there is a **Thank You**, staggered as follows:

#### [from € 5]:

o 1 pass for all games and competitions (for example, Kicker, Kubb, Ping Pong)

### [from € 10 or 1 buffet contribution {donation}]:

o 1 pass for all games and competitions (for example, Kicker, Kubb, Ping Pong)

• Participation in a decision experiment with the possibility of winning 50 Euros or Participation at a 'tasting station' with the possibility of winning 50 Euros

### [from € 20 or € 10 +1 buffet contribution {donation}]:

- o 1 pass for all games and game competitions (for example, Kicker, Kubb, Ping Pong)
- Participation in a decision experiment with the possibility of winning 50 Euros
- $\circ$  Participation at a 'tasting station' with the possibility of winning another 50 Euros

### [from € 30 or € 20 +1 buffet contribution {donation}]:

- o 1 pass for all games and game competitions (for example, Kicker, Kubb, Ping Pong)
- Participation in a decision experiment with the possibility of winning 50 Euros
- Participation at a 'tasting station' with the possibility of winning another 50 Euros
- We will play 5 songs of your choice

### [over 100 € or 90 € + 1 buffet contribution {donation}]:

- 1 pass for all games and game competitions (for example, Kicker, Kubb, Ping Pong)
- $\circ$  Participation in a decision experiment with the possibility of winning 50 Euros
- $\circ$  Participation at a 'tasting station' with the possibility of winning another 50 Euros
- We will play 5 songs of your choice
- A copy of the book 'Fleisch und Farbe' (unique limited edition book, comprising only 100 individually numbered prints).

For every contribution {donation} made <u>before 22.06.2016</u>, an anonymous sponsor will make a **bonus contribution {donation} of**  $\notin$  **5** on your behalf. (However, these 5 euros are not included in the calculation of your 'Thank You' Coupon.)

If the average monetary contribution {donation} is 20 € <10€>, we need 100<200> participants in the campaign to cover the expected costs.\*

The current status of contributions {donation} will be documented daily on the Intranet at (web address) (right column, updated each afternoon at 5 o'clock, Friday at 3).

Your generous monetary contributions {donation} (or willingness to contribute {donation} to the buffet) can be confidentially made to (name) (room (number), between 9am-12 and 1pm - 5pm). (*Those who cannot make the contribution {donation} in person may contact (name) [at: (e-mail address)] for the account details in order to do an online bank transfer)* \*\*

[Your contribution {donation} does even more!]: Your contribution {donation} doesn't only support the summer party as a public good. If we receive more contributions {donation} than required for financing the party, then the surplus will be used for an additional worthy project, e.g. to support the Women's Bike Project, facilitated by the AG Refugees.

We look forward to your active participation in the crowdfunding campaign and, also, to a great party,

The (department name)

\* The revenues will also be used to cover various minor costs, such as the purchase of bread, rolls, paper plates and cutlery as well as the music organization.

\*\* We will not announce any individual contribution {donation} information and guarantee confidentiality.

### **First reminder**

Dear (name of the institute)-ers and friends,

Maybe you have overlooked our email last week starting a **crowdfunding campaign** for this year's **summer party** (see below). We really believe that a party is much nicer without cash boxes so we hope you will join the crowd and help fund the party.

Remember that if you contribute {donate} this week **until Wednesday** it will generate a **match** from an anonymous benefactor of **five additional euros**.

All best

The (name of the institute) Party Team

P.S. Crowdfunding barometer can be seen at (web address)! Take a look!

### Second reminder

Re: Last match day ((name of the institute)summer party 2016)

Dear (name of the institute)-ers and friends,

while our crowdfunding campaign for the summer party will continue until <u>end of June</u>, **TODAY** is the last day where every contribution {donation} that we get will be matched by an additional  $5 \in$  from an anonymous benefactor.

Until yesterday we collected inspiring 495€ (+185€ Boni) + 16 buffet pledges. Many thanks to all contributors {donors} so far! However, we are far away from the threshold we aim at (Needless to say, it won't even cover the drinks). Therefore, we need you to

#### join the crowd now!

<u>To clarify all open questions, let us explain the purpose and working of this campaign once more:</u> **Everything** what was traditionally organized and more: food (including vegetarian burgers and organic sausages), drinks (alcoholic and non-alcoholic), as well as music **WILL BE FREE** on the day. In addition, there will be the well renowned WZB potluck buffet of salads and cakes (also FREE).

The rewards offered within the crowdfunding campaign are made only possible by the additional efforts of our department, are by no means standard, and should serve as additional motivation for the participation in the crowdfunding campaign.

Follow the progress of the campaign at (web address)

### Third reminder

Last call: summer party crowdfunding and program

Dear (name of the institute)-ers and friends,

Less than a week is left till our amazing (name of the institute) summer party 2016 which takes place on Tuesday, **5<sup>th</sup> of July, starting at 4 p.m**. Since we don't have a huge external sponsor this year, we need to rely on your participation in the **crowdfunding campaign** to finance the party!

Until yesterday we collected inspiring 980€ (+395€ Boni) + 25 buffet pledges. Many thanks to all contributors {donors} so far! However, we are still missing the threshold we aim at. Two days left for contributions {donations}! Therefore, we need you to join the crowd now! (contributions {donations} are collected till the end of June by (name), Room (number), 9-12 a.m. and 1-5 p.m.)

Remember: If the average monetary contribution {donation} is 20 €<10€>, we need 100<200> participants in the campaign to cover the expected costs.

**Last call**: please send the information regarding the number of children you would like to sign in for the (**name of the institute**) **Kinderfest** (organized by Familienservice child care animators),

and their respective ages TODAY to: (e-mail address).

Preliminary program:

From 4:00 p.m.	<b>Barbeque</b> (including veggie and vegan options), <b>drinks</b> , and <b>potluck buffet</b>		
From 4:00 p.m.	(name of the institute) Kinderfest fun activities for children.		
4:00-5:30 p.m.	<b>Tasting experiment</b> (Provided you are eligible, you may participate at any time while open. It won't take long, and you have the chance of winning 50 Euros.)		
From 4:00 p.m.	<b>Tournaments</b> (in order to take part in Kicker (Foosball) or Table Tennis (Ping Pong) tournament you must sign up (alone or in pairs) till Friday 2 July with (e-mail address). You will be assigned the staring time. Kubb will be open for spontaneous teams.)		
5:00 p.m.	Experiment 2 (Those who are eligible will get a separate Email with instructions. It is necessary to be on time since the experiment takes place simultaneously for all participants. You must also bring either your smart phone, tablet or laptop with an internet connection with you. There is a chance to win 40 or 10 Euros.)		
5:30 p.m.	We play your songs		
6:00 p.m.	The results and winners of the experiments will be announced		
6:30-8:00 p.m.	We are pleased to announce that 8name) and his band ( <b>name</b> ) (web address) will play at our party		
6:30 p.m.	Long drinks stand will be opened		

Follow the progress of the crowdfunding campaign at (web address)

All best

The (name of the institute) Party Team

# **Appendix E Instructions in the MTurk experiment**

Start page:

	Exit and clear survey
Welcome and thank you for joining!	
Your task consists of two parts.	
In the first part we ask you to participate in realization of a project together with 5 other MTurkers.	
In the second part we ask you to fill in a short survey.	
	Next >>
Based on	
<b><i><u><u></u></u></i></b> <u></u>	
Imprint & Privacy policy	

On the page below, participants were shown instructions and decided on the amount of their gift to the joint account. The screenshot shows the contribution frame. In the donation frame, the term 'contribution' was exchanged for the word 'donation'. There was no prespecified (default) position of the slider: the blue indicator and explanation below only appeared once the individual had clicked. Participants could adjust the slider until choosing their preferred position.

#### Exit and clear survey

#### Part 1 - Project

#### Task

0%

In this part you and 5 other anonymous MTurkers are matched together and receive exactly the same instructions. Each of you receives a budget of \$2. We ask you to contribute to a joint project in order to make it successful.

#### Contributions towards a group account

You can contribute any amount between 0 and 2\$.

Any amount you keep will be directly added to your final payment, in addition to the base payment of 50c, and any bonus that may result from the project.

The amount you contribute will help to make the project successful.

#### Project success

Your contribution and the contributions of the other 5 participants will be payed towards a group account. The project will be successfully realized if the total group contributions are at least \$5. If the project is realized, the money in the group account will be **doubled**.

If the total group contributions fall short of \$5, the project will not be realized, and the money in the group account will not be doubled.

In both cases the money will be equally distributed among all group participants regardless of their own contributions.

#### Rewards

In order to thank you for your participation in the project we have designed additional rewards depending on the level of your contribution:

- If you contribute at least 20c :
  - a bronze contributor recognition award.

#### If you contribute at least 40c :

- a silver contributor recognition award reward of 5c added directly to the final payment.

#### If you contribute at least 80c :

- a golden contributor recognition award reward of 10c added directly to the final payment.

#### If you contribute at least 1.6\$ :

a diamond contributor recognition award
reward of 20c added directly to the final payment.

Please choose your contribution (centwise):	
Your contribution 0 For your cont you will ge and an additio	200 tribution of 100 cents, et the <u>golden</u> award onal reward of 10 cents.
	Next >>

Next, participants received a symbolic award provided that they met one of the thresholds. The next screenshot shows an example of the silver donor award in the donation treatment.



Next, participants were asked how they felt when making their donation/contribution. They were presented with all 20 emotions from the GEW in a random order and marked their responses by moving the slider (again, there was no prespecified position ). The screenshot below shows an example with two emotions in the donation frame (the emotion questions were shown in random order).

		Exit and clear survey
3	3%	
Part 1 - Project		
Think about how you f emotions when you ma	elt when you made your donation. Below you will find a list of 20 different emotions. Please tell us ho ade your decision.	w strongly you experienced each of those
Sadness		
	not at all	very strongly
Relief		
	not at all	very strongly

Next, participants were asked what they thought regarding the level of donations/contributions by other participants in their group, on average.

	Exit and clear survey	
50%		
Part 1 - Project		
How much do you think, that the other in your group donate on average (centwise	e):	
Other's donation on average	200	
	Next >>	
This survey is currently not active. You Based on This Survey is currently not active.	i will not be able to save your responses.	
Imprint & I	Privacy policy	

Next, participants answered four demographic questions.

	Exit and clear survey
	66%
Par	t 2 - Survey
Г	Please answer the following questions.
	What is your age?
	Unis question is mandatory
	What is your gender?
	O This section is set of the
	U This question is mandatory
	Male
	Female
	Other
	What is your highest level of education completed?
	• This question is mandatory
	Less than a High School Degree
	High School Diploma
	Vocational Training
	Attended College
	Bachelor's Degree
	Graduate Degree
	Please choose the category that describes the total amount of income you earned in 2017. Consider all forms of income, including salaries, tips, interest and dividend payments, scholarship support, student loans, parental support, social security, alimony, and child support, and others.
	This question is mandatory
	Under \$5,000
	\$5,000 - \$10,000
	\$10,001 - \$15,000
	\$15,001 - \$25,000
	\$25,001 - \$35,000
	\$35,001 - \$50,000
	\$50,001 - \$65,000
	\$65,001 - \$80,000
	\$80,001 - \$100,000
	0461 \$70/000

# Final page:

	Exit and clear survey
83%	
Part 2 - Survey	
Thank you very much for your participation.	
For your payment, please state your Worker ID here. We will not use it for any other purpose. Note, that your Worker ID can be found on your dashboard page.	
753898620721	
Please copy the survey code below to paste it into the box in MTurk to receive credit for taking our survey. Your Code: 4057685	
	Submit