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## 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 4 Associations with the words 'contribution' and 'donation' (source:
http://www.snappywords.com/)


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 $€ 10$



Note: Based on 5,000 permutations.

Table 7 Individual characteristics in each of the $2 \times 2$ randomization cells and $t$-test $p$-values

| Treatment: | Donation |  |  |  | Contribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treatment: | $10 €$ |  | $20 €$ |  | $10 €$ |  | $20 €$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | $1=2$ | $1=3$ | $2=3$ | 4=2 | 4=3 | $1=4$ |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=135$ |  | $\mathrm{N}=137$ |  | $\mathrm{N}=137$ |  | $\mathrm{N}=136$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share of participants pertaining to the group of: | Mean | Std. err. | Mean | Std. err. | Mean | Std. err. | Mean | Std. err. | Two-sided t-test p-values |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 research assistants | 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 |
| 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 |

[^1]Table 8 Early and late gifts

| Early gifts with match offer of €5 |  |  |  |  |  | Late gifts without match offer |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treatment | Total number of gift givers | Buffet pledges | Number of monetary gifts | Average positive monetary gift | Average positive gift including buffet pledges monetized | Total number of gift givers | Buffet pledges | Number of monetary gifts | Average positive monetary gift | Average positive gift including buffet pledges monetized |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X |
| Contribution | 36 | 12 | 33 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8.33 \\ (0.891) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.67 \\ (0.976) \end{gathered}$ | 25 | 4 | 22 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9.44 \\ (1.359) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.04 \\ (1.575) \end{gathered}$ |
| Donation | 43 | 13 | 40 | $\begin{gathered} 12.44 \\ (2.531) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.47 \\ (2.439) \end{gathered}$ | 25 | 5 | 22 | $\begin{gathered} 14.4 \\ (3.898) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.4 \\ (3.759) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 9 Google Trends searches worldwide (01.01.04-15.12.17)

|  | Delative frequency | Contribution | Relative frequency |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| blood | 100 | ira | 100 |
| blood donation | 95 | ira contribution | 100 |
| organ donation | 45 | 401 k contribution | 75 |
| plasma donation | 40 | 401 k | 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 | 401 k limits | 25 |
| charity donation | 20 | 401 k 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: Examples from charities' own websites |  |  |  |
| America n Red Cross | Charitable Contributions. Donations to the American Red Cross are tax deductible to the full extent of the law. | Tax treatment | https://www.redcross.org/donations/ways-to-donate/charitable-contributions.html |
| UNICEF | Sweden contributes US $\$ 2.7$ million to UNICEF's emergency response for children in Syria | Government donations | https://www.unicef.org/mena/press-releases/sweden-contributes-us27-million-unicefs-emergency-response-children-syria |
| United Way | When you give to United Way, your contribution helps foster both individual and collective success. | Individual donations | https://www.unitedway.org/get-involved/ways-to-give\# |
| APOPO | APOPO Cambodia is deeply grateful for the support and generous contributions of its partners and donors. | Corporate donations | https://www.apopo.org/en/latest/2020/12/AP OPO-and-CMAC-commit-to-another-year-ofpartnership |
| DNDi | Listed below are supporters who have given a cumulative contribution of over USD or EUR 10,000 since 2003, as well as collaborative funding partners. | Government donations | https://dndi.org/about/public-donors/ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oxfam } \\ & \text { UK } \end{aligned}$ | In 2010/11, more than 40 institutional donors contributed an all-time high of $£ 173.5$ million to our projects worldwide. | Institutional donations | https://www.oxfam.org.uk/about-us/how-we-work/about-our-partners/ |
| Tree of Hope | you can help by contributing to that campaign fund | Individual donations | https://www.treeofhope.org.uk/ways-to-donate/donate-to-a-campaign/ |
| Unseen | Just set up a Just Giving page for your friends and family to pay in their contributions - or pay in lump sums easily yourself. | Individual donations | https://www.unseenuk.org/get-involved/helpline-hero/ |
| Safe <br> Line | Donate to us. ... Your contribution can change lives for the better. | Individual donations | https://www.safeline.org.uk/support-us/why-support-us/ |
| Panel B: Examples from project descriptions on an online crowdfunding platform |  |  |  |
| GoFund Me | Ramadhan gives each and every one of us the opportunity to contribute to charity and be a part of uniting our Ummah. | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/7rbym-gift-ofwater |
| GoFund <br> Me | please consider contributing to this sweet family | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/sza4d-family-in-need-due-to-covid19 |
| GoFund <br> Me | Contribute to Lifesaving Medical Care in Lebanon | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/contribute-to-lifesaving-medical-care |
| GoFund Me | If anyone would like to contribute to our funds please see link below. | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/p2p29z-kindness-homeless-street-team-glasgow |
| GoFund <br> Me | We would love for your support by making a contribution to the 2nd annual Staff Appreciation Fund. | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/ghes-staff-appreciation-fund |
| GoFund <br> Me | I would be very grateful if anyone is able to contribute. | Individual donations | https://www.gofundme.com/f/help-with-orthopedic-surgery-in-kenyan-hospital |

Table 11 MTurk survey and emotion levels by frame

|  | Donation |  | Contribution |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=474$ |  | $\mathrm{~N}=511$ |  |  |
|  | Mean | Std. err. | Mean | Std. err. | t-test p- <br> 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 |

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.

Table 12 Participation at the party

| Donated $€ 5$ <br> or more | Donated at <br> least $€ 10$ or <br> buffet | Donated at <br> least $€ 20$ or <br> buffet $+€ 10$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eligible for <br> participation <br> in games or <br> more | Eligible for <br> only 1 <br> experiment | Eligible for <br> 2 <br> experiments | Maximum <br> possible <br> participation <br> in <br> experiments | Actual <br> participation <br> in <br> experiment 1 | Actual <br> participation <br> in <br> experiment 2 | sum |
| $130^{*}$ | 57 | 34 | 49 | 28 | 77 |  |

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 $€ \mathbf{1 0}$ and $€ \mathbf{£ 2}$

Table 13 Results of suggestions

| Treatment | $€ 10$ |  | $€ 20$ |  | T-test pvalue | Test of proportions p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: only 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 giving | 0.213 | (0.052) | 0.254 | (0.057) |  | 0.5944 |
| Panel B: including buffet pledges monetized at $€ 10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 monetized at $€ 10$ | 3.162 | (0.515) | 3.374 | (0.539) | 0.776 |  |
| Average positive gift in $€$ including buffet pledges monetized at $10 €$ | 13.030 | (1.605) | 14.391 | (1.686) | 0.560 |  |

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 $€ 1.75$ or $16 \%$ when the higher amount was suggested (not significant). The median increased from $€ 5$ in the $€ 10$ suggestion treatment to $€ 10$ in the $€ 20$ 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 ( $€ 10$ and $€ 20$ ) and frame. There is a visible shift in the distribution towards larger amounts with higher suggestions. Moreover, the mode increases from $€ 5$ with lower suggestions to $€ 10$ with higher suggestions. Table 13 confirms the impression from Figure 6 . The giving frequency of $€ 5$ is higher with lower suggestions, and this difference is statistically significant. The giving frequency of $€ 10$ as well as that of $€ 15$ and up are higher with higher suggestions, though only the first difference is statistically significant. While the overall monetary return is 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. ${ }^{1}$ 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 $€ 30$ ). The positive gifts by student research assistants are significantly lower (by almost $€ 6$ ). 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. ${ }^{2}$

[^2]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. ${ }^{3}$

Table 14 Individual characteristics

|  | Monetary return | Average positive gift | Overall response rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS | OLS | Probit marginal effects |
| 'Donation' | $\begin{aligned} & 1.402^{* *} \\ & (0.676) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.265^{*} \\ & (2.311) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.030 \\ (0.036) \end{gathered}$ |
| $€ 20$ suggestion | $\begin{gathered} 0.189 \\ (0.692) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.604 \\ (1.867) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.013 \\ & (0.036) \end{aligned}$ |
| Female |  |  | 0.039 |
|  | (0.880) | (2.848) | (0.037) |
| Professor | $\begin{gathered} 6.394 \\ (4.252) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.731^{* *} \\ & (13.823) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.023 \\ (0.090) \end{gathered}$ |
| Postdoc | $\begin{gathered} 1.327 \\ (0.837) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2.405 \\ & (2.290) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.148^{* * *} \\ (0.055) \end{gathered}$ |
| PhD student | $\begin{gathered} 0.528 \\ (0.644) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3.239^{*} \\ & (1.731) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.114^{* *} \\ & (0.051) \end{aligned}$ |
| Student research assistant | $\begin{gathered} -1.424^{* * *} \\ (0.465) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -5.887^{* * *} \\ (1.598) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.092 \\ & (0.064) \end{aligned}$ |
| Administrative staff | $\begin{gathered} 1.815 \\ (1.178) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.111 \\ (2.800) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.154^{* * *} \\ (0.048) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 0.929 \\ (0.830) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.293^{* * *} \\ (2.762) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 544 | 119 | 544 |
| $R^{2} /$ Pseudo $R^{2}$ | 0.050 | 0.280 | 0.044 |

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

[^3]Figure 7 Average unconditional gifts by status

Only monetary gifts


Including buffet pledges monetised at $€ 10$


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

Table 15 Academics versus administration

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

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 16 Gender

| Group | Number <br> of subjects | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { monetary } \\ \text { gifts } \end{gathered}$ | Overall return per mail | Average positive gift | Minimum <br> Median <br> Maximum | Share monetary gift | Share buffet | Overall response rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 269 | 54 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.494 \\ (0.485) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 12.426 \\ & (1.899) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 10 \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.204 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.048 \\ (0.013) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.212 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | 276 | 66 | $\begin{gathered} 2.790 \\ (0.496) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.667 \\ & (1.660) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 10 \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.261 \\ (0.026) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.076 \\ (0.016) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.264 \\ (0.027) \end{gathered}$ |
| T-test p-value Test of proportions |  |  | 0.670 | 0.763 |  | 0.119 | 0.180 | 0.150 0.150 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 17 Interaction with gender

|  | Monetary return | Average <br> positive gift | Overall <br> response rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS | OLS | Probit marginal <br> effects |
| 'Donation' | 0.683 | 6.283 | -0.053 |
| €20 suggestion | $(0.976)$ | $(4.324)$ | $(0.053)$ |
|  | -0.720 | -2.252 | -0.037 |
| Female | $(0.972)$ | $(3.753)$ | $(0.053)$ |
|  | -1.362 | -3.586 | -0.053 |
| Female x 'donation' | $(0.912)$ | $(2.861)$ | $(0.063)$ |
|  | 1.337 | -2.698 | $0.155^{* *}$ |
|  | $(1.384)$ | $(5.152)$ | $(0.072)$ |
| Female x $€ 20$ | 1.969 | 6.918 | 0.053 |
| suggestion | $(1.377)$ | $(4.917)$ | $(0.073)$ |
|  |  | $10.676^{* * *}$ |  |
| Constant | $2.513^{* * *}$ | $(2.102)$ |  |
| Observations | $(0.687)$ | 120 | 545 |
| $R^{2} /$ Pseudo $R^{2}$ | 545 | 0.052 | 0.013 |

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; ${ }^{*} p<0.10,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$.

Table 18 Interaction with administrative staff

|  | Monetary return | Average positive gift | Overall response rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS | OLS | Probit marginal effects |
| 'Donation' | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1.256^{*} \\ & (0.704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.830^{*} \\ & (2.562) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.017 \\ (0.042) \end{gathered}$ |
| $€ 20$ suggestion | $\begin{gathered} 1.074 \\ (0.707) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.630 \\ (2.586) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.042) \end{gathered}$ |
| Administrative staff | $3.086^{* *}$ | $3.576$ | $0.137^{*}$ |
|  | (1.364) | (2.806) | (0.073) |
| Administrative | 0.787 | 0.047 | 0.062 |
|  | (2.015) | (6.048) | (0.084) |
| Administrative staff x € 20 suggestion | $-4.116^{*}$ | -7.735 | -0.099 |
|  | (2.110) | (5.825) | (0.083) |
| Constant | $\begin{aligned} & 1.160^{* *} \\ & (0.471) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.395^{* * *} \\ & (1.766) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Observations | 544 | 119 | 544 |
| $R^{2}$ | 0.024 | 0.049 |  |
| Pseudo $R^{2}$ |  |  | 0.018 |

## 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 $5^{\text {th }}$ of July, beginning at 4 pm . 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
>>>>>>>>>> Crowdfunding Campaign <<<<<<<<<<<<

## 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 $5^{\text {th }}$ 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 $€ \mathbf{2 0}$ or $€ 10+\mathbf{1}$ buffet contribution \{donation\}]:

- 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


## [from $€ 30$ or $€ \mathbf{2 0}+\mathbf{1}$ buffet contribution \{donation\}]:

- 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 $\mathbf{1 0 0} \boldsymbol{€}$ or $\mathbf{9 0} €+\mathbf{1}$ buffet contribution \{donation\}]:

- 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
- A copy of the book 'Fleisch und Farbe' (unique limited edition book, comprising only 100 individually numbered prints).

For every contribution \{donation\} made before 22.06.2016, an anonymous sponsor will make a bonus contribution \{donation\} of $€ \mathbf{5}$ 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 $\mathbf{2 0} €<\mathbf{1 0 €}>$,
we need $\mathbf{1 0 0}<\mathbf{2 0 0}>$ 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 $9 \mathrm{am}-12$ and $1 \mathrm{pm}-5 \mathrm{pm}$ ). (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 end of June, TODAY is the last day where every contribution \{donation\} that we get will be matched by an additional $\mathbf{5} €$ from an anonymous benefactor.

Until yesterday we collected inspiring $\mathbf{4 9 5 €}(+\mathbf{1 8 5}$ € Boni) + $\mathbf{1 6}$ 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!

To clarify all open questions, let us explain the purpose and working of this campaign once more: 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)
All best
The (name of the institute) Party Team
******************************************************************************

## 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, $5^{\text {th }}$ 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 $\mathbf{2 0} \boldsymbol{€}<\mathbf{1 0 €}>$, we need $\mathbf{1 0 0 < 2 0 0 >}$ 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. $\quad$| Barbeque (including veggie and vegan options), drinks, and potluck |
| :--- |
| buffet |

From 4:00 p.m. (name of the institute) Kinderfest fun activities for children.
4:00-5:30 p.m. Tasting experiment (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. Tournaments (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 (name) (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.

Based on
YLimesurvey

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.

## Part 1 - Project

Task
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 50 c , 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 20 c :

- a bronze contributor recognition award.

If you contribute at least 40 c :

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

If you contribute at least 80 c :

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

If you contribute at least $1.6 \$$ :

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


## Please choose your contribution (centwise):

Your contribution

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.

Award


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).

Part 1 - Project
Think about how you felt when you made your donation. Below you will find a list of 20 different emotions. Please tell us how strongly you experienced each of those
emotions when you made your decision.

Sadness

> not at all
very strongly

Relief

Next, participants were asked what they thought regarding the level of donations/contributions by other participants in their group, on average.
Part 1 - Project $\quad$ Exit and clear survey

Other's donation on average
$\qquad$

Based on
CimeSurvey

Next, participants answered four demographic questions.

$\square$
© This question is mandatory
Less than a High School Degree
High School Diploma
Vocational Training
Attended College
Bachelor's Degree
Graduate Degree
Unknown

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
Over \$100,000

Final page:


Please copy the survey code below to paste it into the box in MTurk to receive credit for taking our survey.
Your Code: 4057685


[^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.

[^1]:    Note: All variables above are dummy variables; there are overlaps between the different categories. Std. err.: standard errors.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ We did not control for block fixed effects here because this would only be feasible in Column I.
    ${ }^{2}$ 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.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ 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 fulltime (typically 66-75\%) contracts.

