

Electronic Companion—“Earmarking donations to charity: Cross-cultural evidence on its appeal to donors across 25 countries” by Christoph Fuchs, Martijn G. de Jong, and Martin Schreier, Management Science

Online Appendix A

Table A-1. Robustness Checks: Descriptive Statistics of the Country-level Variables

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
<i>Gini index</i>	38.40	8.74	24.90	62.50
<i>log(GDP/capita)</i>	10.19	0.66	8.79	11.40
<i>Trade freedom</i>	83.11	6.57	69.40	90.00
<i>Labor force participation</i>	60.54	5.55	49.00	69.00

Table A-2a. Robustness Checks: Socioeconomic Variables (Study 1)

	<i>Donation decision</i> (stage 1)				<i>Donation amount</i> (stage 2)			
	Model 1a	Model 2a	Model 3a	Model 4a	Model 1b	Model 2b	Model 3b	Model 4b
Intercept	-0.551 (0.889)	-1.204 (1.637)	-0.258 (1.413)	-2.372* (1.451)	-0.038 (0.148)	0.033 (0.386)	-0.062 (0.277)	-0.024 (0.259)
<i>Autonomy-Embeddedness</i>	-0.742*** (0.269)	-0.374 (0.275)	-0.387 (0.259)	-0.441* (0.262)	0.027 (0.046)	0.025 (0.042)	0.020 (0.038)	0.022 (0.037)
<i>Egalitarianism-Hierarchy</i>	-0.529* (0.265)	-0.562* (0.309)	-0.550* (0.286)	-0.553** (0.285)	-0.029 (0.040)	-0.028 (0.041)	-0.029 (0.040)	-0.029 (0.040)
<i>Harmony-Mastery</i>	0.954** (0.384)	1.073** (0.434)	1.099*** (0.403)	1.122** (0.430)	0.012 (0.067)	0.007 (0.068)	0.009 (0.066)	0.010 (0.070)
<i>Gini index</i>	-0.037** (0.016)				0.001 (0.003)			
<i>log(GDP/capita)</i>		-0.074 (0.165)				-0.005 (0.039)		
<i>Trade freedom</i>			-0.021 (0.016)				0.001 (0.003)	
<i>Labor force participation</i>				0.007 (0.021)				0.000 (0.004)
<i>Earmarking (experimental treatment)</i>	0.579*** (0.114)	0.580*** (0.115)	0.575*** (0.119)	0.570*** (0.116)	0.033 (0.021)	0.033 (0.021)	0.033 (0.021)	0.033 (0.021)
<i>Earmarking</i> × <i>Autonomy-Embeddedness</i>	0.265* (0.140)	0.257* (0.138)	0.261* (0.140)	0.267* (0.138)	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.003 (0.027)
Level-one variance					0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)
Level-two variance intercept	0.226*** (0.098)	0.286*** (0.118)	0.271*** (0.112)	0.284*** (0.116)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)
Level-two variance <i>Earmarking</i>	0.055*** (0.041)	0.055*** (0.039)	0.055*** (0.041)	0.056*** (0.042)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)
Level-two covariance	-0.006 (0.055)	-0.014 (0.064)	-0.015 (0.064)	-0.020 (0.064)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)

Notes: $N = 7,118$ participants for stage 1; $N = 5,938$ for stage 2; reported values are posterior mean estimates (with posterior standard deviations in parentheses). Models 1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a are based on a multilevel logit model for which the dependent variable is *Donation decision*; Models 1b, 2b, 3b, and 4b are based on a multilevel regression model for which the dependent variable is *Donation amount* conditional on *Donation decision*. The models in Tables A-2a and A-2b also contain the same individual-level controls as in our main models in Table 4 (these values of these variables are suppressed because of expository reasons). * 90% credible interval (CI) does not include zero; ** 95% CI does not include zero; *** 99% CI does not include zero.

Table A-2b. Robustness Checks: Socioeconomic Variables (Study 1)

	<i>Donation decision (stage 1)</i>				<i>Donation amount (stage 2)</i>			
	Model 5a	Model 6a	Model 7a	Model 8a	Model 5b	Model 6b	Model 7b	Model 8b
Intercept	-0.302 (0.866)	-1.191 (2.277)	-0.095 (1.544)	-2.410* (1.394)	-0.039 (0.149)	0.032 (0.387)	-0.062 (0.278)	-0.025 (0.260)
<i>Autonomy-Embeddedness</i>	-0.662** (0.254)	-0.310 (0.256)	-0.302 (0.232)	-0.351 (0.239)	0.026 (0.045)	0.024 (0.042)	0.020 (0.037)	0.021 (0.037)
<i>Egalitarianism-Hierarchy</i>	-0.646*** (0.223)	-0.690** (0.266)	-0.668** (0.255)	-0.682*** (0.265)	-0.029 (0.041)	-0.027 (0.042)	-0.028 (0.041)	-0.029 (0.041)
<i>Harmony-Mastery</i>	0.954** (0.381)	1.062** (0.433)	1.084*** (0.405)	1.121** (0.438)	0.012 (0.067)	0.007 (0.068)	0.009 (0.066)	0.010 (0.070)
<i>Gini index</i>	-0.036** (0.017)				0.001 (0.003)			
<i>log(GDP/capita)</i>		-0.054 (0.236)				-0.005 (0.039)		
<i>Trade freedom</i>			-0.021 (0.018)				0.001 (0.003)	
<i>Labor force participation</i>				0.011 (0.021)				0.000 (0.004)
<i>Earmarking (experimental treatment)</i>	-0.224 (0.292)	-0.219 (0.297)	-0.185 (0.293)	-0.202 (0.300)	0.036 (0.056)	0.036 (0.056)	0.036 (0.056)	0.036 (0.056)
<i>Earmarking</i> × <i>Egalitarianism-Hierarchy</i>	0.398*** (0.120)	0.395*** (0.120)	0.381*** (0.119)	0.387*** (0.122)	-0.002 (0.024)	-0.002 (0.024)	-0.002 (0.024)	-0.002 (0.024)
Level-one variance					0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)	0.084*** (0.002)
Level-two variance intercept	0.223*** (0.090)	0.288*** (0.119)	0.273*** (0.113)	0.281*** (0.116)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)
Level-two variance <i>Earmarking</i>	0.041*** (0.028)	0.042*** (0.029)	0.041*** (0.028)	0.042*** (0.030)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)
Level-two covariance	-0.003 (0.045)	-0.015 (0.055)	-0.014 (0.052)	-0.016 (0.053)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)

Notes: $N = 7,118$ participants for stage 1; $N = 5,938$ for stage 2; reported values are posterior mean estimates (with posterior standard deviations in parentheses). Models 5a, 6a, 7a, and 8a are based on a multilevel logit model for which the dependent variable is *Donation decision*; Models 5b, 6b, 7b, and 8b are based on a multilevel regression model for which the dependent variable is *Donation amount* conditional on *Donation decision*. * 90% credible interval (CI) does not include zero; ** 95% CI does not include zero; *** 99% CI does not include zero.

Table A-3. Relationship between Project Ratings and Cultural Values (Study 1)

	Projects				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Autonomy-Embeddedness	-0.011 (0.183)	0.009 (0.140)	0.140 (0.102)	0.072 (0.075)	0.027 (0.097)
Egalitarianism-Hierarchy	0.101 (0.170)	0.196 (0.131)	-0.066 (0.094)	0.053 (0.070)	-0.026 (0.090)
Harmony-Mastery	0.115 (0.278)	-0.010 (0.215)	0.091 (0.154)	0.043 (0.114)	0.015 (0.147)

Notes. $N = 7,118$ participants; reported values are posterior mean estimates (with posterior standard deviations in parentheses). Projects #1 through #5 refer to the number of the Red Cross project described in the main study. Equations are based on a multivariate multilevel model (the dependent variables are the Project liking scores). Results for individual-level control variables (*Age, Gender, Education, Socioeconomic status, Average annual donation, Attitude Red Cross, Familiarity Red Cross, Personal Project Relevance*) and the country-level control variable (*Human Development Index*) are suppressed from the table. * 90% credible interval (CI) does not include zero; ** 95% CI does not include zero; *** 99% CI does not include zero.

Table A-4.
 Relationship between *Decision* not to use the *Earmarking Option* and Cultural Variables (Study 1)

	Logit
<i>Autonomy-Embeddedness</i>	0.066 (0.264)
<i>Egalitarianism-Hierarchy</i>	0.314 (0.256)
<i>Harmony-Mastery</i>	-0.534 (0.415)

Notes: $N = 3,605$ participants (i.e., participants in the earmarking condition); reported values are posterior mean estimates (with posterior standard deviations in parentheses). Multilevel logit model for which the dependent variable is *Decision* not to use the *earmarking option* (1 = participant does not select (earmark) project, 0 = participants selects (earmarks) project). Results for individual-level control variables (*Average project ratings*, *SD project ratings*, *Age*, *Gender*, *Education*, *Socioeconomic status*, *Average annual donation*, *Attitude Red Cross*, *Familiarity Red Cross*, *Personal Project Relevance*) and the country-level control variable (*Human Development Index*) are suppressed from the table * 90% credible interval (CI) does not include zero; ** 95% CI does not include zero; *** 99% CI does not include