## 2b. Barriers: Presenting analytical/impact information switches off system 1;

Charity effectiveness (info/deliberation) -, Donor's mood (Impacting) - Affect prime -, Evaluation mode -

(Karlan & W, '07), (Kogut & R, '05) (Small ea, '07), (Drouvelis & G, '16), (Caviola ea, '14)

We next survey the empirical work related to whether (and when and how) presenting information on a charity's impact (amount of good done per dollar spent) will have a positive effect on amounts raised, and donation propensity. The evidence (from the Economics/Behavioral Economics literature) is largely mixed and indeterminate. There has been only a single strong field trial (Karlan) in a particular context, which itself reported mixed (null overall, positive for some subgroups, negative for others), and some underpowered results. Laboratory experiments (with real donations) by Small et al find that giving to an identifiable victim is reduced when statistics [about what? Not ‘effectiveness’] are also presented and “priming analytic thinking reduced donations to an identifiable victim relative to a feeling-based thinking prime.” [Supported Erlandsson ea ‘16 for the identified victim but not for a group]. Further evidence from lab experiments is mixed and limited, with some studies (Fong and O) apparently finding that exogenous information about recipients [?deservingness] increases donations (although they do not report this), and another underpowered study (Metzger and G). There is some evidence from observational studies that “charity ratings” boost giving, at least for smaller charities (Yoruk), but these ratings do not measure impact [and it is not the presence/absence of such information but its valence; also consider the 2-dimensions of rating]. Further review should explore the psychology (see., e.g., Verkaik), marketing, and nonprofit management literatures. There is some speculation, but again, mixed evidence, that individuals already in a “system 2” (deliberative) frame are more likely to be positively affected by impact information.

"Potential responses; separating ""commitment amount ask"" from ""use of funds"" ask (Bergh?); conditional commitments to avoid potential for motivated reasoning (Exley suggestion)  
  
*Notes:* (is this where Warm Glow fits?)

There is also a distinction to be further explored between “output information” (how the donation is used) and “impact information”; the former is seen to increase generosity in several studies.