

Penn Med Field Experiment (N=402,931)

January 19, 2025

Items

Open Rates	2
Summary Table	2
Open Rates for Email 1 and Combined Emails	2
Click Rates (DV1)	3
Summary	3
Primary Analyses (DV1): Click-Through Rates (Email 1 + Combined Emails)	3
Donation Incidence (DV2)	4
Summary	4
Primary Analyses (DV2): Donation Incidence (Email 1 + Combined Emails)	4
Donation Amount (DV3)	5
Summary	5
Primary Analyses (DV3): Donation Amount (Email 1 + Combined Emails)	5

Open Rates

Summary Table

Table 1: Counts and Percentages of Email Opens by Condition

email	Control	Prosocial Excuse	Explicit	Total
Email 1	66140 (16.41%)	66206 (16.43%)	65714 (16.31%)	198060 (49.15%)
Email 2	8687 (2.16%)	8744 (2.17%)	8620 (2.14%)	26051 (6.47%)
Email 3	4142 (1.03%)	3957 (0.98%)	3782 (0.94%)	11881 (2.95%)

Open Rates for Email 1 and Combined Emails

Table 2: OLS Model Results for Email 1 Open Rates

	Dependent Variable:	
	Open (Email 1 Period)	Open (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Explicit Condition	0.001	-0.002
Prosocial Excuse	-0.005***	-0.007***
Constant	0.493***	0.589***
Observations	402,931	402,931
R ²	0.00003	0.00004
<i>Note:</i> +p<0.1; *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001		

- Open rates are significantly different across conditions for Email 1 and combined emails. So we will analyze all participants, as pre-registered.

Click Rates (DV1)

Summary

Table 3: Counts and Percentages of Email Clicks by Condition

Email Touch	Control	Prosocial Excuse	Explicit	Total
Email 1	182 (0.05%)	176 (0.04%)	164 (0.04%)	346 (0.09%)
Email 2	104 (0.03%)	75 (0.02%)	88 (0.02%)	192 (0.05%)
Email 3	67 (0.02%)	60 (0.01%)	70 (0.02%)	137 (0.03%)

Primary Analyses (DV1): Click-Through Rates (Email 1 + Combined Emails)

Table 4: OLS Model Results for Click-Through Rates

	Dependent Variable:	
	Clicked (Email 1 Period	Clicked (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Prosocial Excuse	−0.0001 (0.0001)	−0.0002 (0.0002)
Explicit	−0.00005 (0.0001)	−0.0003*** (0.0002)
Constant	0.001+ (0.0001)	0.003+ (0.0001)
Observations	402,931	402,931
R ²	0.00000	0.00001
<i>Note:</i>	+ p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001	

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Model 1: $F(1, 402928) = 0.225$, $p = 0.635$

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Model 2: $F(1, 402928) = 0.165$, $p = 0.685$

Donation Incidence (DV2)

Summary

Table 5: Counts and Percentages of Donations by Condition and Email Period

Email.Period	Control	Prosocial.Excuse	Explicit	Total
Email 1 Period	3 (0.00074%)	5 (0.00124%)	2 (0.0005%)	10 (0.00248%)
Email 2 Period	10 (0.00248%)	7 (0.00174%)	6 (0.00149%)	23 (0.00571%)
Email 3 Period	7 (0.00174%)	11 (0.00273%)	6 (0.00149%)	24 (0.00596%)
Total Campaign	20 (0.00496%)	23 (0.00571%)	14 (0.00347%)	57 (0.01415%)

Primary Analyses (DV2): Donation Incidence (Email 1 + Combined Emails)

Table 6: OLS Model Results for Donation Incidence

	Dependent Variable:	
	Donated (Email 1 Period)	Donated (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Prosocial Excuse	-0.00001 (0.00002)	-0.00004 (0.00004)
Explicit	0.00001 (0.00002)	0.00002 (0.00005)
Constant	0.00002*** (0.00001)	0.0001+ (0.00003)
Observations	402,931	402,931
R ²	0.00000	0.00001
<i>Note:</i> + p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001		

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Model 1 (Email 1 Period): $F(1, 402928) = 1.238$, $p = 0.266$

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Model 2 (Full Campaign): $F(1, 402928) = 2.025$, $p = 0.155$

Donation Amount (DV3)

Summary

Table 7: Total Donation Amounts by Condition and Email Period
(Number of Donors)

Email.Period	Control	Prosocial.Excuse	Explicit
Email 1 Period	\$225 (n=3)	\$600 (n=5)	\$150 (n=2)
Full Campaign	\$1,930 (n=20)	\$2,560 (n=23)	\$1,045 (n=14)

Primary Analyses (DV3): Donation Amount (Email 1 + Combined Emails)

Table 8: OLS Model Results for Donation Amount (Raw)

	Dependent Variable:	
	Amount (Email 1 Period)	Amount (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Prosocial Excuse	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.007 (0.004)
Explicit	0.003 (0.002)	0.004 (0.006)
Constant	0.002*** (0.001)	0.014+ (0.004)
Observations	402,931	402,931
R ²	0.00001	0.00001

Note: + p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Raw Amount Model 1 (Email 1 Period): F(1, 402928) = 1.872, p = 0.171

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Raw Amount Model 2 (Full Campaign): F(1, 402928) = 4.631, p = 0.0314

Table 9: OLS Model Results for Donation Amount (Log-Transformed)

	Dependent Variable:	
	Log Amount (Email 1 Period)	Log Amount (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Prosocial Excuse	-0.00003 (0.0001)	-0.0002 (0.0002)
Explicit	0.0001 (0.0001)	0.0001 (0.0002)
Constant	0.0001*** (0.0001)	0.001+ (0.0001)
Observations	402,931	402,931
R ²	0.00000	0.00001
<i>Note:</i> + p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001		

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Log-Transformed Model 1 (Email 1 Period): $F(1, 402928) = 1.451$, $p = 0.228$

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for Log-Transformed Model 2 (Full Campaign): $F(1, 402928) = 2.583$, $p = 0.108$

Table 10: OLS Model Results for Donation Amount (Outliers Removed)

	Dependent Variable:	
	Amount (Email 1 Period)	Amount (Full Campaign)
	(1)	(2)
Prosocial Excuse	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.003)
Explicit	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.004)
Constant	0.002*** (0.001)	0.011 ⁺ (0.003)
Observations	402,930	402,925
R ²	0.00000	0.00000

Note: + p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for No-Outliers Model 1 (Email 1 Period): F(1, 402927) = 0.877, p = 0.349

Wald Test whether Prosocial Excuse == Explicit for No-Outliers Model 2 (Full Campaign): F(1, 402922) = 1.052, p = 0.305