

**Measuring the Environment for Philanthropy across Countries:
How Changing Political and Economic Landscapes Affect Charitable Giving**

Silvia Garcia (sigarcia@iupui.edu)

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, Office of Community Engagement,
Indianapolis, IN, U.S.

Una Osili (uosili@iupui.edu)

Xiaonan Kou (koux@iupui.edu, corresponding author)

Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, Indianapolis, IN, U.S.

Abstract

While a complex array of economic, political, regulatory, and socio-cultural factors shape the development of philanthropy, the factors that support and enhance philanthropy's growth are not well understood. Using data from the 2018 *Global Philanthropy Environment Index*, we explored how economic, political, and social factors operate to enable philanthropic activities. We examined the relationship between philanthropic environment for charitable giving and other contextual political, economic, and social factors. Results suggest that 1) formal giving is more likely to happen in countries with sounder tax incentives and favorable political and socio-cultural environments, while informal giving is exclusively connected to favorable socio-cultural conditions; 2) a country's regulatory quality is a good predictor of its philanthropic environment; and 3) political, economic, and social factors may interact to reinforce each other in shaping the philanthropic environment, but such reinforcing interactions were mostly found in countries with very high levels of human development.

Keywords: enabling environment, global philanthropy, charitable giving, comparative research, global indices.

Introduction

As philanthropy plays a visible role in supporting sustainable development, there is a growing interest in the conditions where philanthropy can thrive and the barriers that constrain philanthropic activities. Today, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), foundations, individuals, and corporations work collaboratively alongside official development assistance to provide risk capital for social innovation, embedding philanthropic efforts in the international development framework. The factors that can enable philanthropic actors, such as individuals and foundations, are determined in part by the policy environment in both sending and recipient economies. However, studies analyzing how countries provide conditions for the development of the philanthropic sector are scarce. Although global indices on enabling environments have been developed in other domains (e.g. the CIVICUS Civil Society Annual Reports, the Freedom in the World Index, and the World Bank Ease of Doing Business Index), cross-national studies of the conditions for philanthropy are still an emerging area of research. There are only a few recent regional studies, such as the Doing Good Index (Center for Asian Philanthropy and Society, 2018), and Philanthropy in the Arab Region (Hartnell, 2018), which analyze the environment for philanthropy in 15 Asian and 22 Arab countries, respectively. It is also worth mentioning the research published by the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law on civic freedoms affecting civil society organizations on 54 countries and 8 multilateral organizations; the research published by the Council on Foundations on the analysis of foreign civil society laws; and *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy* (Wiepking & Handy, 2015).

The spaces for philanthropy are defined by Breen (2018) as enabling environmental conditions for donors “who wish to use their private wealth for the public benefit in a manner that does not suffer unduly from political interference or legal obstruction” (p. 7). Obstructions here refer to the “legal, fiscal, or administrative obstacles (whether viewed as political or more simply “technical” problems) that prevent a free-flow of funds from donor to donee and its effective use thereafter by the recipient or which unduly restrict the creation and operation of philanthropic organisations” (Breen, 2018, p.8). These obstacles, together or in isolation, interfere with the free movement of philanthropy. Although Breen’s definition of philanthropic environment privileges political and legal conditions, numerous philanthropic studies around the world and the recently published *2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index* (Indiana University Lilly Family School

of Philanthropy, 2018) consider other factors of different nature that contribute to shape the environment for philanthropy. Individually or in combination, certain economic, political, fiscal, regulatory, social, and cultural factors operate to create the conditions for philanthropy. A useful tool for the development of policies that support the growth of philanthropy now and in the future is to understand how these factors interplay to improve or constrain the philanthropic environment.

Indices can be used both as benchmarks to measure changes over time and as comparative tools to measure how countries perform in relation to each other. Through such indices, we can identify current global problems and priority issues, establishing a baseline for performance comparisons and making informed decisions towards policy improvement (Marshall & Rowberry, 2013). Data from the recently released *Global Philanthropy Environment Index* (GPEI) are used in this study as an assessment of how the regulatory, political, and socio-cultural factors actually affect philanthropy in 79 economies in different stages of social and economic development. The index measures the existence of country policies and practices that can influence “...the capacity and propensity of individuals and organizations to freely engage in philanthropic activities in a sustained and effective manner” (Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018, p.8). The index not only focuses on policy choices made by government actors, but also considers the country’s historical, cultural, and socio-political practices, traditions, resources, and legacies that can potentially motivate individual philanthropic behaviors and further the development of philanthropy.

The GPEI differs from an earlier index, the *Index of Philanthropic Freedom* (IPF), developed by the Hudson Institute’s Center for Global Prosperity in 2015, in the range of indicators measured and the focus of the assessment. The IPF assesses the regulatory environment, by examining seven indicators that fall in three broad factors: Civil Society Organization Regulations, Domestic Tax Policy, and Cross Border Flows. The GPEI added two new sets of indicators that assess the political and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy. Additionally, while the IPF focuses on civil society organizations, the focus of the GPEI is philanthropic organizations, defined as “...organizations dedicated to philanthropic causes around the world” (Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018. p.68).

The addition of the two new set of indicators and an intentional focus on the philanthropic space situate the GPEI as a source that can be confidently used to better understand how contextual conditions influence the development of philanthropy in the world. Our prior research analyzed

the relationships between the 2015 IPF and a group of selected global indices measuring socio-political and socio-economic factors to understand how other factors that are not measured by the IPF interact with regulatory and fiscal conditions for philanthropy (Garcia, Osili, & Kou, 2017). That study found stronger correlations between the IPF and indices measuring socio-political factors than between the IPF and indices measuring socio-economic factors. The strongest correlations were found with indices measuring civil liberties and political rights.

Though informative, the use of highly aggregated indices in this previous study makes it difficult to draw more specific conclusions to inform policy. In the current paper, we use individual components of composite global indices and compare them with the GPEI scores. We examine economic, political, and social factors that are present in countries where the conditions for philanthropy were assessed in order to provide new insights on how these factors interplay to shape specific philanthropic environments, and offer new knowledge to better interpret cross-national comparisons. This study addresses two main research questions: 1) Are countries with a better philanthropic environment more likely to show better giving behaviors? And 2) how do political, economic, and social factors together improve or constrain the environment for philanthropy?

To address these questions, the study explores the correlations between the 2018 GPEI and other global indices published in 2017 and 2018 on charitable giving, political conditions, economic conditions, and social conditions. In the following section, we present the four hypotheses leading the study.

The rest of the paper is organized into four sections. First, we define the conceptual framework from which our four hypotheses were derived. Next, we describe methodology and indicators selected for the study. In the last two sections, we present results, and discuss findings, conclusions, and implications for future research.

Literature Review

Philanthropy is a sector that interacts with the social, political, and economic aspects of the society. The development of philanthropy shapes and is shaped by contextual conditions in many unpredictable ways. The complexity and variability of these interrelations cannot be interpreted in isolation, and require a deep understanding of the institutional context in which these interrelations are forged. For example, a longitudinal study of the nonprofit sector in South Korea found that the

nonprofit sector was influenced not only by the levels of interdependence between government and the sector, but also by economic and societal needs (S. Kim & Y. Kim, 2015). During 1961–92, military regimes in Korea suppressed civil rights, but promoted economic growth, social welfare, and poverty reduction, leading to the growth of nonprofit activities. However, the government-led social welfare policies reduced private donations to nonprofits, and “many nonprofits have been shaped to represent and support the preferences of a dominant government party” (p.249). Sokolowski (2013) suggests that the effects of government funding to nonprofits on aggregate private philanthropy are not always predictable, and the institutional settings in which charitable giving takes place must be considered. Indeed, the differences in how enabling conditions are created seem to fall into the intersection between how governments get involved in funding social welfare programs and the growing demands of civic organizations for public representation of the views and preferences of significant segments of the population, together with political participation (Sokolowski, 2010).

Charitable giving in enabling philanthropic environments

One major assumption driving the analysis of the environment for philanthropy is that there are certain contextual conditions that enable individuals and organizations to freely and voluntarily practice philanthropy and enable the philanthropic sector to thrive, and that these contextual conditions can be altered by changing government policies and practices. For example, in a comparative study examining the conditions that facilitate the growth of international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) in 126 countries, Lee (2010) found that democracy promoted the growth of INGOs because of the freedom of association and expression. This study also revealed that high income countries had more financial and material resources to facilitate the development of INGOs. In addition, he found that citizens in richer countries tended to participate more in activities of domestic and international NGOs.

Nevertheless, this relationship between the existence of favorable conditions for philanthropy and charitable giving has not been thoroughly studied since high-quality data on philanthropic environments at the global level have just recently started to emerge as a systematic field of study. Both the IPF (Hudson Institute, 2015, including 64 economies) and *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy* (Wiepking and Handy, 2015, including 25 countries and the Caribbean

region) are two pioneer comprehensive and comparative studies that preceded the publication of the new GPEI in 2018.

When tested in a previous study, the association between the 2015 IPF and the 2016 Gallup Civic Engagement scores was weak but significant (Garcia, Osili, & Kou, 2017). This small association may be attributed to the difference between the scope of the IPF (focusing on the regulatory and fiscal environments for philanthropy) and the types of giving behaviors measured in the Civic Engagement report (including both formal and informal pro-giving behaviors). In their global study, Wiepking and Handy (2015) concluded that, in addition to regulatory and legislative frameworks and fiscal incentives, other six contextual factors also affect individual decisions to freely and voluntarily practice philanthropy, including: 1) cultural values; 2) public trust in the belief that individual donations will facilitate the changes the public envisions in an environment of transparency, effectiveness, and accountability; 3) the state of the nonprofit sector; 4) political and economic stability or growth; 5) demographic changes (such as religiosity, age, wealth, and education); and 6) cross-border charitable giving and its effect on local nonprofit development.

In the current study, we consider a wider range of contextual factors. We measure separately the associations between the regulatory, fiscal, political, and socio-cultural components of the GPEI with formal and informal giving behaviors. Informal giving is defined in this study as giving outside of nonprofit organizations, or more specifically, “giving to friends, neighbors, and other individuals with whom people relate more informally than they do with the organizations to which they donate” (Çarkoğlu, Campbell, & Aytaç, 2017. p. 1). We posit that both formal and informal individual giving behaviors are positively and significantly related to the GPEI general score and its specific indicators.

Additionally, since charitable giving includes not only domestic giving but also cross-border giving, we measure how international resources flow into developing and emerging economies and how these flows relate to philanthropic conditions in recipient countries. Using measures of cross-border giving, we determine if the countries that receive more foreign funding are indeed the countries with more favorable conditions for philanthropy.

We hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: The quality of a country’s regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to charitable giving.

Charitable giving here is measured as individual pro-giving behavior (civic engagement) and philanthropic flows into developing and emerging economies.

Political conditions in enabling philanthropic environments

Numerous scholars have examined the interconnectedness between civil liberties and philanthropy, mainly because philanthropy requires that individuals, alone or in association with others, have the capacity to act freely (Anheier, 2014 & 2017; Cornuelle, 1965; Grosby, 2012; Thindaw, Monico, & Reuben, 2004). Freedom of association and peaceful assembly, freedom of expression and belief, freedom of information, and freedom to mobilize financial resources to fulfill philanthropic objectives (including freedom to receive funding and free movement of capital) are among the various forms of civil liberties discussed by these scholars. Additionally, Payton (1987) has pointed out how essential the notion of pluralism is to philanthropy. Pluralism is about representation in the power structures and must be understood as a political right that “...includes the decentralization of power within government as well as reserving the economic power of groups and individuals outside government and protecting the political power of individuals and groups against the state” (p.12). Pluralism requires acceptable levels of political independence and the existence of spaces for negotiation and public debate (Thindaw et al., 2004).

In countries with low democratic culture, civil and political freedoms are constantly challenged, putting in constant jeopardy the development of a strong, independent sector. However, the effects of highly restrictive political environments are unpredictable as they depend on a complex array of factors. Historically, in several developing economies, the nonprofit sector’s relationships with the government depended on government’s impulse to keep control of society; therefore, the frameworks that can be used to explain relations of cooperation with the government in developed countries do not always work in developing economies (Young, 2006). Power asymmetries and poor regulatory conditions may contribute to break the balance for the independent development of the nonprofit sector, even when growing demands for social welfare services require nonprofits to flourish to tackle social issues. In Latin America, “... cooptation has been an important way for authoritarian governments to preclude the emergence of an autonomous sector and potentially threatening rivals” (Appe & Layton, 2016, p.130). In some cases, restrictive regimes have created government-sponsored nongovernmental organizations to undermine democracy. However, unfavorable political conditions may also become breeding

ground for the emergence of informal and/or alternative philanthropic structures that sidestep government regulations (Marquis, Zhou, & Yang, 2015) or in the best of cases lead to the growth of new relationships and forms of collaborations with public and private entities to build sustainability (Appe & Barragan, 2017).

It has also been found that together with a climate of political freedom, stable and predictable regulations are important drivers of philanthropy. Regulations (or lack of regulations), breach of contracts, and failures of implementation have been found in prior studies to be connected with philanthropic developments. The multinational study by Salamon and Toepler (2000) demonstrated associations between the enabling qualities of the legal environment for nonprofits and the extent of the development of the nonprofit sector. Research also shows that the regulatory and fiscal environments enabled by government policies and actions influence factors in philanthropic activities (Bakija, 2000 & 2013; C. Duquette, 1999; N. Duquette, 2014; Moore & Rutzen, 2011). In cases when regulations exist and are properly implemented, the complexity of the law can be a constraint. For example, the complexity of the tax system in Japan, China, and South Korea was found to discourage individual donors from contributing to philanthropic institutions (Wang, Graddy, & Morgan, 2011). This is a particularly persistent situation in Japan and Korea (Center for Asian Philanthropy and Society, 2018). Similarly, tax collection policies in South East Asia were found to be “poorly designed and difficult to enforce” (Anand & Hayling, 2014, p.11). In terms of breach of agreements, Breen (2018) detailed the case of the Hungary’s *Act LXXVI of 2017 on the Transparency of Organizations Receiving Support from Abroad*, which impedes the free flow of philanthropic funds into Hungary, threatening the space for philanthropy within the country. Israel (2016), China (2016), and Egypt (2017) also introduced foreign agents’ laws that hinder the operation of internationally funded organizations, as reported in the 2018 GPEI (Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018).

Nonetheless, properly implemented favorable regulations alone do not guarantee a better philanthropic environment; the relationship between the nonprofit sector and government and the way government organizes itself to regulate, monitor, and support the sector also affect how philanthropy operates and responds to external pressures and demands. These relationships are conditioned by meta-policies, or “... overarching philosophy—explicit or implicit—about the appropriate roles of the state and the nonprofit sector” (Phillips & Blumberg, 2017, p.330). Meta-policies may or may not arise from a base of mutual agreement, and can lead to an environment

that either encourages philanthropy or presents serious restrictions that are not always explicitly established by law. As Phillips and Blumberg (2017) pointed out, most meta-policies for the philanthropic sector are rarely explicit or arise from mutual agreement, and they do not affect uniformly the whole sector; instead, meta-policies target certain organizations or activities within the sector. For example, European economies with totalitarian regimes in the past suppressed segments of the philanthropic sector that were linked to labor interests, largely bypassing the work of organizations implementing governments' welfare policies (Sokolowski, 2010).

Because political and regulatory factors have a large influence on the development of philanthropy, we assume that economies with a higher level of political freedom and more favorable political conditions also have a more enabling philanthropic environment. Similarly, we assume that countries with poor political conditions also reflect poor philanthropic environments. Thus, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2: The quality of a country's regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to the quality of its internal political conditions.

Political conditions here are measured by a country's political stability, regulatory quality, respect for rule of law, civil liberties, and political rights.

Economic conditions in enabling philanthropic environments

The economic climate within a country drives investment decisions and influences wealth and income creation. This economic climate is defined in part by how government decides to intervene the economy, altering the conditions for the development of an economically free and independent society. Both economic freedom and economic climate are concepts related to philanthropy as they may influence private social investment decisions within and across countries.

Economic freedom is defined as the degree to which an economy "...entails the possibility of entering into voluntary contracts within the framework of a stable and predictable rule of law that upholds contracts and protects private property, with a limited degree of interventionism in the form of government ownership, regulations, and taxes" (Berggren, 2003, p.194). Pritchard (2017) believes that "...an increase of the level of economic freedom will free up resources for the private sector, and will, in fact, result in greater levels of charitable giving" (p. 2). The truth is that economic freedom, government intervention, and regulatory stability interplay to create better conditions for an economy to prosper. In fact, legal structure, private ownership, and freedom to

use alternate currency were found to be the three main variables in the economic freedom index that have positive and robust relations with GDP growth (Carlsson & Lundström, 2002). Among others, freedom from corruption, government size, trade freedom, and property rights were similarly found to be important determinants of growth in OECD countries (Cebula, Clark, & Mixon, 2013).

Economic freedom also affects the direction and intensity of outward foreign direct investment benefiting countries with economic climate conducive to foreign investments (Anwar & Mughal, 2012; Kimura, 2008; Sonora, 2008), and affects the levels of human capital investment (Feldmann, 2017). Using data from 1972 to 2011 on 109 countries, Feldmann (2017) found that economic freedom was likely to affect human capital investment because countries with high levels of economic freedom: 1) included secure property rights and a low level of taxation and monetary stability, protecting economic agents; 2) provided rule of law, light regulatory burden, and low tariff barriers to international trade, enhancing the gains from economic exchange; and 3) facilitated the operation of credit markets. Studies from different regions of the world have also found that economic freedom in the host country is a positive determinant of foreign investment inflows (Ajide & Eregba, 2014; Azman-Saini, Baharumshah, & Law, 2010; Bengoa & Sanchez-Robles, 2003; Caetano & Caleiro, 2009; Kobeissi, 2005; Imtiaz & Bashir, 2017). However, there are other factors that affect foreign investments in host countries, such as labor market regulations (Subasat & Bellos, 2011), rule of law and trade freedom (Tag, Degirmen, & Saltik, 2016), governance and the legal system (Kobeissi, 2005), and levels of transparency (Caetano & Caleiro, 2009). These findings show the interplay of political and economic factors in determining the growth of foreign investments, and lay the groundwork for developing plausible explanations on how economic freedom can improve the environment for philanthropy, specifically in terms of cross-border flows.

Although Pritchard (2017) found a positive and significant relationship between economic freedom and charitable contributions in the United States, evidence directly connecting economic freedom and philanthropy is very scarce. However, it is important to mention that there is evidence suggesting the influence of economic freedom on economic growth (e.g. Carlsson, & Lundstrom, 2002; Gwartney, Lawson, & Holcombe, 1999; Nalley & Barkley, 2005), since several scholars have pointed out that there is a relationship between wealth and philanthropy. According to Havens and Schervish (2014), the growth of both GDP and household wealth promotes higher income and

increases in charitable donations, allowing households more choices in the amount and scope of charities to which they donate. Frumkin (1995) expressed that the accumulation of personal wealth led to increased charity and assistance to those in need. In several studies since 1999, the Center on Wealth and Philanthropy at Boston College has estimated intergenerational wealth transfers and the growth of household charitable giving in next generations, based on the assumption that resources available for charitable giving grow larger as wealth transfer grows.

This connection between economic freedom, economic growth, and charitable giving suggests that advantageous economic conditions contribute to favorable philanthropic environments. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3: The quality of a country's regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to the quality of its economic conditions.

Economic conditions here are measured by the levels of economic freedom, economic quality, and economic growth.

Strengths of associations in countries with varying levels of human development

Human development is often considered as a more comprehensive measure of development and the ultimate goal of the development process (Ranis, Stewart, & Ramirez, 2000). Human development, as explained by Sen (2000), goes beyond the solitary and traditional concept of economic progress, bringing a pluralistic conception to the exercise of development evaluation. In our earlier research, we analyzed the associations between the 2015 IPF and several selected political, economic, and giving variables across countries by level of human development measured in the Human Development Index (HDI) (Garcia, Osili, & Kou, 2017). The HDI focuses on three basic dimensions of human development: the ability to lead a long and healthy life, measured by life expectancy at birth; the ability to acquire knowledge, measured by mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling; and the ability to achieve a decent standard of living, measured by gross national income per capita (United Nations Development Programme, 2018). We found that countries with very high HDI showed stronger associations with the IPF scores, and these countries also had highly positive political and economic conditions. These results offer new evidence that social factors also provide building blocks to the construction of enabling conditions for philanthropy (Wiepking & Handy, 2015).

Political, economic, and social factors interact in different ways to create the conditions for philanthropy. Research has found that economic freedom can substantially help build social trust, which is considered an important driver of giving (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Wang & Graddy, 2008). The multinational study by Berggren and Jordahl (2006) concluded that the legal structure and security of property rights seem to have a significant effect on the general trust that people have in the political system and other people, as well as “...on the expectation that they will be trustworthy and that those who are not can oftentimes be detected” (p. 161). Similarly, U.S. studies suggest that there is an indirect effect of economic freedom on shaping the socio-cultural environment for philanthropy, which in turn may affect charitable giving (Jackson, Carden, & Compton, 2015; Kyaw Min Maw, 2015).

If we assume that the philanthropic environment is shaped by a positive interplay of political, economic, and social factors, we expect stronger associations between indicators of these factors and the GPEI in countries with higher levels of human development. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 4: Countries at a higher stage of human development show stronger relationships between philanthropic environment and political, economic, and giving indicators.

Methodology and Data

The study includes 79 countries and economies from all regions of the world. We conducted pairwise correlations to measure how the regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environment scores in the 2018 GPEI relate to political, economic, and social indicators measured by other established global indices. Partial correlations controlling for GDP per capita were conducted in order to determine if the associations between the GPEI and other indices was affected by the country’s economic level.

We used data from the 2018 GPEI as measures for philanthropic environment. Additionally, we included eight global indices in the analysis, which include four indicators of giving, four political indicators, three economic indicators, and one composite indicator on human development.

Philanthropic environment:

- Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI) captures experts' assessments of: 1) regulations on philanthropic organization formation, operation, and dissolution; 2) laws and regulations governing fiscal incentives and disincentives of giving and receiving donations domestically; 3) laws and regulations governing incentives and disincentives of giving and receiving donations across borders; 4) political and governance environment (government support, spaces for dialogue, independence from public pressures, and public policies and practices towards philanthropy); and 5) socio-cultural environment (philanthropic culture, values and beliefs, perception of philanthropy, and social and human capital).

Giving:

- Charities Aid Foundation's World Giving Index measures people's inclination to help a stranger, donate money to charity, and volunteer time to an organization. Each indicator was considered separately.
- Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy's Million Dollar List (MDL) tracks charitable gifts of \$1 million or more donated by U.S. donors (individuals, corporations, private foundations, and other grant making nonprofits) to domestic or international entities from 2000. Only charitable gifts donated to developing and emerging economies made in 2015 and 2016 were included in the analysis.

Civil liberties and political rights:

- Freedom House's Freedom in the World Index captures experts' assessment of levels of civil liberties and political rights. While civil liberties include freedoms of expression, assembly, association, education, religion, and individual rights, political rights assessment refers to pluralism, political participation, and functioning of government.

Regulatory quality and political climate:

- World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators:

- Regulatory quality captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.
- Rule of law captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.
- Political stability and absence of violence/terrorism measures perceptions of the likelihood of political instability and/or politically motivated violence, including terrorism.

Economic freedom:

- Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom measures rule of law (property rights, judicial effectiveness, and government integrity), government size (tax burden, government spending, and fiscal health), regulatory efficiency (business freedom, labor freedom, and monetary freedom), and open markets (trade freedom, investment freedom, and financial freedom).
- World Bank's Ease of Doing Business measures regulatory environment to start and operate a local firm and trade across borders.

Economic quality:

- Legatum Institute's Prosperity Index-Economic Quality captures standard of living, economic inclusiveness, anti-monopoly policy, labor force participation, trade competitiveness, and openness to trade.

Economic growth:

- Per Capita GDP.

Human development:

- United Nations Development Programme: Human Development Index (HDI) measures social and economic development, and ranks countries based on mean years of

schooling, expected years of schooling, life expectancy at birth, and gross national income per capita based on purchasing power parity to reflect average income and people's living standards.

The 2017 HDI is used in the analysis to categorize 77 of the 79 economies¹ into three groups with different human development levels in order to analyze bivariate correlations within each group (Table 4). Using the HDI ranking categories, we created three groups of economies: 1) very high human development economies (HDI score 0.8 or above, including 41 economies), 2) high human development economies (HDI score between 0.700 and 0.799, including 19 economies), and 3) medium to low human development economies (HDI score 0.699 and lower, with 17 economies). Indicators including GDP per capita in the calculation were excluded from our analysis. Using the HDI allows us to test these relationships within each group of countries with similar HDI levels and opens the door to analyze the role of social variables in understanding these relationships.

Empirical Results

Relationship between the enabling philanthropic environment and charitable giving

Table 1 shows a significant, but weak, association between the GPEI and the World Giving Index scores. Results confirm that individual giving is significantly associated with the quality of the environment for philanthropy, specifically tax incentives, political environment, and socio-cultural environment. Two indicators that did not show significant associations (ease of operation and cross-border flows) are connected to organizational functioning. Table 1 also shows that while the strength of the association is weak with the overall score ($r=.323$, $p < .01$), this relationship is stronger with the socio-cultural indicator ($r=.419$, $p < .01$), suggesting that charitable giving is closely connected to philanthropic values and beliefs.

The disaggregation of the World Giving Index in three components of formal and informal giving shows significant associations of the GPEI with formal giving (i.e. donating money, $r=.408$, $p < .01$), but insignificant associations with informal pro-giving behavior (i.e. helping a stranger). Specifically, donating money is statistically significantly associated with all five indicators of GPEI (mostly with $p < .01$). Volunteering has a statistically significant correlation with three

¹ Kosovo and Taiwan are not included in the HDI.

indicators—tax incentives, political environment, and socio-cultural environment (all with $p < .05$). Informal giving is significantly associated with the socio-cultural environment indicator only, implying that this type of giving is more likely to occur in environments where the socio-cultural environment is favorable.

Table 1. Correlations between 2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI) scores and charitable giving

Index Measuring Charitable Giving	Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI)					
	Overall Score	Ease of Operating	Tax Incentives	Cross-Border Flows	Political Environment	Socio-cultural Environment
World Giving Index (WGI, 2017)	.323**	0.189	.320**	0.129	.263*	.419**
WGI-Helped a Stranger	.065	-.061	.156	-.016	-.031	.263*
WGI-Volunteered	.225*	.112	.274*	.002	.235*	.333*
WGI-Donated Money	.408*	.307**	.322**	.231*	.358**	.415**
Million Dollar List^a	0.288	0.372	-0.049	-0.035	0.465	0.26

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

^a N=13

We further measured the association between World Giving indicators of formal and informal giving and GPEI controlling for GDP per capita. Coefficients were negative and not statistically significant, ranging from -.012 (donating money) to -.114 (helping a stranger). The correlation of informal giving was also non-significant, suggesting that this relationship is largely explained by levels of economic growth.

In order to measure outflows to developing and emerging economies, we used data from the Million Dollar List (MDL) on the amounts donated by U.S. donors in 2015 and 2016. The OECD Data Survey on private philanthropy for development revealed that foundations provided U.S.

\$23.9 billion for development over 2013-15 (OECD, 2018). The survey also showed that the main source of giving was the United States, largely due to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, with over U.S. \$11.6 billion of giving in this period. The OECD report found that foundations based in emerging countries mainly operated domestically. Based on this information, we used data from the MDL as a proxy measure of cross-border giving. For the analysis, we extracted a list of 13 recipient emerging and developing economies. The correlation of GPEI scores with the dollar amounts given by U.S. private donors to emerging and developing economies in 2015 and 2016 is not statistically significant. It is very likely that the period considered in the MDL, together with the fact that only U.S. sources are included, influenced these results.

Relationship between the enabling philanthropic environment and political conditions

We examined the correlations between GPEI and indicators measuring civil liberties, political rights, rule of law, regulatory quality, and political stability. As shown in Table 2, we found strong and significant correlations between GPEI and World Bank's Regulatory Quality ($r=.816$, $p < .01$), Rule of Law ($r=.766$, $p < .01$) and Political Stability ($r=.540$, $p < .01$) indicators. Correlations were also strong with the Civil Liberties ($r=.719$, $p < .01$) and Political Rights ($r=.641$, $p < .01$) indicators.

Table 2. Correlation between 2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI) scores and selected political indicators

Index Measuring Political Conditions	Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI)					
	Overall Score	Ease of Operating	Tax Incentives	Cross-Border Flows	Political Environment	Socio-cultural Environment
Freedom House: Freedom in the World-Political Rights (2018)	.641**	.642**	.497**	.487**	.620**	.267*
Freedom House: Freedom in the World-Civil Liberties (2018)	.719**	.712**	.558**	.583**	.672**	.297**
World Bank WGI – Regulatory Quality (2017)	.816**	.716**	.650**	.685**	.705**	.491**

World Bank WGI -Rule of Law (2017)	.766**	.629**	.633**	.611**	.681**	.501**
World Bank WGI – Political Stability and No-Violence (2017)	.540**	.525**	.461**	.459**	.499**	0.176

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In general, the associations between global political indicators and most GPEI indicators are moderate to strong and highly significant. However, the correlations of the socio-cultural environment indicator with political stability and no-violence, political rights, and civil liberties were surprisingly weak.

The strength of the relationships between GPEI and political indicators while controlling for the effect of economic growth (as measured by per capita GDP) remains significant for four of the indicators; moderate for indicators measuring civil liberties ($r=.405$, $p < .01$) and political rights ($r=.466$, $p < .01$), and strong to moderate for indicators measuring regulatory quality ($r=.632$, $p < .01$) and rule of law ($r=.507$, $p < .01$). However, the relationship with the political stability indicator was non-significant implying the mediating effect of the GDP per capita in this relationship.

Relationship between the enabling philanthropic environment and economic conditions

Table 3 shows strong correlations between GPEI indicators and global economic indicators, and even stronger with economic freedom ($r=.655$, $p < .01$). We conducted additional analysis with the individual indicators included in the Index of Economic Freedom to determine which aspects of economic freedom were associated to philanthropic environmental conditions. The analysis yielded strong correlations with indicators measuring property rights—freedom to accumulate private property ($r=.743$, $p < .01$), investment freedom—freedom to move resources internally and across borders ($r=.706$, $p < .01$), and government integrity—absence of systemic corruption ($r=.676$, $p < .01$).

Table 3. Correlation between 2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI) scores and selected economic indicators

	Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI)
--	---

Index Measuring Economic Conditions	Overall Score	Ease of Operating	Tax Incentives	Cross-Border Flows	Political Environment	Socio-cultural Environment
Heritage Foundation: Index of Economic Freedom (2018)	.655**	.599**	.485**	.564**	.567**	.381**
World Bank Ease of Doing Business (2018)	-.624**	-.612**	-.497**	-.550**	-.544**	-.253*
Legatum Institute: Prosperity Index-Economic Quality (2017)	.492**	.315**	.531**	.474**	.382**	.248*
GDP Per Capita (2017)	.626**	.420**	.584**	.512**	.500**	.522**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

World Bank's Ease of Doing Business measures the barriers to start-up and operate a private firm. Countries with higher rankings present fewer barriers and a more conducive regulatory environment for private businesses. The correlation of the GPEI with this index is strong ($r = -.624$, $p < .01$) and, as expected, the strongest correlation was found with the GPEI Ease of Operating indicator ($r = -.612$, $p < .01$).

The Economic Quality indicator (Legatum Institute) measures openness of countries' economies and foundations for growth. We found significant but weak to moderate correlations with all indicators of the GPEI. We also found significant correlations with economic growth (per capita GDP) in all GPEI indicators.

Partial correlations controlling for per capita GDP yielded significant correlations of the GPEI with economic freedom ($r = .437$, $p < .01$) and ease of doing business ($r = -.355$, $p < .01$), but non-significant correlation with economic quality ($r = .035$), showing the mediating effect of GDP in the relationship between Economic Quality and GPEI.

Relationships within groups of countries with similar human development levels

The analysis of the correlation between HDI and GPEI for the 77 countries included in this study shows strong association ($r=-.647$, $p <.01$), suggesting that GPEI scores are in correspondence with social development indicators, similarly to political and economic indicators. Countries with high HDI tended to have highly enabling philanthropic environments. However, when countries are grouped by HDI levels, correlations with giving, political stability, ease of doing business, and economic quality indicators are significant only in very high human developed countries (see Table 4). Among countries with high and medium-low levels of human development, some of the non-significant correlations yielded negative coefficients, which is contrary to what was expected (except for ease of doing business). Relationships with indices measuring civil liberties, political rights, and economic freedom are significant in very high and medium-low HDI countries. More importantly, the relationship between regulatory quality and GPEI resulted strong and significant for all three groups of countries in different stages of human development, which means that regulatory quality is a good predictor of the quality of the philanthropic environment across stages of human development.

Table 4. Correlations between 2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index (GPEI) and other indicators by level of human development

Global Indices	Human Development Index (HDI)		
	Very High (N=41)	High (N=19)	Medium-Low (N=17)
INDICES MEASURING GIVING			
CAF World Giving (2017)	.520**	.026	-.060
World Giving Index-Helped a stranger	.183	-.049	.121
World Giving Index-Volunteered	.520**	-.172	.074
World Giving Index-Donated Money	.609**	.154	-.178
INDICES MEASURING POLITICAL CONDITIONS			
Freedom House: Freedom in the World-Political Rights (2018)	.578**	.300	.567*
Freedom House: Freedom in the World-Civil Liberties (2018)	.625**	.443	.622**
World Bank WGI –Regulatory Quality (2017)	.761**	.551*	.673**

World Bank WGI -Rule of Law (2017)	.704**	.436	.345
World Bank WGI – Political Stability and No-Violence (2017)	.421**	-.049	-.140
INDICES MEASURING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
Heritage Foundation: Index of Economic Freedom (2018)	.502**	.448	.594*
World Bank Ease of Doing Business (2018)	-.592**	-.422	-.066
Legatum Institute: Prosperity Index-Economic Quality (2017)	.395*	.028	-.096

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Discussion

Hypothesis 1: The quality of a country's regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to charitable giving.

To test the hypothesis, indicators of formal and informal giving from the World Giving Index were correlated with GPEI indicators. We found positive, moderate, and statistically significant associations between formal pro-giving behavior (donating money) and GPEI indicators. Formal pro-giving behavior is more likely to occur in countries with sounder tax incentives and favorable socio-cultural environments, confirming previous findings on the influence of social capital, trust, religion (Forbes & Zampelli, 2013; Wang & Graddy, 2008), and tax incentives (Bakija & Heim, 2011) on charitable giving.

Another important finding is the weak associations between informal giving (helping a stranger) and GPEI indicators, with the only exception of the socio-cultural environment indicator. The socio-cultural environment as defined in the GPEI captures cultural philanthropic traditions, values, public trust, and awareness of the importance of philanthropy. This finding confirms that informal giving is closely related to people's values and beliefs, and that informal giving may occur in environments with unfavorable political, regulatory, and fiscal conditions. Consistently, in the 2018 GPEI report, the socio-cultural environment was assessed as positive even in countries with challenging political conditions. The socio-cultural environment was the indicator with less score variability across countries, with most countries scoring at the higher end of the 1-5 scale used for assessment, with a global average of 3.80 (Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018).

To determine how private cross-border giving to recipient emerging and developing economies related to the recipient country's philanthropic environment, we used data from the Million Dollar List, a public database of charitable donations made by U.S. donors at the million dollar level or above. We found no significant correlations, which suggest that cross-border philanthropy at this level may depend on other facilitating factors in the recipient countries not measured by the GPEI, such as levels of transparency (Caetano & Caleiro, 2009) or political stability (Wiepking and Handy, 2015). In fact, according to OECD (2018), philanthropists favor "...investing in stable, middle-income economies and through large, established partners, such as international organisations and NGOs" (p.16). This report shows that between 2013 and 2015 "...67% of country-allocable giving was directed to middle income countries, of which 37% went to lower middle-income countries (LMICs) and 30% to upper middle-income countries (UMICs). Only a third of country allocable funding targeted the least developed countries (28%) and other low-income countries (LICs) (5%)." (p. 44). Top ten beneficiary countries of cross-border philanthropy in 2013-2015 were India, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil, Ethiopia, China, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and Indonesia. The report notes high concentration of giving in middle income countries and some geographical regions like Africa leading to overlap of efforts between philanthropic and Official Development Assistance (ODA)-supported initiatives, and questions whether philanthropy is really maximizing its comparative advantage as a "gap filler" and innovator outside of mainstream programs. Even though our results are supported by the data reported by OECD, we reiterate the limitations in the MDL data used for this analysis and recommend more studies in this area with more current data.

Hypothesis 2: The quality of a country's regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to the quality of its internal political conditions.

In most cases, we found positive, strong, and significant correlations between the GPEI scores and indicators of political conditions, even when controlling for GDP per capita, showing that countries with favorable philanthropic environments are in general countries where citizens can freely exercise their political and civil rights, perceive regulations as adequate and fair, and perceive that they can operate within a framework of a stable and predictable rule of law. The relationship between GPEI indicators and political stability is weaker than with other political indicators, and the association became non-significant when controlled for the GPD per capita.

This result makes sense if we consider the close relationship found in previous cross-national studies between political stability and economic growth (Barro, 1991; Alesina, et al., 1996).

Both regulatory quality and rule of law relate to the perception of capacity of government agents to provide stable and predictable policies, regulations, and agreed meta-policies. As we discussed earlier, favorable regulations alone do not guarantee a better philanthropic environment; instead, explicit and implicit contractual agreements between government and the nonprofit sector (Phillips & Blumberg, 2017) can affect the conditions for philanthropy but not in the same manner, since certain policies may affect specific philanthropic sub-sectors operating within a country (Sokolowski, 2010). The strength of the relationships found specifically with the GPEI political environment may be explained by the fact that GPEI incorporates perception of government regulations (ability of the government to formulate and implement policies and regulations that permit and promote philanthropy) in the definition of the political environment indicator. The strength of the correlation of the regulatory quality indicator with the GPEI ease of operating was expected since ease of operating refers to the regulatory environment to create and operate a philanthropic organization.

The GPEI does not directly measure political rights (right to election, pluralism and participation, government functioning), therefore, the observed associations suggest that we can expect low levels of political rights in countries with challenging philanthropic environments. The absence or presence of political rights within a country can reinforce the existent philanthropic conditions and make them either more favorable or restrictive.

Hypothesis 3: The quality of a country's regulatory, political, and socio-cultural environments for philanthropy is positively related to the quality of its economic conditions.

Economic conditions, defined as economic freedom (regulatory efficiency, openness of the economy, and size of government), ease of doing business (regulatory environment to start and operate a business), and economic growth (GDP per capita), were found to be strongly associated with all GPEI indicators. A good economic climate is usually associated with positive outcomes in foreign investment inflows, economic growth, and creation of wealth. Both the growth of GDP and household wealth nurture the conditions to increase giving (Havens & Schervish, 2014). As discussed earlier, economic conditions influence decisions to invest (Anwar & Mughal, 2012; Kimura, 2008; Sonora, 2008), and mediate to create better social conditions for giving (Berggren

& Jordahl, 2006). Results show that economic conditions significantly contribute to reinforce the existent political, fiscal, regulatory, and socio-cultural conditions for philanthropy. Favorable economic conditions would act to reinforce, rather than hinder, the potential beneficial effects of existing enabling conditions for philanthropy.

Hypothesis 4: Countries at a higher stage of human development show stronger relationships between philanthropic environment and political, economic, and giving indicators.

Human development was the factor that we used to understand the kind of social environments where the harmonic interplay of political, economic, and social variables can occur to advance philanthropy. Variations of how these factors interplay under different social conditions inform the necessary social conditions for government policies and regulations to interact effectively and support philanthropic endeavors. We selected HDI as the measure of human development because the HDI assesses wellbeing and not just economic income. Countries with the same level of GNI per capita may rank differently on the HDI simply because they may implement policies that affect other human development outcomes differently, such as life expectancy, which has been considered an important driver of giving (Wiepking and Handy, 2015).

When using the total sample of 79 countries, we found significant relationships between the GPEI overall score and almost all variables included in the study. These results suggest that in general changes in economic and political factors can be expected to be accompanied by changes in the environment for philanthropy as measured by the GPEI. The question is how these relationships operate in different social environments. If our fourth hypothesis had been true, these relationships should have yielded significant results for countries of all stages of human development, implying that the associations between GPEI and contextual political and economic factors share similar strength and direction in countries with different HDI levels. However, the analysis using the HDI as the measure of human development reveals that only in very high HDI countries all relationships were consistently strong and significant, and regulatory quality was the only indicator that remained significantly correlated with GPEI in all three HDI groups. This indicates that regulatory quality is a powerful indicator of philanthropic environment in countries with different HDI levels.

Our analysis revealed that the relationship between GPEI and pro-giving behavior is significant only in countries with very high levels of human development (as measured by HDI). The lack of

significance in the correlations in countries with medium-low and high HDI suggests that individuals giving in those countries respond to other drivers of charitable giving in addition to the contextual factors measured by GPEI. The weak but significant association found between informal giving and the GPEI socio-cultural environment indicator in Table 1 remained statistically significant only in countries with very high HDI ($r=.434$, $p < .01$). As we mentioned earlier, informal giving may occur in unfavorable economic and political conditions if socio-cultural conditions are favorable. However, these results also suggest the possibility of a tipping point on the human development spectrum when socio-cultural conditions start to have an impact on philanthropic activities.

Our findings also suggest that the positive effects of economic and political factors on philanthropic environmental conditions are mostly limited to countries with very high HDI. Table 4 shows that the statistically significant interactions between ease of doing business and economic quality with the environment for philanthropy are only present in very high HDI countries; therefore, these two economic indicators should be analyzed considering the inter-relationship with other social conditions that shape the philanthropic environment especially in medium-low and high HDI countries. The relationship between GPEI and economic freedom remains significant when controlling for economic growth (measured as GDP) suggesting that economic freedom can potentially be a reinforcing factor of philanthropic conditions mostly in very high and medium-low HDI economies. The same could be said of the two political indicators, political rights and civil liberties.

It is important to highlight the inter-correlations found between political and economic indicators in the three groups of countries. We found strong and meaningful correlations between economic freedom and indicators of rule of law, regulatory quality, and ease of doing business in countries with very high, high and medium-low HDI. We also found that ease of doing business and indicators of regulatory quality and rule of law were strongly associated. This can be explained by the interrelated nature of the elements measured by these four indicators, all of which deal with regulations that facilitate economic operations, generate trust, and measure respect for contractual agreements and the rule of law. These associations reveal that these factors do not work in isolation, rather, they work to consistently reinforce each other's effect.

As observed, the interrelations of the political, social, and economic systems with the philanthropic sector and charitable giving are complex and very dynamic (S. Kim & Y. Kim, 2015)

and not always predictable, depending on the institutional settings in which giving takes place (Sokolowski, 2013). Our findings suggest that in general the dynamic interrelations of social, political, and economic factors may reinforce each other to shape the philanthropic environment, but these interactions are more predictable to positively reinforce each other in countries with very high HDI.

Conclusions

Two research questions guided this study: 1) Are countries with a better philanthropic environment more likely to show better giving behaviors? And 2) how do political, economic, and social factors together improve or constrain the environment for philanthropy?

The relationship of giving with GPEI indicates that the environment for philanthropy tend to change in tandem with giving. This is not necessarily a cause and effect relationship. Instead, it merely tells us that, as conditions for philanthropy improve, higher levels of giving can often be expected, especially giving through formal channels. This is particularly true in countries with very high HDI. The weak relationships between informal giving and GPEI indicators, except for the socio-cultural environment, actually emphasize the critical role of social and cultural factors, such as individual beliefs and values, in shaping philanthropic behaviors.

Although previous studies have demonstrated the influence of favorable political and regulatory conditions on foreign investment, we were not able to find statistically significant correlations with foreign donations of \$1 million dollar or more from the U.S. to emerging and developing economies. We could not demonstrate that recipient countries with more favorable philanthropic conditions were more likely to receive cross-border donations from U.S. at the million dollar or above. This may be attributed to the limitations in the data used to measure cross-border giving.

Prior literature has found that political conditions, such as civil liberties, political rights, efficient and properly implemented regulations and policies, and relationship with government, affect the development of an independent and prosper philanthropic sector. Literature has also found evidence of the importance of economic freedom in creating favorable conditions (such as economic growth, social capital, and human capital investment) for the development of philanthropy. In this study, we found new evidence suggesting that a certain combination of political, economic, and social factors operate within countries to create a better philanthropic environment.

This study found that, regardless of a country's human development stage, the indicator measuring regulatory quality can be used to predict the quality of the philanthropic environment. Moreover, we found that countries with a very high level of human development provide better conditions for political and economic factors to have a reinforcing positive effect on the philanthropic environment and ultimately on giving. This occurs because the institutional components of the social and political system offer the stability, freedom, and transparency required to build a sense of trust in philanthropy and strengthen the role of philanthropic organizations.

Conditions evidenced in the literature as potentially beneficial for the development of philanthropy (including political stability, government effectiveness, rule of law, social capital, economic freedom, and economic quality) appear to be mostly reinforcing the philanthropic environment in highly developed countries. This opens new avenues for research on the most adequate social conditions in which contextual factors can exert a joint positive influence on philanthropy. This includes using innovative frameworks to explain the relations of the philanthropic sector with government in developing and emerging economies.

Finally, this study is a continuation of previous studies conducted by the authors to understand the factors that influence the philanthropic environment in economies situated in different stages of development. Our prior study offered support in expanding the number of indicators to be measured by the GPEI. The results from the current study suggest the need to further expand the indicators in the GPEI to include economic environment and to give more emphasis to the role of political stability in the assessment of the philanthropic environment.

This study is not without limitations. The wide range of factors and various methodologies of the global indices used in the study convey a comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of public policies seeking sustainable development as ultimate goal. However, this in itself may become a limitation when comparing results between indices, since these indices are all constructed using different conceptualizations and methodologies. Although we were attentive to the definition of each indicator we used, the diversity of the methodological approaches in their construction must be kept in mind when interpreting results. Another limitation lies in the lack of recent detailed data on cross-border flows to emerging and developing countries. The rapidly evolving political landscapes and the implementation of regulatory changes around the world require more recent

data to examine if and how the philanthropic environment is in any way connected to the dynamic resource flows internationally.

Using a set of specific indicators, this study sheds light on how different economic and political factors interrelate to promote or constrain the enabling philanthropic conditions at the country level. This study also provides insights to further research on the effects of contextual factors and to improve policies strengthening the role of philanthropy in society. Longitudinal studies are needed to investigate the effects of changing contextual factors on philanthropy and the role of political, economic, and social factors in shaping the conditions for philanthropy in the long term.

References

- Ajide, K. B., & Eregha, P. B. (2014). Economic Freedom and Foreign Direct Investment in Ecowas Countries: A Panel Data Analysis. *Applied Econometrics and International Development*, 14(2).
- Alesina, A., Özler, S., Roubini, N., & Swagel, P. (1996). Political instability and economic growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1(2), 189-211.
- Anand, P. U., & Hayling, C. (2014). *Levers for change--philanthropy in select South East Asian countries*. Social Insight Research Series. Lien Centre for Social Innovation Reports. Retrieved from http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lien_reports/6
- Anheier, H. K. (2017). Civil society challenged: towards an enabling policy environment. *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*, 11(2017-29), 1-20.
- Anheier, H. K. (2014). Institutional voids and the role of civil society: the case of global finance. *Global Policy*, 5(1), 23-35.
- Anwar, A., & Mughal, M. (2012). Economic Freedom and Indian Outward Foreign Direct Investment: An Empirical Analysis. *Economics Bulletin*, 32(4), 2991-3007.
- Appel, S. M., & Layton, M. D. (2016). Government and the nonprofit sector in Latin America. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 7(2), 117-135.
- Appel, S., & Barragán, D. (2017). Universities, NGOs, and civil society sustainability: preliminary lessons from Ecuador. *Development in Practice*, 27(4), 472-486.

- Azman-Saini, W. N. W., Baharumshah, A. Z., & Law, S. H. (2010). Foreign direct investment, economic freedom and economic growth: International evidence. *Economic Modelling*, 27(5), 1079-1089.
- Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic growth in a cross section of countries. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 106(2), 407-443.
- Bakija, J. (2000). Distinguishing Transitory and Permanent Price Elasticities of Charitable Giving with Pre-Announced Changes in Tax Law. Retrieved from <http://web.williams.edu/Economics/wp/bakijacharity.pdf>
- Bakija, J. (2013). Tax policy and philanthropy: A primer on the empirical evidence for the United States and its implications. *Social Research*, 80(2), 557.
- Bakija, J., & Heim, B. T. (2011). How does charitable giving respond to incentives and income? New estimates from panel data. *National Tax Journal*, 64(2), 615-650. Retrieved from <http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/872087732?accountid=7398>
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.
- Bengoa, M., & Sanchez-Robles, B. (2003). Foreign direct investment, economic freedom and growth: new evidence from Latin America. *European journal of political economy*, 19(3), 529-545.
- Berggren, N. (2003). The benefits of economic freedom: a survey. *The independent review*, 8(2), 193-211.
- Berggren, N., & Jordahl, H. (2006). Free to trust: Economic freedom and social capital. *Kyklos*, 59(2), 141-169. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6435.2006.00324.x>
- Breen, O. (2018) Enlarging the Space for European Philanthropy. A DAFNE/EFC commissioned study. Retrieved from https://dafne-online.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Enlarging-the-Space-for-European-Philanthropy-joint-EFC-DAFNE-study_2018.pdf
- Brown, E., & Ferris, J. M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99.

- Caetano, J., & Caleiro, A. (2009). *Economic Freedom and Foreign Direct Investment--How different are the MENA countries from the EU?* (No. 2009/02). Documento de Trabalho.
- Çarkoğlu, A., Campbell, D. & Aytaç, S.E. (2017). Informal Giving in Turkey. Paper Prepared for the European Research Network on Philanthropy Conference. Copenhagen, Denmark. July 14, 2017. Available http://ernop.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Campbell-Carkoglu-Aytac_Informal_Giving_in_Turkey_ERNOP.pdf
- Carlsson, F., & Lundström, S. (2002). Economic freedom and growth: Decomposing the effects. *Public choice*, 112(3-4), 335-344.
- Cebula, R. J., Clark, J. R., & Mixon Jr, F. G. (2013). The impact of economic freedom on per capita real GDP: A study of OECD nations. *Journal of Regional Analysis & Policy*, 43(1), 34.
- Center for Asian Philanthropy and Society. (2018) *Doing Good Index 2018. Maximizing Asia's Potential*. Available <http://caps.org/our-research/doing-good-index-2018/>
- Cornuelle, R. (1965). *Reclaiming the American Dream*. Random House: New York.
- Duquette, C. M. (1999). Is charitable giving by nonitemizers responsive to tax incentives? New evidence. *National Tax Journal*, 52(2), 195-206.
- Duquette, N. J. (2014). *Fiscal policy and the American nonprofit sector*. Retrieved from <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/108955>
- Feldmann, H. (2017). Economic freedom and human capital investment. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 13(2), 421-445.
- Forbes, K. F., & Zampelli, E. M. (2013). The impacts of religion, political ideology, and social capital on religious and secular giving: evidence from the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey. *Applied Economics*, 45(17), 2481-2490.
- Frumkin, P. (1995). Philanthropy: Strangled Freedom. *The American Scholar*, 64(4), 590-597. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41212417>
- Garcia, S., Osili, U., and Kou, X. (2017). *Measuring Philanthropic Freedom across Countries*. European Research Network on Philanthropy 8th International Conference. Copenhagen, 13-14 July 2017. Retrieved from http://ernop.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Garcia-Osili-Kou_Measuring_Philanthropic_Freedom_Across_Countries-7.pdf
- Grosby, S. (2012). Philanthropy, Law, and Associational Liberty: A Few Remarks on Gierke's Genossenschaftsrecht. *Conversations on Philanthropy*, 9, 53-73.

- Gwartney, J. D., Lawson, R. A., & Holcombe, R. G. (1999). Economic freedom and the environment for economic growth. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 643-663.
- Hartnell, C. (2018) *Philanthropy in the Arab Region*. Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace. Retrieved from <http://www.psjp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Philanthropy-in-the-Arab-region-March-2018.pdf>
- Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (2014). A Golden Age of Philanthropy Still Beckons: National Wealth Transfer and Potential for Philanthropy Technical Report. *Center on Wealth and Philanthropy, Boston College*, May, 28.
- Hudson Institute. (2015). Index of Philanthropic Freedom 2015. Available <https://www.hudson.org/research/11363-index-of-philanthropic-freedom-2015>
- Imtiaz, S., & Bashir, M. F. (2017). Economic freedom and foreign direct investment in South Asian countries. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 24(2).
- Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy (2018). Global Philanthropy Environment Index. Available <https://globalindices.iupui.edu/environment/downloads/index.html>
- Jackson, J., Carden, A., & Compton, R. A. (2015). Economic freedom and social capital. *Applied Economics*, 47(52-54), 5853-5867. Retrieved from <http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1775618311?accountid=7398>
- Kim, S. E., & Kim, Y. H. (2015). Measuring the growth of the nonprofit sector: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 75(2), 242-251.
- Kimura, F. (2008). How Does Economic Freedom Affect International Trade in Services?. *Journal of Korea Trade*, 12(3), 1-28.
- Kobeissi, N. (2005). Impact of governance, legal system and economic freedom on foreign investment in the MENA region. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 8(1).
- Kyaw Min Maw, A. (2015). Effect of Economic Freedom on Social Capital Panel Evidence from US Contiguous States (Doctoral dissertation, North Dakota State University).
- Lee, T. (2010). The rise of international nongovernmental organizations: A top-down or bottom-up explanation? *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 21(3), 393-416.

- Marquis, C., Zhou, Y. & Yang, Z. (2016). The emergence of subversive charities in China. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2016, 42-47.
- Marshall, J. T., & Rowberry, R. M. (2013). Urban wreckage and resiliency: Articulating a practical framework for preserving, reconstructing, and building cities. *Idaho Law Review*, 50, 49-83.
- Moore, D., & Rutzen, D. (2011). Legal framework for global philanthropy: Barriers and opportunities. *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, 13(1-2), 5-41.
- Nalley, L. L., & Barkley, A. (2005). Political Freedom, Economic Freedom, and Prosperity: International Trade Policy as a Measure of Economic Freedom. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 21(1), 123.
- OECD (2018), *Private Philanthropy for Development*, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264085190-en>.
- Payton, R. (1987). *Philanthropy as a concept*. Retrieved from <http://134.68.190.22/output/pdf/0081.pdf>
- Phillips, S. D., & Blumberg, M. (2017). International trends in government-nonprofit relations. In E. Boris & C. E. Steuerle (Eds.), *Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and conflict* (pp. 313-342). Lanham, MD: The Urban Institute Press.
- Pritchard, I. T. (2017). Economic freedom and philanthropy (Order No. 10638760). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2010532700). Retrieved from <http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/2010532700?accountid=7398>
- Ranis, G., Stewart, F., & Ramirez, A. (2000). Economic growth and human development. *World development*, 28(2), 197-219.
- Salamon, L. M. and Toepler, S. (2000) *The Influence of the Legal Environment on the Development of the Nonprofit Sector*, Working Paper No. 17, Center for Civil Society Studies, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Sen, A. (2000). A decade of human development. *Journal of human development*, 1(1), 17-23.
- Sokolowski, S. W. (2013). Effects of government support of nonprofit institutions on aggregate private philanthropy: Evidence from 40 countries. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 24(2), 359-381.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11266-011-9258-5>

- Sokolowski, W. (2010). Philanthropic leadership in totalitarian and communist societies. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage..
- Sonora, R. J. (2008). On the Impacts of Economic Freedom on International Trade Flows: Asymmetries and Freedom Components. *EFZG working paper series*, (05), 1-31.
- Subasat, T., & Bellos, S. (2011). Economic freedom and foreign direct investment in Latin America: A panel gravity model approach. *Economics Bulletin*, 31(3), 2053-2065.
- Tag, M. N., Degirmen, S., & Saltik, O. (2016, January). Do institutions of economic freedom attract foreign direct investment? Evidence from panel data. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Macroeconomic Analysis and International Finance. Greece, Retrieved from http://economics.soc.uoc.gr/macro/docs/Year/2016/papers/paper_2_144.pdf
- Thindwa, J., Monico, C., & Reuben, W. (2003). Enabling environments for civic engagement in PRSP countries. *Social Development Notes*, 82, 1-5. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPCENG/214578-1116506912206/21061533/sdn82.pdf>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2018). *Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical update*. Available <http://hdr.undp.org/en/2018-update>
- Wang, L., & Graddy, E. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(1), 23-42.
- Wang, L., Graddy, E., & Morgan, D. (2011). The development of community-based foundations in East Asia. *Public Management Review*, 13(8), 1155-1178.
- Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (Eds.). (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, D. R. (2006). Complementary, supplementary, or adversarial? *Nonprofit-government relations. Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and conflict*, 37-80.

Appendix 1. 2018 GPEI Scores by Country

Sub-Saharan Africa		Latin America	
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE	COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE
Kenya	2.87	Argentina	3.50
South Africa	3.80	Bolivia	3.08
Tanzania	3.03	Brazil	3.37
Zimbabwe	2.55	Chile	3.98
Nigeria	3.33	Colombia	3.43
Senegal	3.68	Ecuador	2.70
Central Asia and South Caucasus		Mexico	3.47
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE	Peru	3.03
Armenia	3.42	Uruguay	3.87
Azerbaijan	3.31	Venezuela	2.56
Belarus	2.30	Southern and South-Eastern Asia	
Georgia	3.86	COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE
Kazakhstan	3.83	India	3.21
Kyrgyz Republic	3.18	Indonesia	3.17
Russia	3.33	Myanmar	2.87
Middle East and Northern Africa		Nepal	2.60
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE	Pakistan	3.53
Egypt	2.75	Philippines	4.10
Israel	3.83	Singapore	4.42
Jordan	3.62	Thailand	3.10
Kuwait	3.31	Vietnam	2.71
Lebanon	3.67	Balkan Countries	
Morocco	3.25	COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE
Qatar	2.07	Albania	3.12
Saudi Arabia	2.95	Bosnia and Hercegovina	3.57

Turkey	2.73	Croatia	3.83
United Arab Emirates	3.52	Kosovo	3.51
Eastern Asia		Macedonia	3.93
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE	Montenegro	4.03
China	2.75	Serbia	3.60
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	4.22	Oceania	
Japan	4.37	COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE
Republic of Korea	4.37	Australia	4.17
Taiwan-China	4.05	New Zealand	4.33
Eastern and Southern Europe		Northern and Western Europe	
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE	COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE
Bulgaria	3.75	Austria	4.41
Czech Republic	3.69	Denmark	4.42
Greece	3.59	Finland	4.80
Hungary	3.30	France	4.67
Italy	4.67	Germany	4.73
Poland	4.00	Ireland	4.33
Portugal	3.65	Netherlands	4.80
Slovakia	3.62	Norway	4.40
Spain	3.97	Sweden	4.30
Ukraine	3.97	Switzerland	4.75
United States and Canada		United Kingdom	4.18
COUNTRY	OVERALL SCORE		
Canada	4.38		
United States	4.77		