



Public Good in Philanthropic Behavior: Associations and Location

Sohail Zafar¹ Daniela Andren² & Per Sandin³

¹Migrate from KIE, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Email: sohail.zafar@iiu.edu.pk

²Associate Professor, School of Business Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg, Orebro University, Sweden.

³Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer Department of Crop Production Ecology; Agriculture Cropping System, Swedish University of Agriculture Sciences, Sweden.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:	January	15, 2022
Revised:	January	25, 2022
Accepted:	February	22, 2022
Available Online:	March	25, 2022

Keywords:

philanthropic behaviour giving comparative study
public policy location association

ABSTRACT

It's a wide spread activity of private giving on public purposes by individuals foundations and corporations. Gift giving scholarship on philanthropy whereas gift is itself an altruism. Scholarship in public economics, human resource development, econometric finance, consumer behaviour, divine economics and economics of religiosity, for economists, believers in economics. More recently economists are taking interest in philanthropic behaviour and have made distinguished contribution draw attention of public economists. This include through understanding of micro and macro factors directly taking part in philanthropic behavior. The specification of public and private interests to shape the direction and consequences of philanthropic behavior. Apparently for several disciplines of economics the individual philanthropic behaviour and motivation for the behavior are at least to some extent universal, there is strong evidence for people across the world do not equally display this behaviour in each discipline being away from religiosity. In this study we shall shed light on public entities in universal perspective on philanthropy. Macro level study of philanthropy is underdeveloped, due to three problems. First intrinsic to the study of philanthropic behaviour, location, geographic orientation and religiosity. As initial step on philanthropic behavior across different cultures, religion is taking part in public and private good more towards policy and attainment of welfare.



© 2024 The Authors, Published by AIRSD. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

Corresponding Author's Email: sohail.zafar@iiu.edu.pk

INTRODUCTION

In different cultures people have wide range of philanthropic behaviour. Public good in games Henrich et al. (2004) it is benefiting others in voluntary and giving Ruiters and De Graaf (2000) giving money or helping strangers Borgonovi (2008) helping strangers Benett and Einolf (2017). Research shows that philanthropic behaviour is at least to some extent universal. Intra disciplinary research support the argument for universal parameters in individual motivation. Aknin et al. (2013) people across cultures experience warm glow of

giving. It light up for reward associated with it Campbell Meiklejohn (2019). It is when contributing to others on meta-analysis Thielmann et al. (2020) its personality traits on prosaically behaviour. On unconditional concerns of divine welfare Zafar et al. (2023) away from economic gains on life, but taking life here after and reservoir of afterlife more specifically, Loh-e-Mehfoz Qur'an (36: 1-83). To lit and collect reader, on opening words, 'And there came from the farthest end of the city a man, running. He said, O people, follow the messengers' Qur'an (36:20). Research show large variation across countries how treat phenomenon and go for it depending upon their norms if not universal at least on religiosity that it counter part of public good. Taking how society of giving scale up on data its 1427 US dollar in USA compared to 12 US dollars in Russia. And there is large variation of giving across countries, cultures reported on how much they helped stranger in a week. People in Liberia Sierra Leone and United States of America most often get reported on helping the stranger. However Japan Cambodia are least giving countries reported on stranger CAF (2022). There is strong evidence for people across the world do not equally have this behaviour. Shall we be able to explain philanthropic behaviour worldwide and more importantly what we learn out of it. Shall we take care of why people behave differently should be a remarkable contribution to public goods. It could support the development of societies where people are more reluctant to show philanthropic behaviour.

Public Good in Philanthropic Behavior

A good is strictly public if non excludable and non-rival. None can be excluded consuming it, neither any reduce its availability for others. Non excludability and non-rival precisely distinguish models of public goods with axiom that public good effectively could be used by large number of individuals. However it is limited to the size of the population meant for public. As Buchanan (1965) while goods and services may be reasonably classified as purely private, even in extreme sense, fewer goods satisfy the condition of collectiveness. Several factors limit the pool of beneficiaries able to consume non excludable and non-rival goods. One limitation is intrinsic to the service itself a children hospital is only to treat children, a public bath for men indeed exclude women, a library is only of use for literate. In philanthropic behavior similarly geography also limit the access to public good. Geographically proximity of such goods become more critical for services citizen use on every day basis. Location turns out an infrastructural provision for theoretically a public good and in some rare cases a semi private good. Geographic constraints limit use of service create allocation inequalities for residents. It matter little how much literature on demand and supply side consideration we grasp which actually reinforce allocation differences among localities and groups. In philanthropic behavior it need a complete set of action plan because of collective action problem created by heterogeneities in taste ethically and socially on diverse regions plagues and lobbying efforts with the political fronts result in lower provision of public projects. The supply side focus on distributive impact of centralization of provision of local goods Alesina et al. (1999). It is also biased for strategic on electoral basis to ensure success in making the government (Dixit and Londregan 1996; Cox and McCubbins 1986; Ahmed, Mahboob, Hamid, Sheikh, Ali, Glabiszewski, & Cyfert, 2022; Rehman, Abro, Mustafa, Ullah, & Khattak, 2021). None of the models help or predict us explain equality of

access to services which elite provide public good as charitable endowment. First the bureaucratic institutions shape with collective action capacity of masses philanthropy impact the equilibrium. In absence of formal responsibility public good shall be lagging in quantity, quality or location of the good provided. On philanthropic behavior it get more complex when endower is a political elite, would be praised for voluntary investing in a project rather than being accused for investing in every locality in the country. In a system where formal institutionalized political responsibility for having equal service for all. What are the incentive to voluntary endow public good? What facilitate decision of allocation taking in account endowments? Who gets what, why, and how?

Proposition I: The optimal philanthropic activity will be higher from individuals with higher giving than from individuals with lower giving's.

Proposition II: The greater the level of consistency between philanthropic activity and a community based public austerity greater the returns of associations even if geographic distancing.

Although philanthropic behavior is a universal human trait, equally common is to build and maintain social reputation, not only mortal but supernatural. To lit the research Zafar et al. (2023) life on earth is only small part of whole life Qur'an (3: 14-15, 8: 46, 9: 25, 9: 38, 18: 16-17, 21: 64, 22: 56, 28: 60, 43: 35). It is not only mortals but supernatural Qur'an (72: 1-2). Supernatural came forth about them and for mortals, see Qur'an (72 1-28). Precisely, of course supernatural say those not follow the right path, are hell creature. According to islamic code of life, belief in life after death Hamdani (2002) Tashfeen et al. (2008) Tashfeen et al. (2013) and the Day of Judgment should have significant influence on economic decision making process of which, for example, time allocation is the most important. Under islamic research, life on earth is only one small part of the whole life. An un-ending life begins Qur'an (2023a, 2023b) Alama (2007) Mududi (1998) Hamdani (2008) Tashfeen et al. (2008) Tashfeen et al. (2013) after death Qur'an (3: 14-15, 8: 46, 9: 25, 9: 38, 22: 56). The concept of two lives, in fact is like two phases. The first phase is transitional which begins with the present life on this earth. All of its material conveniences and pleasures will come to an end on an appointed day. And then it begins the second phase, the life hereafter which is eternal and endless in terms of life and its pleasure and possessions. Social status gains could be obtained through voluntary contributions of public good insofar as community receive the provided, otherwise it will be just and almost anonymous donations. For supernatural, for most it is believed giving is good, but there are inherent complications and contradiction when private interest meet public need. In recent years nature of philanthropy in democratic societies is central topic causing disparities let open debate on public good.

Location and Association

On analysis it appear three reasons to go through. It is orientation in location definition and meanings. It lemmatise the scope of society in contribution. On social basis of society Barman (2017) examines micro, meso-and macro level explanations of philanthropy. She define philanthropy as private giving for public purposes. It need to understand

characteristics traits and roles of actors in micro level in a changing social relationships. For supernatural, In meso-analysis philanthropic behaviour embodies in broader social configuration that acknowledge charitable giving Qur'an (72: 1). For further developments the study call for a macro level analysis. It also limit the contribution to the society as a whole. One reason could be to cross geographic units, in evidence based interventions to stimulate philanthropic behaviour. This shall give to a rising trends on technology in behaviour Zafar et al. (2023). Across the world governments cooperation and civil societies that are constantly advocating new technologies. And how it interact in counter analysis. These interventions are rarely evaluated. Suppose changes in laws every year it reschedule and fiscal constraints in covid and challenges organisations had to face (CAF (2022; Debne et al. 2008; Taqi, e-Ali, Parveen, Babar, & Khan, 2021); Qureshi, Ahmad, Ullah, & ul Mustafa, 2023). More relevant here are fiscal incentives for giving in charitable organisations and policies that channel billions of dollars and transactions form people abroad. Migrants through remittances in support of nuclear families such as more distant kin and communities Adelman et al. (2016) Moreno Dodon et al. (2012) Tertychnaya et al. (2018). These are examples of how the macro level and contextual changes effect the philanthropic behaviour. It is known little about demography economic and social changes on philanthropy. Shall geographic behavior intervene in aging populations economic downturns inequality technology human and natural disasters on philanthropy such as outside of European states and North America having least developments on overall scale. One reason could be nested argument in study of philanthropy.

Location: Shall geographic distribution matter Ma and Konrath (2018) depict cluster of articles taking their origin in 19 academic journals it is evident that most of the articles are originated from North America Western Europe Australia and India. Non-profit and voluntary journals are less hope full. In year 2017, 71% published in volunts and some 84% published in Voluntary Sector Quarterly were either from north Amercia or Western Europe. Philanthropy on geographic scale depict its scatter plot for where people need to change their universal values. Higher level of philanthropic behaviour especial those in charitable giving is still not a standard Balliet et al. (2014) Wiepking (2021). This is well documented in the critiques in Europe Breeze (2019) MoGoey (2015) and in USA Callahan (2017) Reich (2018) Villanueva (2018) Wiepking (2021) Overall outcome of philanthropic behaviour should lead to improved social outcomes for al not a selected group of society. How shall one use translog cost to determine, this is out of the scope of this study. Some of the interesting findings are in the studies of Bennette and Ainolf (2017). Gotez et al. (2020), Ameer, Ali, Farooq, Ayub, & Waqas, (2023), Ali, Khan, & Mustafa, (2022), Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) and Yonah (2019) personal interaction with authors to produce articles is another key source for having more research on journals. Using geographic focus for the work itself and data used in empirical studies shall shed more light about regions. It's important in a sense to understand what is from America and Western Europe view of what is philanthropy and consequently which regions or countries are more philanthropic, English language and philanthropy. This shall let us understand more emerging areas and markets for public good and transformation in micro level identities in philanthropic scale. A one-dimensional North American and Western society is policy invariant for taking behavior in a global context.

Table 1: Helping a stranger

Top 10 Countries			Bottom 10 Countries		
Country	Rank	People %	Country	Rank	People%
Siera Leone	1	83%	Malta	110	485
Venezuela	2	82%	Kazakhstan	111	47%
Jamaica	3	80%	Afghanistan	112	44%
USA	4	80%	Italy	113	44%
Nigeria	5	80%	Neither land	114	43%
Costa Rica	6	79%	Switzerland	115	40%
Kenya	7	78%	France	116	38%
Uganda	8	77%	Lao	117	36%
Colombia	9	76%	Japan	118	24%
Mexico	10	76%	Cambodian	119	23%

Source: Charities Aid Foundation 2022

There are many barriers for scholars studying geography. On public orientation it become more important for what region and on how it discriminate. Such as underdeveloped countries like Pakistan. Market segmentation and how it interact on policy for development of fiscal and monetary black and white. Academic research in Asia for commercial banks pay well. How situation differ for America and shall religion play role in it. How religiosity in the region effect giving standards. We see geographic disparities with the following tables 1 2 and 3.

Table 2: Donation

Top 10 Countries			Bottom 10 Countries		
Country	Rnnk	People%	Country	Rank	People %
Indonesia	1	84%	Malawi	110	14%
Myanmar	2	73%	Jordan	111	14%
Netherland	3	68%	Namibia	112	13%
Iceland	4	67%	Gabon	113	11%

United Kingdom	5	65%	Zimbabwe	114	10%
Australia	6	64%	Tunisia	115	9%
Malta	7	64%	Egypt	116	7%
Thailand	8	62%	Afghanistan	117	7%
USA	9	61%	Marroco	118	7%
New Zealand	10	61%	Georgia	119	3%

Source: *Charities Aid Foundation 2022*

Sierra Leone is at best in 83% of people helping someone they did not know. Closely followed by Venezuela 82% Jamaica 80% and United State of America 80%. Five out of ten countries stand in South Central America Half of the countries found in the bottom ten are high income European. One reason could be at large part of the welfare states of strong safety network.

Indonesia is the highest proportion of people some 84% donate money in charities. Mayamer sand second 73%. Widespread donation in both countries could be at large a religious activity or community cultural tradition. It is evident than 7 out of 10 countries are from high income countries. All bottom 10 are low income countries. Georgia had the lowest proportion of people donating money to charity 3% and mostly bottom line, countries are in Africa.

Volunteering is getting better from 19% to 23% returning to pre pandemic levels. Despite several lockdown and barriers. This is the highest level of volunteering since 2009. Indonesia is the country with highest rate of volunteering.63% of adult population. Kenya is second best for volunteering time slightly increased from 49% to 52%. Sirloin stand first in index stand third in volunteers. There are many barriers for scholars studying in North America and Europe because of geography and society for not following religion but norms as standard especially when we grasp research based on region. There are different forms and different programs academic research publications commercial and those paid research units to get in deeper for having none on public reasoning. More often discussed on civil society and through highly qualified value oriented quantitative outcomes with regions and their interaction for equitable source based on giving barriers is an important limiting factor in global study of philanthropy Bekkers (2016). To collect high quality quantitative data needed for publish articles. Provided there are very few data source for outputs on comparative study of philanthropic behaviour such as publically available for euro meter EB (2004), World Values Survey (2005), European Social Society (2003), Individual International Philanthropy database (2016), and the costly gallop world poll (2023), World development Indicators. Here gallop world poll and world value survey provide a global source.

Table 3: Volunteer

Top 10 Countries			Bottom 10 Countries		
County	Rank	People%	Country	Rank	People %
Indonesia	1	63%	Bosnia Herzegovina	110	10%
Kenya	2	52%	Pakistan	111	10%
Sire Leone	3	44%	Latvia	112	10%
Zambia	4	43%	Portugal	113	10%
Tajikistan	5	43%	Cambodia	114	10%
Pilli pines	6	39%	Jordon	115	9%
USA	7	37%	Serbia	116	9%
Srilanka	8	37%	Lebanon	117	9%
Jamaica	9	36%	Albania	118	8%
Domina Republica	10	36%	Egypt	119	4%

Source: *Charities Aid Foundation 2022*

Associations: Another important aspect is association people do with the word of philanthropy used in published research. In Europe and North America philanthropy is associated with rich when men giving away their money and this is not always for charitable reasons Herzong et al. (2020). Examples such as people images of historical figures Carnigie and Rockefeller or more recently philanthropists such as Bill Gates and Worren Buffet. People are viewed as, needing to be rich multi billionaires millionaires. Old saying of white man rich and wealthy running organizations not just regular person on it Women Philanthropy Institute (2019). In Netherlands a burgher used as a title for citizen of upper scale Jan Steen and his daughters give donations why one should be like them for having careless for what other get. This is how people mould there will for others. How others get in an equitable society. How, many people are in philanthropy and how they get assign philanthropist, or get a title. And those critiques of philanthropy Lassing (2004) Owen (1965) Rodgers (1949) Rosenthal (1972) several issues explain behavior. There are several philanthropists care for others their commitment for giving for social out comes Breeze (2019) Buchanan (2019).

The most important aspect in taking in views how geographic associations take part, for what comes, how one define for its complex for different societies. Primarily for different regions it is different of course on conventional economics there are different standards when religion is not a source of finding the facts how region do it for this. It make it more complex to study

their behaviour. Geographical orientation where do people live actually or what are their origin and those migrate where ever you live you get alike for they need one to act as nonbelievers suppose in liberals Qur'an (4: 88-91). Then connotation, matters. Several people gather on research when culture and more inclusive is taken on best. Definition of philanthropy including Salamon and Anheir (1992, 1998) Payton (1988 Payton and Moody (2008) Sulek (2010a, 2010b) Bies and Kennedy (2019) Fowler and Mati (2019) Schuyt (2020) it need global research to get to the true meaning of philanthropy and how different disciplines in different cultures define. In public, it's biased on comprehension a comparative study of religiosity could shed light on spread effect, we use cost function, which is more suitable than production function due to several reasons. The cost function represents the minimum overall cost based on factor pricing and the amount of output, while the production function represents the output based on factor inputs. The factor price is considered exogenous in both the cost and production function. Another justification for utilizing a cost function is that it provides immediate estimations of Allen-Uzawa elasticities of substitution. These criteria are crucial for describing the pattern and extent of substitutability and complementarity among the components of production. One additional benefit of using the cost function approach is that it allows for the utilization of duality theory without any limitations on the returns to scale in the underlying technology. An example of this is Shepherd's lemma, although it is not within the topic of this research. This also call for more open understanding of philanthropy. Western view in the literature for philanthropy is typically defined in line with the view of Payton it's a voluntary action for the public good. Payton (1988). This is an optimization of charitable giving in organizations. This could be done in one of the comparative study in individual international differentials and time frames, for charitable organizations. It is because existing data sources differ in comparative source and location. In global world poll between 20 to 150 countries were having the same question. Have you gone through past month helped you are not known a stranger? Donated money to charity and volunteered for some organization? There are several issues afterword come up with the question on proxy for such behaviour see table 1, 2, 3, 4 for outcomes.

METHODOLOGY AND DISCUSSION

This research is taking cultures and norms a source of differences. Use of different time periods reported in the global world poll. It includes local and religious festivals that align with increased participation in volunteering and charitable activities. The use of aggregate statistics from the global world poll to rank countries by a charitable aid foundation is rather controversial. Another big stream of research emphasises what for waqfs is actually act to full altruism. As these are the pure charitable or waqf as an expression of pure altruism. waqf implicitly is acting in spreading the worth and It also give a detailed debate on intra faith and socioeconomic variation in public services. It also tell about universal needs and balance. In table 4 the most giving countries are shown. Indonesia has the highest giving index score in 2022. Its top ranked for 68% being unchanged since 2020 and 69% in 2022. Indonesia has highest rank in donation 84% of people and volunteering 63% in the world. Kenya is up from 58% to 61%. All the three scores are up from in the following year it has a higher value index for those helping others. Over the past five years Indonesia and Kenyans helped someone that

they did not know someone it is in comparison to those on average of 62%. Both countries have rising trends. One reason could be because religion is the key deriving source for giving, on evidence comes from percentage of religious population. Another important for America Newzeland and Australia are aspect is association people do with the world of philanthropy which is quite often used in published research. In Europe and North America philanthropy is more towards rich for giving their assets and it's not only for charities Herzong et al. (2020). One example for this is image of strong partners Carnigie and Rockefeller or more recently philanthropists viewed as, needing to be rich. On ten more generous countries, Canada has a return approaching from rank of 35% to 8% an overall index score. It's at least after a year western countries have occupied the top ranking more toward English speaking, also hit by pandemic. However some of the top ten generous countries such as Uk Ireland and Netherland rise up on index scale. This statistics show some poorly low ranking countries have increased their giving. Two new entries in giving scale up Zambia and Ukrine. Apparently Ukrine is the only European country occupying place in top ten moving up from 20% in year 2020 to 10% in year 2021.

Table 4. *The 10 most generous countries of the World*

Rank	Country	Total Giving Score	Charity	Volunteer
1	Indonesia	68%	55%	84%
2	Keynya	61%	77%	55%
3	USA	59%	80%	61%
4	Australia	55%	69%	64%
5	Newzealand	54%	66%	61%
6	Myanmar	52%	55%	73%
7	Sierra Leon	51%	83%	27%
8	Canada	51%	65%	59%
9	Zambia	50%	74%	35%
t10	Ukrine	49%	75%	47%

Source: Charities Aid Foundation 2022

On religion it's contemporary or at some places even kicked out for more religious, however equitable and growing, as shown in top ten countries. One example could be no prayer call for Muslims on loudspeaker in Denmark being considered noise pollution on public good. On evidence recognition of mosque in Norway is another implication, Uk to allow call for prayer is still another example rising up on world index of giving. Researchers should forward this for government to legislate, call for prayer. Norway is on 32 on list of countries indexed 45%,

stands on rank 106 for 50% taking giving, on charity rank 15 with score of 49% and some 41 for 26% engaged in voluntary time allocation. United Kingdom in Birmingham mosque could be seen on higher statistics in comparison. For simplicity the scale is the same, ranking the country up on Denmark and Norway, at 17 with score of 47% as a whole, rank 97 with score of 52% on giving's, up on top ten in charity rank 5 with 65% and voluntary work rank 55 on 24%. How religion play role in charitable giving in and on recognition in developed poorly religious societies. In Islam it's forbidden to inherit women against their will and one should not treat them with harshness, however commit on illegal sexual intercourse Qur'an (4: 19). There could be cat people follow more than religion. Or this might be their religion for associated as religious. On happy index Denmark is the happiest nation indeed and what on religion, Danes. On festive nude dance, or play, it ease them get friendly or change friends said the newspaper ekstrabladet. Then again what is the definition of which. Giving's are on top scale up in these societies on public good a banner in America. Denmark is 24 in the list of countries on giving indexed 46%. In comparing with the rank 74 for giving strangers score 60% measured on charity rank 22 and score 55% even low in voluntary time allocation rank 61 with score 23%. This means for global reasoning replacing the word with generosity and there may not be one term taking all complex strategy. In philanthropy generosity is well understood comes from informal and formal interviews carried by renounced researchers across the world or its only dealing with discourse. Herzog et al. (2010) and weird like life of doing and still good on philanthropic scale here comes a question for what is actually and could be generosity. We should go for a soft concept. Its more concerned for values and act of giving taking god gift such as strengths itself also in giving Herzog et al. (2020). To get more grip on technology better find more alternatives in global scale. As this research has gone through for definition it need to get in more complex understandings on religiosity is getting more easily of course supernatural follow Qur'an (72: 1).

One possible reason for the increase in philanthropy in Ukraine might be attributed to the country's socio-economic progress and cultural changes that were occurring prior to the war. Research on charity giving reveals that variables such as increasing living standards and the adoption of innovative and creative methods of charitable activities contribute to societal transformation. The significant rise in the demand for charitable contributions during the COVID-19 epidemic has stimulated an increase in both philanthropic donations and engagement. However invade of Russia had all destruction, those dead or terribly poor had strong giving potential.

People around the world go differently and their practice identical. To overcome what type of behavior for an inclusive understanding and parameters that globally are acceptable. Its money currency or there is something else associated with it. In definition of money M6 and M7 do not incorporate philanthropy. However on tangible and non-tangible it is measured on common standard and for what. Come what kind of generosity and in which standard and in which currency. And do currency itself is more reflection of giving. Every country publish globally acceptable currency notes. People across the world behave differently for different currencies. We should look in reputation among other it's not even less important for pleasure. There are several strategies. In research there are two strategies. One way of doing

is excellent qualitative and quantitative work in all forms of generosity on which researchers are up to or have done mentioned in research Bucher and Einolf (2017) Fowler and Matz (2019) Campbell and Carkoglu (2019) Bies and Kenedy (2019) and in study of state how it measure volunteering in China Hu (2020) different type of behavior in Brazil Vietes (2017) on charitable giving and health care system in Iran Zilochi et al. (2019) people from Japan Okebe et al. (2019) Afkhami et al. (2019) and individual giving in India Sen et al. (2020) Mexico Butcher Garciacoli and Ruz (2016) on large scale quantitative where local and global researchers grouped together on generosity in their own language. We are taking behavior across the world. In this process a quantitative design shall take them all together it's weird. It is to be good at understanding language practices for behavior across the world, 'english'. In this way a study comparatively understandable for all on measuring behavior and operational for quantitative research. It need a multi factored motivation meaning researchers have an access on multifactor philanthropic behavior. In global generosity intention behind are on linked scale in one language zone or another and then their comparative quantitative analysis. Institutional generosity behavior available to researchers to study implications in global scale or its development of societies or gain from noting or giving from world for after world. In societal world of giving, both quantitative and qualitative technologies in philanthropic behavior. This will take geographical published research on behavior to add on existing literature. More towards solving lack of comparable institutionalization role and policies in makeup of all this in a nested modelling. In order to have a more elaborative project based study, high quality on counter count for back wash effect. The international recognition on philanthropy, on reasoning civil society and networks organizations are more relevant for a high quantitative research and gatherings.

CONCLUSION

A stranded result of philanthropic behaviour in economy is that in absence of government regulations a system of donations and voluntary time allocation. Without knowing others helping people under supply public goods. These models rarely investigate empirically allocation consequences of voluntary provisions. How do charitable contribute public good affect the distributional side of equilibrium across ethical groups regional disparities, organization's on efficiency standards, how it differ around the world people contribute to public goods. Research shows that philanthropic behaviour is at least to some extent universal. Intra disciplinary research support the argument for universal parameters in pavement individual motivation. People across cultures experience warm glow of giving. It light up for reward associated with it. It is when contributing to others on meta-analysis. Its personality traits on prosaically behaviour and on unconditional concerns of welfare, divine welfare, away from economic gains on life here after and reservoir of afterlife. Research show large variation across countries how treat phenomenon and go for it depending upon their norms if not universal at least on religiosity, should recognise that it counter part of public good.

REFERENCES:

- Adelman, C., Barnett, J. N., and Riskin, E (2016) Index of global philanthropy and remittances Washington, DC Hudson Institute.
- Afkhami, N., Nasir Isfahani, A., Abzari, M., and Teimouri, H (2019) Toward a deep insight into employee participation in employee supported volunteering in Iranian organizations; A grounded theory, *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit organizations*, 30(5), pp 1036-1053.
- Ahmed, N., Mahboob, F., Hamid, Z., Sheikh, A. A., Ali, M. S. E., Glabiszewski, W., ... & Cyfert, S. (2022). Nexus between nuclear energy consumption and carbon footprint in asia pacific region: policy toward environmental sustainability. *Energies*, 15(19), 6956.
- Aknin, L. B et al. (2013) Prosocial spending and wellbeing: Cross cultural evidence for a psychological universal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(4), pp 635-652.
- Alama, M. T., by Alama, A. A (2007) *Tehzib Al Muhammad*, Published by Minhaj Ul Saleheen, Urdu Bazar, Lahore.
- Alesina, A., Baqir, R., and Easterly, E (1999) Public goods and ethics divisions, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114(4), pp 1243-1248.
- Ali, S. R., Khan, S. U., & Mustafa, A. R. (2022). Assessing the behaviour of Pakistani rice producers under exchange rate variability. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 38(1), 103-109.
- Ameer, W., Ali, M. S. E., Farooq, F., Ayub, B., & Waqas, M. (2023). Renewable energy electricity, environmental taxes, and sustainable development: empirical evidence from E7 economies. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-16.
- Balliet, D., Wu, J., and De Dreu, C, K (2014) In-group favouritism in cooperation: A meta analysis.
- Barman, E (2017) The social bases of philanthropy, *Annual Review of Sociology* 43, pp 271-280.
- Bekkers, R (2016) The analysis of regional differences in philanthropy evidence from the European Social survey, the Euro meter and the giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey in R Meullem G Kraaykamp and M Wittengerg (Eds.), *Netherland in context Verschellen en overeenkomsten* pp 26-49 The Neitherlands. DANS.
- Bennett, M. R., and Einolf, C. J (2017) Religion, altruism and helping strangers: A multivariate analysis of 126 countries. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 56(2), pp 323-341.
- Bieri, F., and Valev, N. T (2015) *Givings in Bulgaria: A non-profit sector in transition*, Wiepking and Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy*, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. pp 118-136.
- Bies, A., and Kennedy, S (2019) The state and the state of the art on philanthropy in Chia, *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization* 30(4), pp 619-633.
- Borgonovis, F (2008) Dividend we stand, united we fall: Religious pluralism, giving, and volunteering. *American Sociological Review* 73(1), pp 105-128.
- Breeze, B (2019) Philanthropy bad reputation could put big donors off giving-here why it matters. *The Conversation UK* <https://theconversation.com/philanthropys-bad-reputation-could-putbig-donors-off-giving-heres-why-it-matters-116023>.
- Buchanan (2019) *Giving done right: Effective philanthropy and every dollar count* New York Public Affairs.
- Buchanan, J. M (1965) An economic theory of clubs, *Economica* 32(125), pp 1-14.

- Butcher, G., Colin, J., and Ruz, S, S (2016) Giving Mexico: Giving by individuals VOLUNTAAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations 27(1), pp 322-347.
- Butcher, J., and Einolf, C. J (2017) Perspective on volunteering champ Springer.
- CAF (2023) Donation states, An International comparison of the tax treatment of donation London UK Charities Aid Foundation <https://cafonline.org/docs/default-source/about-us-publication/fwg4-donation-states>. Accessed 11 Dec 2023.
- Callahan, D (2017) The givers: Wealth power and philanthropy in a new guided age, New York Vintages Books.
- Campbell, D. A., and Carkoglu, A (2019) Informal giving in Turkey, VOLUNTAS International Journal of Voluntary and Non profit Organizations 30(4), pp 738-753.
- CIVICUS (2019) State of civil society report 2019 Johannesburg, South Civicus <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/state-of-civil-society-report-2019>.
- Cox, G., and McCubbins, M (1986) Electoral politics as a redistributive game. The Journal of Politics, 48(2), pp 370-389.
- Cutler, J., and Campbell-Meiklejohn, D (2019) A comparative FMRI meta analysis of altruistic and strategies decisions to give, Neuro image 184, pp 227-241.
- De Wit, A., Neumayr, M., Handy, F., Weipking, P (2018) Do government expenditures shift private philanthropic donations to particular fields of welfare? Evidence form cross country data, European Sociological Review, 43(1), pp 6-21.
- Dehne, A., Friedrich, P., Nam, C., and Parshe, R (2008) Taxation of non profit associations in an internal comparison non profit and voluntary sector quarterly 37(4), pp 709-729.
- Dixit, A., and Londregan, J (1996) The determinants of success of special interests in redistributive politics, The Journal of Politics 58(4), pp 1132-1155.
- ESS (2003) European Social Survey wave I Bergen Norway. Norwegian Social Science Data Service NSD.
- EU Russia Civil Society Forum (2017) 2016 Report on the state of civil society in the EU and Russia Berlin EU Russia Civil Forum.
- Euro barometer (2004) Euro barometer 62.2 Agricultural Policy Development Aid Social Capital and Information and Commercial Technology European Commission Directorate General Press and Communication opinion poll.
- Fowler, A., and Mati, J. M (2019) African Gifting Pluralising the concept of Philanthropy, VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 30, pp 724-737.
- Girdhardas, A (2018) Winners take all: The elite charade of changing the world New York Vitage Books.
- Gorleer, S., Bracke, P., and Hustinx, L (2020) The organizational field of blood collection: A multilevel analysis of organizational determinants of blood donation in Europe. European Sociological Review 36(3), pp 474-492.
- Gotz N., Brewis, G., and Werther, S (2020) Humanitarianism in the modern world: The moral economy of famine relief Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GWP (2023) The Gallop World Poll. Washington Gallop <https://www.gallup.com/analytics/232838/world-poll.aspx>.
- Haely, K (2000) Embedded altruism, Blood collection regimes and the European Union donor population, American Journal of Sociology, 105(6), pp 1633-1657.
- Hamdani, N (2008) A methodology for divine economics, A study of religion and Islam in each other perspective, A tradition of Imam Musa Kazim, Center of Divine Economics UAJK Published form New York.
- Hamdani, N. H., and Eatzaz, A (2002a) Towards divine economics: Some estimable propositions, The Pakistan Development Review 41(4), pp 607–26.

- Hamdani, N. H., and Eatzaz, A (2002c) Religiosity and time allocation behavior. paper presented at Asia and Southeast Asia Econometric Society Meeting, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore.
- Hartnell, C (2017) Philanthropy in India. A working paper Philanthropy for social justice and peace in association with Alliance, WINGS and the Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy Ashoka University <http://www.psjp.org/the-roleof-philanthropy-in-society-2/>.
- Hartnell, C (2018a) Philanthropy in Russia. A working paper philanthropy of social justice and peace in association with alliance, WINGS and Philanthropy Network for Social Justice.
- Hartnell, C (2019) Individual giving in India Russia the Arab region and Brazil PSJP association with Alliance CAF Russia Philanthropy Network for Social Justice Rede de Filantropia para a justice Institute for development of social investment SAANED AND WINGS <http://www.psjp.org/the-roleof-philanthropy-in-society-2/>.
- Hartnell, C (2020) Philanthropy in Indonesia. A working paper. Philanthropy of Social Justice and Peace in association ith Alliance, Filantropi Indonesia, Indonesia for Humanity and WINGS, <http://www.psjp.org/the-roleof-philanthropy-in-society-2/>
- Hartnell, C., and Milner, A (2018) Philanthropy in Brazil. A working paper Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace in Association with Alliance Wings and Philanthropy Network for Social Justice.
- Hartnell, C (2018b) Philanthropy in the Arab Region, A working paper. Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace in association with Alliance Arab Foundation Fourm John D Gerhart Center for Philanthropy, King Khalid Foundation, Philanthropy Age, SAANED and Wings <http://www.psjp.org/the-roleof-philanthropy-in-society-2/>
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Fehr, E., Camerer, C., and Gintis, H (2004) Foundation of human sociality. Economic expectations and ethnographic evidence from fifteen small scale societies, Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., and Norenzayan, A (2020) Most people are not Weird. *Nature*, 466(7302), 29.
- Herzog et al. (2020) Religiosity and generosity: Multi level approaches to studying the religiousness of prosaically actions, *Religions*, 11, pp 466. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel1090446>.
- Hu, M (2020) Making the states volunteers in contemporary China *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit organization*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00190-9>.
- IIPD (2016) Individual International Philanthropy Database, version in Wiepking, P and Handy, F. Rotterdam, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Johnson, E. J., Goldstein, D (2023) Medicine. Do defaults save lives? *Science*, 302(5649), pp 1338-1339.
- Lassig, S (2004) Burgerlichkeit, Patronage and Communal Liberalism in Germany 1871-1914, In T. Adms Ed. *Philanthropy patronage and civil society. Experiences from Germany Great Britain and North America*, Bloomington. Indiana University Press.
- Ma, J., and Konrath, S (2018) A century of non-profit studies; Scaling the knowledge of the field *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization*, 29(6), pp 1139-1158.
- McGoey, L (2015) No such thing as a free gift: The gates foundation and the price of philanthropy. London Verso Book.
- Mersianova, I., Jakobson, L., and Krasnopol'skaya, I (2015) Giving in Russia: The difficult shaping of the new non profit regime in P. Weipking and F. Handy (Ed.), *The*

- Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy, Hampshire; Palgrave MacMillian, pp 249-266.
- Moreno-Dodson, B., Mohapatra, S., and Ratha, D (2012) Migration Taxation and Inequality The World Bank Economic Premise, No. 8.
- Oanda (2014) Historical Currency Converter, <https://www.oanda.com/fx-for-business/historical-rates>.
- Okabe, Y., Shiratori, S., and Suda, K (2019) What motivates Japans international volunteers? Categorizing Japan overseas cooperation volunteers VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 30(5), pp 1069-1089.
- Owen, D (1965) English philanthropy 1660-1960. London: Oxford University Press.
- Payton, R. L (1988) Philanthropy: Voluntary action for the public good, New York Mcmillian Publishing Company.
- Payton, R. L., and Moody, M. P (2008) Understanding Philanthropy: It meaning and mission. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Qur'an (2023a) Web page: Ahadees.com, <http://ahadees.com/ayat-1-surah-29.html>, updated 2023, Last visited Dec 2023, World Wide Web.
- Qur'an (2023b) Web Page: <http://www.whyquran.com/877/content/view/81/updated> 2023, Last Visited, Dec 2023, World Wide Web.
- Qureshi, M., Ahmad, N., Ullah, S., & ul Mustafa, A. R. (2023). Forecasting real exchange rate (REER) using artificial intelligence and time series models. *Heliyon*, 9(5).
- Radovanovic, R (2019) Individual giving: Theoretical discussions and the evidence from Serbia and Canada: ethical issues, contextual and individual factors of giving time and money to organisations and people, Ph. D thesis, Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge.
- Rehman, S., Abro, A. A., Mustafa, A. R. U., Ullah, N., & Khattak, S. W. (2021). An analysis of stock market integration in the Asian developed and emerging markets. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 9(3), 1175-1190.
- Reich, R (2018) Just giving: Why Philanthropy is falling democracy and how it can do better, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Rodgers, B (1949) Cloak of Charity: Studies in eighteen century philanthropy. London Methuen and Co Ltd.
- Rosenthal, J. T (1972) The purchase of paradise: Gift giving and the aristocracy, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp 1307- 1485.
- Ruiter, S., and De Graaf, N. D (2006) National context, religiosity and volunteering: Results from 53 countries, *Amercian Sociological Review*, 71(2) pp 191-210.
- Salamon, L. M., and Anheier, H. K (1992) In search of the non-profit sector: The question of definition, VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization, 3(2), pp 125-151.
- Salamon, L. M., and Anheir, H, K (1998) Social organs of civil society: Explaining the non-profit sector coral nationality. VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization, 9(3), pp 2013-248.
- Schuyt, T. N (2020) world of giving. Philanthropy as a Universal Social Agreement, Amsterdam, The Neitherland.
- Sen, A., Chatterjee, R., Nayak, N and Mahakud, J (2020) Determinants of individual giving behavior in urban India. VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization, 3(2), pp 271-285.
- Sulek, M (2010a) On the classical meaning of philanthropic Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39(3), pp 385-408.
- Sulek, M (2010b) On the modern meaning of philanthropy, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39(2), 193-212.

- Taqi, M., e Ali, M. S., Parveen, S., Babar, M., & Khan, I. M. (2021). An analysis of Human Development Index and Economic Growth. A Case Study of Pakistan. *iRASD Journal of Economics*, 3(3), 261-271.
- Tashfeen, M. A., Hamdani, H. S. N., and Malik, W. S (2008) The role of philanthropy towards good governance. Presented in 4th International Conference of Mahdism doctrine, Tehran, Islamic Republic Iran.
- Tashfeen, M. A., Hamdani, H. S. N., and Malik, W. S (2008) The role of philanthropy towards good governance. Presented in 4th International Conference of Mahdism doctrine, Tehran, Islamic Republic Iran.
- Tashfeen, T. and Bhatti, M. A (2013) Faith based Afterlife Incentives in Philanthropic Behavior. Presented in ASREC Conference Washington DC.
- Tashfeen, T. and Bhatti, M. A (2013) Faith based Afterlife Incentives in Philanthropic Behavior. Presented in ASREC Conference Washington DC.
- Tertychnaya, K., De Vries, C. E., Solaz, H., and Doyle, D. (2018) When the money stops: Fluctuation in financial remittances and incumbent approval in central eastern Europe, Central Asia, *American Political Review*, 112(4), pp 758-774.
- Thielmann, I., Spandaro, G., and Balliet, D (2020) Personality and prosocial behavior: A theoretical framework and meta-analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(1), pp 30-90.
- US Bureau of Labour Statistics (2014) Achieved consumer price index detailed report, <https://www.bls.gov/cpi/tables/detailedreports/home.htm>.
- Vieites, Y (2017) The prosocial class: How social class influences prosocial behavior Rio De Janiero Brazil, Ph. D Thesis Escola Brasileira de Administracao Publica e de Empresas.
- Villanueva, E (2018) Decentralizing wealth: Indigenous wisdom to heal divides and restrore balance, Oakland, Berett Koehler Publisher.
- Wiepking, P (2021) The Global Study of Philanthropic Behavior, VOLUNTAS: International Society for Third Sector Research. 32, pp 194-203 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00279>.
- Wiepking, P., and Handy F (2015) The practice of philanthropy: The facilitation factors from across national perspective In P. Weipking, and Handy (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillian , pp 597-623.
- Wiepking, P., and Handy, F (2016) Documentation individual international philanthropy data base IIPD, A comparative study of global giving Rotterdam, The Neitherland. Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Wiepking, P., and Handy, F Eds (2015a) *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy*, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Wiepking, P., Handy, F., Park, S., Neumayr, M., Bekkers, R., Breeze, B., et al. (2020) Global philanthropy: How institutional factors enable philanthropic giving Revise and Resubmit with Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.
- WINGS (2018) The gloval landscape of philanthropy, Sao Paulo: WINGS.
- Women Philanthropy Institute (2019) Who is a Philanthropist? Indianaopolis, <https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/institutes/womens-philanthropy-institute/research/women-give19-video.html>.
- World Values Study Group (2005) World values survey 2005-2006 Ann Arbour MI; Inter university consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Xinsong, W., Fingqin, L., Fang, N., Xiaoping, Z., Xiulan, Z (2015) Giving in China; An emerging non-profit sector embedded within a strong state in P. Weipking and F, Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy*, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillian, pp 354-368.

- Yang, Y., and Wiepking, P (2020) Party membership and charitable giving in China: The mediating role of resource networks prosocial values, and making compulsory donations. Forthcoming Voluntary Sector Review.
- Yasin, K (2020) Philanthropy in Ethiopia: A strong culture of philanthropy and challenging but improving legal and fiscal infrastructure to the third sector. Indianapolis, IN Working paper Lilly School of Philanthropy.
- Yonah, H (2019) Major life changing events and prosocial behavior. Terrorism mas shooting natural disaster immigration and philanthropy. Jerusalem, Israel, Ph. D thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Zafar S., Tashfeen, A., and Irina Georgescu (2023) Public good in philanthropic behavior: location and association, Journal of Asian Development Studies, out for publication.
- Ziloochi, M. H., Sari, A. A., Takian, A., and Arab, M (2019) charitable contribution in health care: What drives Iranians to donate money? Achieve of Iranian Medicine AIM, 22(2), pp 109-115.