



Philanthropic Behavior on Finance Cherish the communities

Sohail Zafar¹, Anna Uhlin² and Wafa Ben Khaled³

¹Corresponding author, Ph. D scholar on migrate from KIE, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Muzaffarabad,
email: sohail.zafar@iiu.edu.pk

²Associate Senior Lecturer, Department of Organization and Management Mälardalen University.

³Assistant Professor at ESCP Business School, University of Birmingham.
Email - sohail.zafar@iiu.edu.pk

Abstract: Research on philanthropic behavior is taking wider shades of life account for billions of dollars donated. And many cared for meals in developing countries. The steps of government for none sleep hungry. Philanthropic behavior is pivotal on promoting wellbeing of society, and encounter analysis to discuss several aspects of individualism. On generosity this is one major source for belongings on philanthropy, such as donating money to fund one or many. On terminology one who get engaged in philanthropy is more toward not only in this world but life here after, enjoying twin benefit of addition in this life and after. Most often those philanthropist are well to do. However in a cross country analysis carried by gallop world poll this is not the case. On evidence it appear developing countries are more toward giving then some of the European countries. This aspect of giving needs us to focus on behavioral concerns more specifically, what society reflect in giving. Without being wealthy people do giving. This give rise to questions for spreadsheet of spending in public and private limited firms if we just get out of the individual giving count. This means embarrassment for more toward a happier life then without giving. It improve the norms in society, justice to bring those capable but are not financially strong to perform, because of specific ties may be in the form of some giving could let them get forward on economic activity. University scholarship in philanthropic behavior, divine economics, divine finance, divine welfare. This paper focus on giving how it become a two way phenomenon benefiting, both receiver and one give. It cherish the communities. Those receive get mentally better and solved for ties and good luck get on their way. It's like a good luck penny for a person a reward for all community. An opposite gravity of good luck is bad luck which relay prolong to recover. Giving in a society let people for having means, government recognize them well off and for receivers it register them for a count on community. This paper shall also shed light on public and private giving in Pakistan.

Keywords: philanthropic behavior giving charity volunteer wellbeing.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Philanthropy is an important counter part of society. It is well recognized in democratic society. The word philanthropy is derived from phils, a greek word on loving and antropos, means humankind. Purpose of this behavior is originally a wellbeing of a society. Barman (2017) defines philanthropy as private giving for public Atul and Samnath (2023) Azimpour et al. (2017). More generally those give are not answerable, to government and this gather a whole lot all together. It also declare none to the criteria and choose and choice is out of the said pattern and ties Azziz and Ronald (1975) Barron and Chou (2017) Edwards (2008) Fombrun and Shanley (1975) Francis and Pearson (1987). It could be a choice of pleasure behind which on return is itself rewarding Bible (2023). One side of the act of philanthropy in western society is to let closer and on the other end a cohabitation. Jointly important in European universities and their standard of education. Giving implicitly work through for more equitable society on knowledge. However this is not the case in Muslim societies Bemmett and Einolf (2017) Bering and Johnson Hamkdani (2003) Hamdani (2004) Hamdani and Eatzaz (2002a). On Philanthropic behavior it is free to choose among people and this further let them out from ties, register or laws enforced from government Edwards (2008) Fombrun and Shanley (1990) Francis and Pearson (1987) or governments are poor around the world for not having said pattern. On high mass consumption this aspect get more importance for what and how much wealth in this life. Schools, pools, clubs, libraries, hospitals in every aspect of life, comes support and this support is from generosity, more precisely philanthropic behavior. Human nature and human connection and on pressing the actions of extensive society on well Bing of social individuality in return a reward in



kind and ethics for public as whole King and Nicol (1999) Krettenauer and Hdertz (2005). This is in the form of greater advancements on knowledge and capital. For kind and generous means others more positively taking part in charitable activities Bennett and Einolf (2017) Bering and Johnson (2005). It is like adding to the best fit with greater magnitude for adding every type of people in a liberal society. Philanthropy is an old concept, thousands of years old Bennet and Einolf (2017). Its implications and evidences for betterment is rather new. People practice it for several reason kindness and concerns for common good. Some people even get it for recognition. And this is orientation for geographic dimensions for giving. One reason could be to obtain the favor of gods such as idol worshipers the hell creatures on philanthropy. Torah, the example of those who were ordered to bear the responsibility of acting upon the Torah then they did not care, is like a donkey that carries a load of books Qur'an (62: 5). Bible and Qur'an are said examples a proper code. A religious society shall get more rewarding than those practice evil and fill evil needs of the society. Buddhism Japanese and Native Americans culture and Hinduism. Generally, Zakat or giving is one of the five pillars of islam, it is to help people become closer to God Qur'an (2023a, 2023b) Bible (2023). Giving is a way to honor the sacredness of each individual. Amen I say to you weather you did for one of the least brothers of mine, you did for me. The highest level in helping is someone to become self-sufficient which is itself explanation of Philanthropy Hamdani (2004) Hamdani and Eatzaz (2002a). This study identify giving is philanthropy and how relationship between giving and charitable work together in a society for public and private entities. To be more towards charity means more towards a society then individuality. This study on methodology use conceptual understandings as measuring rod for highlighting conceptual framework. Research on philanthropy use several quantitative and qualitative methods. Across culture analysis well document what needs a society. People in a wide range of activity cooperate in public good gain De Graaf (2006) charitable giving Borgonvi (2008) and helping strangers Bennett and Einolf (2017) researchers treat philanthropic behavior more as universal in every society this is rebound for it pay back. This is well documented in all disciplines on ethical standards. Aknin et al. (2013) discussed different cultures experience giving a warm glow for meta-analysis in resource imaging. Strategic decision work properly in this concern Cutler and Campbell (2019) contributing to society reward and light up. In another study Thielmann and Baillet (2020) the influence of personality and behavior conclude in return a trait for prosaically behavior it take concerns of others in orientation for welfare. These are more strongly correlated for prosaically ends in economic turn overs in public limited firms Bennett and Einolf (2017) Vering and Johnson (2005). Although much research has examined the effect of income on happiness. How it matter for spending to be managed for giving Corbin and Strauss (2008) Chocrance (1979). More specifically we hypothesize that spending means money bring as important as it earn. Specifically, expenditure on individual framework including charitable are more rewarding for return on happiness to the individual and as a whole to the society Hamdani (2003) Hamdani (2004) Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) Gibbs (2003). It is on the basis of evidences governed by philanthropic behavior, individuality or in terms of private or public enterprise work through registered government spending. Ultimate source in return is happiness not only for a unit but society Iannacone (1998) Gibbs (2003) Iannacone (1986) Hamdani (2003) Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) Gibbs (2003) Iannacone (1988) Iannacone (1990) Hamdani (2004) Iannacone (1991) Iannacone (1992) Zafar (2020a, 2020b) Zafar et al. (2023). Finally participants suppose randomly assigned coding for results in nested framework are in evidence gather more weight for spending in giving on proportionality to non-giving. Happiness is a core reflection in two way outcome either charitable or money itself in currency notes Dunn et al. (2008) Zafar et al. (2023). The principals of being indifferent in management of personal traits in decision making for spending in different market goods work through self-determination. Which in turn explain motivation for economic products in giving. This further project for public and private entities working on the ground, moral values determined by personal reasoning which ultimately center on physical health on economic interface Hill and Howell (2011) Hamdani and Eatzaz (2002a, 2002b). For an action could be violation of personal traits in philanthropic behavior need to understand self-determination out of conscious and unconscious decisions for an effective decision making Burki et al. (1997). It need in other words to be well aware of manufacturing and individual indeed for optimality. To get involved is fundamental for being connected in giving and charitable organizations Edwards (2008) Fombrun and Shanley (1990). This reality shape the decision making of individuals for better ends Deaton and Mulbauer (1980). This create a bonding between giving and society likely to bring ends on economic development Giacalone and Kiewicz (2003) Gibbs (2003). It's similar to a state of mind where some opportunity arise for some at a particular time period and this is on the basis of set of activities going on in day to day working of individual in philanthropic behavior. Personal choice and how it direct the inputs for out puts is the question of performance measurement in an organization which is beyond the scope of this research. Research on giving and philanthropic behavior point out to the question of identifying traits and variables that better explain the relationship Glover (1997) Gotsis and Kortezi (2008) Greeley and John (1991). These traits in giving are key source in sustainable society taken as a whole or in macro framework of localities.



2. Methodology and Discussion :

Generic data models are developed for solving the loopholes of conventional models. This could be better understood by social practices of economists and for having produced different on conventional data sets for models in the same domain. In Philanthropic behavior it appear the same because of different people with different location civilization Zafar et al. (2023) Zafar (2020a, 2020b) can lead to different giving such as one where it is added for having strangers. World Gallop Poll index and models on data sets on difficulty of keeping all modeling’s grouped together provided how collected the data or exchanged in civilizations. These differences are attributed on abstraction of models on differences and kind of facts incorporated in semantic expression capabilities in agreement for Philanthropic behavior. Generically it explicitly include versions of entity classes reasonably robust and easy to understand on computation of philanthropy. Although there are undoubtedly management shortcomings in philanthropic behavior, it nonetheless proceeds with a high degree of acceptability and applicability. We also use the Gallup World Poll in addition to Economic Survey IIPD. Nevertheless, there are a number of limitations, including the way it highlights inherent issues with the current comparable data source. Similar to the IIPD, the Gallup World Poll operationalizes philanthropic behavior in a problematic way due to its narrow definition. There are various problems in interpreting the question as a measure of charitable giving. These concerns are related to the previously discussed cultural variations in definition and variations in the opportunity to exhibit behavior across time periods in the Gallup World Poll. . More concrete and specific data models will be at risk of having to change the scope provided Generous means more toward people rather than money where as one branch of economic trying to capture the monitory worth of a human. A measured money for an individual this information reinforce economists to understand for part of human body sold in market or giving in philanthropy. Kidney centers are one example for this. Kidney research shall unveil the money behind and replacement charges and overall it return for wellbeing in a society. Philanthropic behavior is on evidence for specific parts of human body. Among the traits it identify the philanthropic behavior with in family such as giving kidney. Or body parts to known and unknown. Such as in Srilanka eye donation is most common among people where as it is even nil for some localities. Openness is more towards the people completely unknown for each other. Acceptance is also associated with acquisition of resources from friends or unknown. A study of receiving and engagement is another source of activity for being understood Carlo et al. (2005) there are evidences on philanthropic behavior for turn modest and straightforward in day to day scheduling events in economic wellbeing. This is view of a thin area of research for it differ for societies. Similarly extraversion associated with positive emotions for wealth see table 1 for giving in Pakistan. Some people involve in voluntary activities based on agreeable nature. Its more strongly advocate the idea of involvement in volunteerism in massive scale and organization working. Personality dimensions work implicitly outperform on philanthropic behavior becomes an important measure Carlo et al. (2005) Hill et al. (2013) and Hornik and Dan (1996). Charity in some cases is also used anonymously with philanthropy Giacalone and Jurkeiwicz (2003). Philanthropic interchangeably create a broader net for giving. The foundation of charity is typically personal giving and immediate assistance to others. The frequency with which time is donated to organizations or the community is another crucial aspect of time volunteering. About 24% of respondents to a Gallup Poll stated that they had volunteered more than a year ago for an organization. An additional 44% reported volunteering this week, 21% this month, and 13% during the previous six months. Baluchistan has the highest score of 44%, prudently varying in time volunteerism, followed by Punjab (27%), KP (22%), and Sindh (17%).

Category	Punjab	Sindh	KP	Baluchistan	AK & GB
1. Religion encourage giving	67%	67%	64%	72%	75%
People less fortunate.	24%	30%	25%	30%	29%
To help solve social problem.	23%	14%	24%	20%	29%
Care about cause.	11%	13%	10%	7%	4%
Trust on organization.	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%
Behavioral concerns	1%	1%	1%	0%	4%
All family member do giving.	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
People ask for help.	2%	4%	1%	4%	0%
Others	4%	5%	7%	0%	7%

Source world Gallop Poll (2021)



Category	Punjab	Sindh	KP	Baluchistan	AK	GB	Total
A large impact	21%	19%	29%	29%	27%	13%	21%
Somewhat large	43%	45%	34%	26%	53%	63%	43%
Small impact	16%	16%	12%	14%	13%	13%	16%
No impact	8%	7%	15%	12%	0%	0%	8%
Don't Know	12%	13%	10%	10%	7%	13%	12%

Source world Gallop Poll (2021)

Province	Last week	Last months	Last 6 months	Last 12 months	More than a year ago
Punjab	18%	23%	13%	11%	27%
Sindh	27%	16%	19%	16%	17%
KPK	26%	30%	13%	9%	22%
Baluchistan	11%	11%	22%	0%	44%
GB and AJK	43%	29%	0%	14%	14%
Total	24%	21%	13%	10%	24%

Source world Gallop Poll (2021)

However there are provincial variation in the percentage score of time volunteerism the time reference of past week a month and 12 months see table III Gallup Poll (2021). Like donations, it also giving for homeless. Helping out for contributing in food items. Free food points establishment such as Imran Khan Government had several free mobile food opening in different cities and even free mobile food delivery. Shelter house and to settle people in society. These are act of charity building school and libraries donation in millions of dollars Edwards (2008) Francis and Pearson (1987). Scholarships for divine economics and philanthropy. The scholarship fund in universities. On philanthropic sums for betterment of students helping to let them cope with financial ties and with stand to be effective member of society. The act of charity may be considered as philanthropic efforts for building room for those get hindrance to come up with Jones and pleasure Corbin and Strauss (2008). Scholarship fund shall be an added unit working in a department for the god of students. Awareness is another source of philanthropy out of alumni associations in universities. According to Gallup Poll Pakistan and similar survey done by WIN international across the world, 30% Pakistani agree that they are concerned about sharing their personal information and about the necessity of sharing personal information 24% share for its necessary now a days and 47% Pakistani are not fine with privacy practice of data collectors. 46% Pakistani don't know what happen with their personal information. Gallup Poll (2021b). That is people more likely to help when they realize help is needed. It is also important to note that effective mechanism and collection record will help researchers to find the difference on scale and scope Miller (1977) Warren and Walker (1991).

Another approach on philanthropy is awareness and communication between people giving Bryant and Tax (2003). People weigh the cost and benefit for giving and focus on only that part where they see more social outcomes Miller (1999). There is some diversity in the responses as indicated by the province's score for the perceived impact of charity contributions. However, the percentage of respondents who felt that their donations had a significant and moderately significant influence across all provinces, with AJK and Gilgit Baltistan scoring the highest overall at 80% and 76%, respectively, and KPK scoring lower at 63%. Sindh: 65% Balochistan 65% and Punjab 64% Gallup Survey (2021)—refer to Table 1 This suggests that people would rather donate to organizations that they believe would have a positive impact and make them feel good about themselves. University departmental activity is one example for activities. Individuals are also concerned on reputation or one social standing this ultimately effect charitable giving. According to a survey conducted by Gallup Poll in Pakisan 76% of Pakistanis agree either completely or somewhat getting a college university degree is important for success in life. A nationality representative sample of adult men and women from across the country were asked the question, "Please tell how much you agree or disagree with the statement getting a



college /university degree is very important for a successful life? In response 65% said completely agree 11% said agree to some extent 2% said neither agree nor disagree 6% said disagree to some extent 12% said completely disagree 3% said that they did not know or gave no response Gallop Poll (2023a). There is significant research in VOLUNTAS on the basis of published articles in journals Zafar et al. (2023) effectively engage in highlighting the giving internationally. In a country wise comparison 77% of Pakistanis agree that a higher education degree is important for success in life. When the results are broken down by nation, it can be seen that 3% more Indians and 2% more Singaporeans share this belief, but Malaysians' share is just 3% lower than Pakistan's. Gallop Pakistan Gallup Poll conducted and published the survey in Pakistan (2023a). This was a telephone poll with a 95% confidence level, conducted among 1303 men and women in urban and rural locations across all four provinces of the nation. Social pressure is another source not only affect oppositely it also hinder on scale Bekkers and Wiepking (2007). In addition to social benefit reputation and philanthropic behavior together on one page rule out inefficiencies on scale Coyne (1997) Creswell (2023) Cunningham (2007). Individuals give depending on mood and image. Those with positive image help the pool of people with a like mood Bennett and Einolf (2017). Such as in a society of people helping each other Hamdnai (2003) Hamdani (20004) Hamdani and Eatzaz (2002a, 2002b). People help others through philanthropy more likely to have altruistic nature prosaically and post materialistic gather values for moral responsibility Bekkers and Weipking (2007) Ray (1998) it energies the process for more giving. Once people understand their charitable are working through and see apparently for what it get on results on media is another example for university alumni for making headlines for those have given and the output. With regard to efficiency such as events in departments on international upfront for outcomes and declaration. The contributions and return, a successful members of society. People understand their input is important and they want to see the outcome. In departmental activates on philanthropy should be on news or highlights. Is an effective supportive cell working implicitly in departments for the good of university students? When people see their giving returns they give more. They feel their giving are on the right place and are provided in the right amount Jackson and, Mathew (1995) Parsons (2003).

3. Conclusion:

Happier people give more and giving make people happier. Happiness and giving operate in a positive way. Giving is good when it optimize ones basket of spending. A list of purchase include purchase of philanthropy. It is when it share some for others on reap a return for both. Philanthropy is also linked with harmonic changes in body feeling warmth for other connection and in return giving more. It's a powerful activate on charity and giving in manufacturing's and individuals. Giving in traditional disciplines of philanthropy a tool for fulfilling needs of others. Fundamental tool in building social confidence connect people and build a network for making the difference. Philanthropic behavior is globally known and is an effective tool for sustainable development. The benefits of philanthropy are countess in short term or long term analysis. Corporations that support charitable giving and receive a wealth on return in a multiple set out a langrage. Attracting new partners for helping the pool of talent such as companies engaged for charities.

REFERENCES :

1. Akin, L., Barrington C., Dnn, E., Helliell, J., Burn, J., Biswas Diener et al. (2013) Prosaically spending and well-being: Cross culture evidence for a psychological universal, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(4), pp 635-652.
2. Atul and Samnath (2023) Charity donation behavior: A systematic literature review and research agenda, *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 35(1), pp 1-46.
3. Azimpour et al. (2017) The linkage of intelligence, prosaically moral reasoning and moral identity among Iranian university students, *International Journal of Psychology*, 11, pp 150-181.
4. Azzi, C., and Ronald, E (1975) Household allocation of time and church attendance, *Journal of Political Economy*, 84(3), pp 27-56.
5. Barman, E (2017) The social basis of philanthropy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43, pp 271-290.
6. Barron, K., and Chou, S (2017) Spirituality and social responsibility performance, *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 8 pp 63-82 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-07-2016-0020>
7. Bekkers, R (2006) Traditional and health related philanthropy the role of resources and personality, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(4), pp 349-366.



8. Bennett, M and Eionolf, C (2017) Religion altruism and helping strangers: A multivalve analysis of 126 countries, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 5(6), 323-341.
9. Bennett, M., and Einolf, C (2017) Religion altruism and helping strangers: A multilevel analysis of 126 countries, *Journal of the scientific study of religion*, 56, pp 323-341.
10. Bering, J., and Johnson, D (2005) O lord..., you perceive my thoughts from a far, *Recursive and the evolution of supernatural agency*, *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 5 pp 118-142.
11. Bible (2023) web pages <https://ethnicharvest.org/bibbles> in different languages last visited 2023.
12. Borgonovi, F (2008) Divided we stand united we fall: Religious pluralism, giving and volunteering, *American Sociological Review*, 73(1), pp 105-128.
13. Bryant, W., Haekyung J., Hoyjin, K., and Tax (2003) Participation in philanthropic activities: Donating Money and time, *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 26, pp 43-73.
14. Carlo, G., Moris, A., George P., Maria Rosario (2005) The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: Agreeable extraversion and prosocially values on motivation, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(6), PP 1293-1305.
15. Chocrance, W (1979) *Sampling techniques*, 3rd Edition, London John Willey.
16. Corbin, J., and Strauss, A (2008) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, London Sage,
17. Coyne, I (1997) Sampling in qualitative research: Purposeful and theoretical sampling merging or clear boundaries, *Journal of Advance Nursing*, 26, pp 623-630.
18. Creswell, J (2013) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* London Sage publication.
19. Cunningham, P (2007) The challenges prospects and promise of transpersonal psychology, *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 26, pp 41-55.
20. Cutler, J and Campbell- Meiklejohn D (2019) A comparative Firm meta-analysis of altruistic and strategic decision to give, *Neuroimaging*, 184, pp 227-241.
21. Deaton, A., and Muelbauer J (1980) *Economics and consumer behavior*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Dunn, E., Lara, B., and Michael, N (2008) Spending money on others promotes happiness, *Science* 319(5870), pp 1687-1688.
23. Edwards, J (2008) Chapter four, Person environment fit in organizations: An assessment of theoretical progress, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), pp 167-230.
24. Fornbrun, C., and Shanley, M (19990) What's in the name? Reputation building and corporate strategy, *Academy of Management Journal* 33, pp 233-258.
25. Francis, L and Pearson, P (1987) Empathic development during adolescence: Religiosity, the missing link? *Personality and Individual differences*, 8 pp 145-148.
26. Gallup Poll (2021) Pakistan Giving Index, Pakistan Center of Philanthropy, Retrived from www.pcp.org.pk pp 1-34.
27. Gallup Poll (2021b) TPakistani about their personal information data and share with data collection, oll from Gallop Pakistan International, pp 1-3.
28. Gallup Poll (2023a) Tell how much you agree or disagree with the statement getting a college/ university degeee is very important to succeed in life, Opinion Poll from Gallop Pakistan International, pp 1-3.
29. Giacalone, R., and Jurkiewicz, C (2003) Toward a science of workplace spirituality, In Giacalone R. Jukiewicz, C (Eds) *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organization performance*, New York ME Sharpe, pp 3-28.
30. Gibs, J (2003) *Moral development and reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg and Hoffman* London, UK Sage Publication.
31. Glover, R (1997) Relationships in moral reasoning and religion among members of conservative moderate, and liberal religious groups, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, pp 247-254.
32. Gotsis, G and Kortezi, Z (2008) Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach, *Journal of Business and Ethics*, 78, pp 575-600.
33. Greeley, A., and John, D (1991) A model of religious choice under uncertainty, *Rationality and Society*, 3(2), pp 178-196.
34. Hamdani, N (2003) A divine economics framework for the study of time allocation behavior and religiosity, *University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Kashmir Economic Review* II.



35. Hamdani, N (2004) Religious orientation as a factor in time allocation, Ph. D dissertation, submitted to the Department of Economics, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.
36. Hamdani, N and Eatnaz, A (2002b) Religiosity and time allocation behavior paper presented at Asia and Southeast Asia Economic Society meeting, Lahore University of Management Science, Lahore.
37. Hamdani, N., and Eatnaz, A (2002a) towards divine economics some testable propositions, *The Development Review* 41(1), pp 607-26.
38. Herich, J., Boyd., B., Fehr, E., Camerer, C., and Gintis, H (2004) *Foundation of humanity society: Economic experiment of ethnographic evidence from fifteen small scale societies* Oxford University Press on Demand.
39. Hornik, J., and Dan, Z (1996) Psychological time: The case of time and consumer behavior, *ociety* 5(3), pp 385-397.
40. Howell, R., Chenot, D., Hill, G., and Howell C (2011) Momentary happiness: The role of psychological need satisfaction, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12(1), pp 1-15.
41. Iannacone, L (1988) A formal model of church and sect, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp-241-268.
42. Iannacone, L (1990) Religious participation A human capital approach, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29(3), pp 297-314.
43. Iannacone, L (1991) The consequences of religious market structure Adam Smith and the economics of religion, *Rationality and Society*, 3(2), pp 156-177.
44. Iannacone, L (1992) Sacrifice and stigma, Reducing free riding in cults, communes and other collectives, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(2), pp 271-291.
45. Iannacone, L (1996) Addiction and satiation, *Economic Letters*, 21, pp 95-99
46. Iannacone, L (1998) The Introduction of economics of religion, *Journal of Economic Literature*, pp 1465-1496.I
47. Jackson, N., and Mark R (1995) Using Public feedback to increase contribution to a multipurpose senior center, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis*, 28, pp 449-455.
48. King, S., and Nicol, D (1999) Organizational Enhancement through recognition of individual spirituality: Reflection of Jaques and Jung, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(3), pp 234-243.
49. Krettenauer, T., and Hertz, S (2015) What develops in moral identities? A critical review, *Human Development*, 58, pp 137-153.
50. Miller, D (1999) The Norm of Self-interest, *American Psychologist* 54, pp 1053-1060.
51. Parson, L., (2003) Is Accounting information from nonprofit organization useful for donor? A Review of Charitable Giving and Value Relevance, *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 22, p 104-129.
52. Payne, A., (1998) Does the government crowd out private donation new evidence from a sample of nonprofit firms? *Journal of Public Economics*, 69, pp 323-345.
53. Ray, L (1998) Why we give: Testing economic and social psychological accounts of altruism, *Polity*, 30, pp 383-415.
54. Ruiters, S., De, G (2006) National context, religiosity and volunteering Results from 53 countries, *American Sociological Review*, 71(2), pp 191-210.
55. Thielmann, I., Spadaro, G., and Balliet, D (2020) Personality and prosocially behavior, A theoretical framework meta-analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(1), pp 30-90.
56. Warren, P., and Ian, W (1991) Empathy effectiveness and Donations to charity: Social psychology contribution, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, pp 325-337.
57. Zafar, S (2020a) Public ownership in banking: Modeling divine energy efficiency of selected Chinese banks in China Pak economic corridor (CPEC), *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 9(4), pp 7-18.
58. Zafar, S., (2020b) Evidence on allocative efficiency and scale economies of National Bank of Pakistan, Unpublished Ph. D thesis, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Muzaffarbad.
59. Zafar, S., Tashfeen, A., and Irina, G (2023) Positive trend technology in philanthropic behavior, *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, out for publication. pp 1-14.