Science of Generosity Request for Proposals

The University of Notre Dame is pleased to announce a $3 million project on the Science of Generosity, generously supported with funding from the John Templeton Foundation. Open invitations are now issued for proposals for the Science of Generosity in the human and social sciences. Four to eight proposals with requested funding from $250,000 - $500,000 will be awarded in this first wave of competition in 2009. A second competition in 2010 will fund $1.2 million of smaller projects for projects with budgets up to $150,000. Letters of inquiry (LOIs) for the first wave of the competition were due April 1, 2009. LOIs for second wave of competition must be received by December 1, 2009.

Generosity is an important personal virtue, collective responsibility, and vital element in the building of social capital, community wellbeing, justice, and peace in the world. The aim of this initiative is to stimulate scientific research on the practice of generosity in human life and society. Notre Dame’s Science of Generosity project is particularly interested in better understanding three key aspects of generosity:

1. The sources, origins, and causes of generosity
2. The variety of manifestations and expressions of generosity
3. The consequences of generosity for both the givers and receivers involved

We believe it is useful to separate these three analytical dimensions of generosity—its sources, manifestations, and consequences—and invite proposals that seek to understand only one dimension as well as seek to understand two or three and the relationships between them.

For purposes of this project, "generosity" is defined as the disposition toward and practice of giving good things to others freely and abundantly. Generosity may involve the giving of money, possessions, time, attention, aid, encouragement, emotional investment, and more. As a research topic, generosity is related to but not identical with the areas of charitable financial giving, volunteering, altruism, philanthropy, informal helping, corporate giving, voluntary service, bequests and estates, relational commitment, love, social exchange, and so on.

Through this initiative, we hope to create a coherent field of academic study centered on the questions of the origins, manifestations, and consequences of generosity. We wish to help internationalize generosity studies by forming a global scholarly network of social and human scientists who are interested in generosity. We intend to launch a great many major research initiatives on generosity by top scholars around the world. We hope the disseminated findings of this proposed project will have the effect of increasing the practices of generosity of many millions of people through personal and organizational means. We believe that a significant growth in generosity will have the very practical enduring effect of
increasing human love, wellbeing, responsibility, organizational functionality, prosperity, and justice in the world.

What is Generosity?

Etymology of Generosity

The modern English word "generosity" derives from the Latin word *generōsus*, which means "of noble birth," which itself was passed down to English through the Old French word *generous*.

- The Latin stem *gener-* is the declensional stem of *genus*, meaning "kin," "clan," "race," or "stock," with the root Indo–European meaning of *gen* being "to beget."
- The same root gives us the words genesis, gentry, gender, genital, gentile, genealogy, and genius, among others.
- Most recorded English uses of the word "generous" up to and during the Sixteenth Century reflect an aristocratic sense of being of noble lineage or high birth. To be generous was literally a way of saying "to belong to nobility."

During the 17th Century, however, the meaning and use of the word began to change. Generosity came increasingly to identify not literal family heritage but a nobility of *spirit* thought to be associated with high birth— that is, with various admirable qualities that could now vary from person to person, depending not on family history but on whether a person actually possessed the qualities.

- In this way generosity increasingly came in the 17th Century to signify a *variety* of traits of character and action historically associated (whether accurately or not) with the ideals of actual nobility: gallantry, courage, strength, richness, gentleness, and fairness.
- In addition to describing these diverse human qualities, "generous "became a word during this period used to describe fertile land, the strength of animal breeds, abundant provisions of food, vibrancy of colors, the strength of liquor, and the potency of medicine.

Then, during the 18th Century, the meaning of "generosity" continued to evolve in directions denoting the more specific, contemporary meaning of munificence, open–handedness, and liberality in the giving of money and possessions to others.

- This more specific meaning came to dominate English usage by the 19th Century.
- Over the last five centuries in the English speaking world, "generosity" developed from being primarily the description of an ascribed status pertaining to the elite nobility to being an achieved mark of admirable personal quality and action capable of being exercised in theory by any person who had learned virtue and noble character.
Modern Usage of the Word

This etymological genealogy tells us that the word "generosity" that we inherit and use today entails certain historical associations which may still inform, however faintly, our contemporary cultural sensibilities on the matter.

- Generosity has not long been viewed as a normal trait of ordinary, or of all people, but rather one expected to be practiced by those of higher quality or greater goodness.
- Generosity— unlike, say, truth telling or not stealing— is more an ideal toward which the best may aspire and achieve than a "democratic" obligation that is the duty of all to practice.
- Generosity may thus, on the positive side, properly call any given person to a higher standard.

Yet simultaneously (and more problematically), this two-tier understanding may have the effect of "excusing" the majority from practicing generosity because of their more ordinary perceived status.

We learn from this historical review that the meanings of words can and do evolve, and often do so in response to changing macro social conditions—such as long-term transitions from aristocratic to more democratic societies and cultures.

The Science of Generosity Project Usage

For our purposes, by generosity we mean the virtue of giving good things to others freely and abundantly.

- Generosity thus conceived is a learned character trait that involves both attitude and action—entailing as a virtue both an inclination or predilection to give liberally and an actual practice of giving liberally.
- Generosity is therefore not a random idea or haphazard behavior but rather, in its mature form, a basic, personal, moral orientation to life. Furthermore, in a world of moral contrasts, generosity entails not only the moral good expressed but also many vices rejected (selfishness, greed, fear, meanness).
- Generosity also involves giving to others not simply anything in abundance but rather giving those things that are good for others. Generosity always intends to enhance the true wellbeing of those to whom it gives.
- What exactly generosity gives can be various things: money, possessions, time, attention, aid, encouragement, emotional availability, and more.
- Generosity, to be clear, is not identical to pure altruism, since people can be authentically generous in part for reasons that serve their own interests as well as those of others. Indeed, insofar as generosity is a virtue, to practice it for the good of others also necessarily means that doing so achieves one’s own true, long-term good as well.
- And so generosity, like all of the virtues, is in people’s genuine enlightened self-interest to learn and practice.
Two Waves of Funding

The funding of research proposals by this initiative will take place in two waves targeting two sets of projects of different scales and budgets.

- In 2009, the Science of Generosity project at the University of Notre Dame will invite proposals for a first wave of funding for projects requesting budgets between $250,000-$500,000 and will fund 4-8 awards.
- In 2009, the Science of Generosity project at the University of Notre Dame will also invite a second wave of proposals requesting budgets of up to $150,000 and will fund 7-15 awards. Unsuccessful proposals in the first wave of competition may be invited to revise and submit again in the second wave.

Procedure

Judging of proposed research will be carried out in two stages.

- In the first stage, researchers will submit a 3-page letter of inquiry (LOI) describing their proposed project as clearly, thoroughly, and concisely as possible. An interdisciplinary panel of judges will review and evaluate the LOIs and then select a subset of the most promising and appropriate of the LOIs for invitation to submit a full proposal of their project.
- The invited principal investigators will then be requested to submit full proposals. An interdisciplinary panel of judges will review and evaluate the full proposals and recommend the strongest LOIs for awards. Funding for projects will be awarded directly from the University of Notre Dame.

Letter of Inquiry

The Letter of Inquiry (LOI) should be no longer than three (3) pages with an attached Letter of Inquiry (LOI) coversheet (single-spaced, single-sided, 12 point Times New Roman font, and one-inch margins) and should include:

1. Title for the proposed project
2. Description of the research
3. Explanation of how the proposed project fits within this initiative
4. Information on the methodology and significance
5. Required budget to complete the proposed research
6. Identification of collaborators (if applicable)
7. A one-page biographical sketch inclusive of all investigators (Note: this does not count toward 3-page LOI limit)

To be considered for the Wave 2 funding, all copies of your LOI with attached, completed coversheet and biographical sketch must be received between September 1, 2009 and before 5:00 p.m. EST on December 1, 2009. Before you mail your LOI packet, please copy and paste the information from your LOI coversheet into our online form which alerts our office to the pending arrival of your LOI.
packet. (Please note that submission of your information through our online form is a new requirement of LOI process.)

After completing the online form of intention, please mail by postal service or courier the seven (7) copies of your LOI to:

Science of Generosity  
University of Notre Dame  
936 Flanner Hall  
Notre Dame, IN 46556

If you have any questions on these submission guidelines please Contact Us.

Note: LOIs will not be accepted prior to September 1, 2009. Please check back for any updated requirements or information.

Full Proposal Guidelines

NOTE: Only researchers whose LOIs have been reviewed and approved by the project judges panel will be requested to submit full proposals.

Full proposals must be postmarked no later than the wave one due date of September 1, 2009 and wave two due date of May 1, 2010. All full proposal submissions must follow all the guidelines listed here to be considered complete.

The full proposal, including all required content and format (described below), must be submitted via 12 printed copies mailed to the Science of Generosity, University of Notre Dame, 936 Flanner Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556. If you experience any difficulty in downloading or viewing the documents, please contact the Project Manager.

All proposals must be submitted in English, single-spaced, and typed with one-inch margins. Font size is restricted to no smaller than 11-point and no larger than 12-point, and font type must be Times New Roman. Proposals that do not follow these font and margin specifications will not be accepted. Emphasis should also be placed on completeness, timeliness and clarity of content. The full proposal must include all content that is outlined in the following

Full Proposal Content

The following is a description of documents that will be required for all full proposal submissions:

1. Cover Sheet [downloadable from website]  
2. Table of Contents  
3. Project Summary  
4. Project Description  
5. Project Timeline
6. Curriculum Vitae
7. Detailed Budget
8. Budget Narrative

1. Full Proposal Cover Sheet
   Please complete the Cover Sheet and include it as the first page of the proposal. It can be downloaded here. The Principal Investigator, who is ultimately responsible for the scientific conduct of the proposed project, must ink sign the cover sheet.

   If applicable, an official of the applicant institution, who is authorizing the proposed project and its budget, must ink sign the Cover Sheet as well. As indicated on the coversheet, be sure to identify the financial contact, or key contact person who will handle all or most of the financial aspects of your project. If the proposed project uses human or animal subjects, please be certain to note any institutional review board (IRB) approvals required and/or secured for the project. Documentation of IRB and/or human subject approval authorization, or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval of the use of animal subjects will be required before initial payment may be made.

2. Table of Contents (1-page limit)
   This one-page section of your full proposal is simply an outline (table of contents) for the project proposal itself. Following the Cover Sheet, your Table of Contents should mirror the headings of each required section that is outlined in the RFP Guidelines from 3. Project Summary through 7. Detailed Budget. You may include subheadings under each major section heading to provide brief detail, but it should not to exceed one page.

3. Project Summary (1-page limit)
   The proposal must contain a one-page, single-spaced summary of the proposed activity. The Project Summary should include a statement of research objectives and methods to be employed. Within the Project Summary, it must clearly address in separate statements: (1) the intellectual merit of the proposed activity; and (2) the broader impacts resulting from the proposed activity. It should be informative to other persons working in the same or related fields and, insofar as possible, understandable to a scientifically or technically literate lay reader.

4. Project Description (maximum of 10-pages, single-spaced)
   The central part of the proposal will be a narrative description of the project itself. Please limit the Project Description to no greater than 10 pages (not including references/bibliography/appendices). It should include:

   1. Research hypotheses (within which it is important to clarify your use of the term "generosity");
   2. Objectives for the period of the proposed work;
   3. Relationship of the project to the relevant scholarly literature, and your project’s distinctive contribution to generosity research, including a description of how your project builds on previous research;
   4. Detailed explanation of the activity of the grant, including how the project will specifically address studying the underlying causal mechanisms of generosity;
   5. Thoughtful explanation on how the project will further understanding of at least one of the following: 1) The sources, origins, and causes of generosity, 2) The variety of manifestations and
expressions of generosity, 3) The consequences of generosity for both the givers and receivers involved;
6. Methodologies and plans for data analysis;
7. Statistical considerations (if applicable) and sample survey questions or in-person interview schedule (if survey or in-person interview research is being undertaken);
8. Any demonstrated commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration, including an explanation of the range and levels of involvement of scholars and researchers within multiple academic disciplines; and
9. Statements elaborating on the expected significance of this work, with reference to the Evaluation Criteria for the program.

Note: There is no page limit for the bibliography/references/appendices portion of the Project Description.

5. Project Timeline (1-page limit)
The Project Timeline should detail the major activities of the proposed project timeline period ending no later than May 31, 2012. Briefly describe the major goals, tactics, and responsible parties throughout the course of the project.

6. Curriculum Vitae (No page limit)
Names and full CVs of the Principal Investigator, and the Co-investigators participating in the project.

7. Detailed Budget Summary
Please submit a Budget Summary for each calendar year period (this will include all or parts of three consecutive years (2010-2012) for the requested funds. (Please refer to the instructions below for completing the Budget Summary.) We ask that you also include cumulative or "Total Projected Costs" within the budget.

Budget Guidelines:

I. General
A. Each grant proposal must contain a budget summary in the required format. Budget amounts must be entered in whole dollar (US) amounts (e.g. $2000 [correct]; $2000.50 [incorrect])

B. Identify each yearly request for each line item. If applicable, please include any known sources of other funding per line item. If you have no other sources of funding, then all values entered in this final column should match all values entered in the "Total Projected Costs" column.

II. Budget Line Items
Careful budgeting is encouraged in order to maximize the impact of the project as a whole, with emphasis on scientific return per dollar rather than per proposal. Modest (less than 15% of the total grant) expenses for computer equipment, travel, publication charges and supplies are allowable, provided that these items are clearly explained and justified in the proposal. The following is a brief outline of budget documentation requirements by line item. (NOTE: All documentation, justification/explanation required on the line items below should be provided in the Budget Justification Narrative - Part 8 of the full proposal content.)
A. **Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits.** List individually, all senior personnel (names and abbreviated titles) and their percentage of effort dedicated to the project for each year’s budget (e.g. "John Smith, Asst. Prof., 15"). Grant funds may not be used to augment the total salary or rate of salary of faculty members during the period covered by the term of faculty appointment or to reimburse faculty members for consulting or other time in addition to a regular fulltime organization salary covering the same general period of employment. In most circumstances, particularly for institutions of higher education, salaries of administrative or clerical staff are included as part of indirect costs. However, salaries of administrative or clerical staff may be requested as direct costs for a project requiring an extensive amount of administrative or clerical support where these costs can be readily and specifically identified with the project. For fringe benefits please list the percentage of salary costs being applied to this grant as well as the normal institution fringe benefits percentage in the budget justification narrative.

B. **Consultant or Subcontractor Services.** Consultant services should be justified and information furnished on each individual/firm’s expertise, primary organizational affiliation, normal daily compensation rate and number of days of expected service. Consultants’ travel costs and per diem allowances should be listed in the *Budget Justification Narrative*. Payment for consultants’ services, exclusive of expenses, may not exceed the consultant’s normal rate or the normal daily maximum rate established by the research organization, whichever is less. Indirect costs are not applied to consultant expenses or subcontracts.

C. **Equipment.** Items of needed equipment should be listed individually by description and estimated cost, including tax, and adequately justified in the *Budget Justification Narrative*. General purpose equipment, such as a personal computer, are not eligible for support unless exclusively used in the actual conduct of this project. Indirect costs are not applied to equipment.

D. **Travel.** Address the type and extent of travel and its relation to the project. This line item refers to travel, if any, that is required for your project. The travel expenses for the Science of Generosity project events are funded by the [University of Notre Dame](https://www.nd.edu); therefore, the expenses for these two events should **not** be reflected in your *Budget Summary* and *Budget Justification Narrative*.

E. **Other Direct Costs.** Any costs charged to a grant must be reasonable and directly allocable to the supported activity. The budget should identify and itemize other anticipated direct costs not included under the headings above, including materials and supplies, publication costs, computer services, participant/subject costs, communications, and other direct expenses:

1. **Materials and Supplies** - Indicate types required and estimate costs.
2. **Participant Costs** - Indicate costs associated with testing on subjects including fees and travel for human subjects as well as care costs for animal testing.
3. **Publication Costs** - Costs associated with editing, reviewing, and printing.
4. **Computer Services** - Include justification based on estimated computer service rates at the proposing institution. Purchase of equipment should be included under line item C.
5. **Communications** - Possible communications costs include online services used for the direct work of this grant, shipping costs directly associated with the work of this grant, or separate telephone services needed to complete the work of this grant.
6. **Other** - Itemize and justify.
F. **Total Direct Costs:** Sum of line items $A$ through $E$.

G. **Indirect Costs.** Indirect costs/overhead are not levied on equipment, consultants/subcontractors, or any function that is outsourced such as computer services. If this function is being performed by staff from the home institute, then indirect costs may be taken on it. **Indirect costs are limited to 15% of applicable line items.**

H. **Total Costs:** Sum of line items $F$ and $G$.

---

III. **Funding from Other Sources**

Within this column of the *Detailed Budget Summary*, be sure to identify, in whole dollar amounts, each pending and/or current grant that may overlap with your potential funding from the University of Notre Dame.

8. **Budget Justification Narrative (no page limit)**

A narrative budget justification is required. Please explain the costs associated with each line item (please do not justify each 12 month period separately). Also, include some detail on your sources of other funding. There is no page limit, but you are encouraged to be succinct.

*Note:* All awards will formally be made on a cost-reimbursable basis. Awardees must invoice for costs that have actually been incurred during the invoice period. Invoicing against the budget is not allowed (i.e. dividing the budget by the number of budget months). The invoice must be signed by a person who has responsibility for official financial data and can certify its validity. The PI is usually not this person. Payment will be provided within 30 days of invoice receipt. Invoices can be submitted monthly, quarterly, or annually for costs of $1,000 or more.

**Timeline**

**Due Date**

All materials for full proposals must be post marked no later than **September 1, 2009** for the first wave of funding applications and **May 1, 2010** for the second wave of funding applications. All principal investigators are subject to strict adherence to this deadline. It is the sole responsibility of the principal investigators for ensuring that their full proposals are submitted on time. Any proposals or addenda pertaining thereto, received after the announced due date will be rejected. However, nothing precludes the project from requesting additional information at any time during the application and review process.

**Timeline**

**April 1, 2009**

Wave 1 RFP letters of inquiry (LOI) due.

**June 1, 2009**

Wave 1 LOI decisions made and 10-12 full proposals invited.
September 1, 2009
Wave 1 full proposals due. We will begin accepting letters of inquiry for Wave 2.

November 1, 2009
Wave 1 full proposal reviewer evaluations due.

November 15, 2009
Wave 1 face-to-face advisory meeting.

November 20, 2009
Wave 1 grant applicants notified of decisions.

December 1, 2009
Wave 2 letters of inquiry (LOI) due in Science of Generosity Office by 5:00 p.m. EST.

January 15, 2010
Wave 1 grant start dates.

February 1, 2010
Wave 2 LOI decisions made and 22-27 full proposals invited.

May 1, 2010
Wave 2 full proposals due.

July 20, 2010
Wave 2 face-to-face advisory meeting.

July 31, 2010
Wave 2 grant applicants notified of decisions.

October 1, 2010
Wave 2 grant start dates.

Fall 2010
Initial meeting of all (wave 1 and 2) awardees.

January 15, 2011
Wave 1 RFP awardees first major report deadline

October 1, 2011
Wave 2 RFP awardees first major report deadline

May 31, 2012
Grant end dates and final reports of Wave 1 and Wave 2 projects due.
July, 2012
Major conference for presentation of research findings with presentations by all awardees.
Eligibility

Proposed projects:

- are encouraged but not limited to scholars in the disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science, social psychology, family and developmental studies, geography, law, education, communication and cultural studies, religious studies, business, finance, behavioral economics, and sociobiology (note: this initiative does not intend exclusively to fund research in the natural sciences or humanities)
- may be either discipline specific or inter-disciplinary
- may come from scholars with expertise in generosity research or those recently investing into researching generosity
- may plan to employ any legitimate research methodology in the human and social sciences that is demonstrably appropriate for the proposed study
- are encouraged to focus on identifying causal mechanisms that generate and obstruct generosity, not merely on significant statistical associations between variables
- are encouraged but not required to partner with other sources of secure research funding
- must be able to be accomplished with a budget of no more than $500,000 and within a two to three year time span (2010–2012, see timeline for specific dates)
- must be able to provide tax-exempt status

All proposals will be judged in two stages – letters of inquiry (LOIs) and invited full proposals. An inter-disciplinary panel of judges will review and evaluate the LOIs and will select a subset of the most promising and appropriate of them to invite to submit full proposals. LOI authors will be notified of the first stage decisions, and researchers of selected projects will then submit their full proposals of about 25 pages plus supplemental materials. An inter-disciplinary panel of judges will review and evaluate the full proposals and recommend the strongest for awards. Full proposal authors will then be selected as grant awardees.
Topics

Some examples of topics and questions that may be of interest for funding from this initiative include:

- How people originally learn to be generous and not generous
- The relationship between generosity of money, time, helping, and emotional support
- Causal mechanisms generating voluntary religious and charitable financial giving
- Survey data, experimental data, ethnographies, focus groups, and interviews each have their strengths and weaknesses. In order to increase the value of investigations in the field of generosity, it will be important to combine these methods.
- Social psychological obstacles to generosity and how they are reinforced and overcome
- Comparative cross-national research on political, economic, and cultural influences on generosity
- Institutional and cultural generators of generosity
- Social network dynamics shaping generosity
- Empirical tax policy implications for generosity
- Innovations in experimental studies of generosity
- Ethnographic studies of financial giving and volunteering in organizations
- Mechanisms promoting pro–social planned estate and corporate giving
- Intergenerational transmission of generosity
- The mental and physical health consequences of generosity
- Contributions of voluntary generosity to the common good of society

All proposals—whatever their specific substantive interests and disciplinary and methodological approaches—will be required to specifically address in one way or another one or more of the three focuses governing the central concern of this proposal, namely, the sources, manifestations, and consequences of generosity.

Possible Research Questions and Approaches

In general, many questions remain unanswered in the study of generosity. While some work has been done to investigate generosity in the social sciences, there is a great deal of scientific labor left to be done.

- The main topical areas that need further exploration concern motives of generosity, external constraints, circumstances, and contexts that promote generosity, how generous behaviors have evolved over time from primates to humans, the existence or not of a biological basis for generosity, whether generous behavior can be taught, religious influences on motives, barriers, consequences, changes to generous behavior, and how we can measure these changes.

- It would also be good to learn the sum total of United States and global giving, and the counterfactual social affects if this sum was not given. We also need investigations to study how much and in what ways the context in which people live determine their levels of philanthropy. Numerous findings suggest that social context is important for such outcomes.
It seems that people learn, adopt, copy, and adapt prosocial behaviors displayed by others around them. Some experiments have shown that these others may have an exogenous influence. However, we do not know how strong this influence actually is in society because few studies have used appropriate multi-level methods to study context effects. In order to apply such models, datasets including multiple observations from the same context are needed. Experiments are also needed to reveal how prosocial or generous behavior displayed by others affects individual behavior.

We also need to explore under what conditions general prosocial values promote generosity specifically? What are the formative conditions shaping prosocial values and generous outcomes?

We know that for some people generosity is an important part of who they are, their sense of self. What can be done to encourage such a sense of self? The concern here is not personality correlates but teachings, practices, materials, and life events that can be shaped effectively by intervention.

What are the consequences of changes in formative conditions, like the increasing risk of divorce, the increasing level of education, ethnic heterogeneity and secularization, on generosity outcomes?

What are the cross-national differences in the size and predictors of philanthropy? Nations differ strongly in the level and nature of generosity. Why nations differ is not clear. A wide range of factors may explain these differences: compositional effects, fiscal policy, government subsidies, effectiveness of fundraising, regulation of fundraising, religious tradition, level of democracy, globalization, “civic culture,” and so on. Cross-national comparative research is greatly needed on generosity.

**Unexplored or Underdeveloped Research Areas**

Based on conversations with prominent generosity-related scholars in the fields of economics, philanthropic studies, sociology, and social psychology, the following is a list of what, in their collective expert opinion, remains as the categories for unanswered questions and unaddressed areas for generosity research.

These experts all agree that much work remains to be done to bring together the currently disparate explorations to form a more unified, comprehensive field of generosity. From these conversations we know that the most pressing research needs concern:

1. understanding how people learn to be generous;
2. the adequacy of the data that are available on generosity;
3. use of multiple research methods to identify the causal mechanisms of generosity; and
4. exploring the consequences of generous behavior.
Learning to Give
Giving is patently learned behavior, yet current theoretical accounts offer few insights into how and when such generosity is learned.

- Social psychology offers us some valuable insights into the ways that generous behavior is often acquired. With “operant conditioning,” individuals can learn to be helpful and altruistic by being rewarded for such behavior and punished for not assisting others.
- Modeling—rooted in work on social learning theory—can also be a factor in the development of prosocial behavior. When children are presented with a generous model, they are more likely to be generous themselves.
- Although there can be other models in children’s lives, parents are the most influential models cited by altruistic adolescents and adults and the primary socialization agents in individuals’ lives.
- Finally, as described above, role identities may help us better understand how people are socialized to give to religious causes and organizations, but how these dynamics may actually operate in the real world remains grossly understudied.
- Learning to give can occur across the lifespan, and future study should be sensitive to all the ways, whether intentional or not, congregations teach giving to all their members via practices, teachings, and rituals.

Improving Available Survey Data
There are manifold problems related to data collection on giving, most of which revolve around survey variety. There are two basic threats to the validity of survey research on giving.

- The lack of accurate recall may lead to underreporting of giving behavior and second, social desirability may lead to over-reporting of it. To compensate for these difficulties, as well as problems in remembering, research has established that longer giving modules with more questions are recommended over short ones. The longer modules allow for more extensive prompting of different types of giving.
- Other researchers argue that multiple members of households ideally should be surveyed to best estimate total giving.
- The greater availability and use of multi-level panel data would allow for a quantum leap forward in the quality of research on religious giving. The field is in need of more longitudinal data.
- More studies are needed on a wider range of prosocial behaviors.
- Our knowledge would benefit greatly from data representing a wider variety of contexts and traditions.
- Finally, the majority of survey questions currently in existence do not adequately include indicators of causal mechanisms of generosity. Better survey questions need to incorporate items that enable more sophisticated testing of theories of generosity.
Using Multiple Methods
The field of Generosity is in need of data collected through alternate methods.

- Survey data, experimental data, ethnographies, focus groups, and interviews each have their strengths and weaknesses. In order to increase the value of investigations in the field of generosity, it will be important to combine these methods.
- Social science needs to better address issues of causation by more adequately identifying the mechanisms in theoretical terms by which structure produces patterns of events. Future work in giving should similarly specify and test causal mechanisms so that we may better understand how giving is causally generated in the social world.

Consequences of Generous Behavior
Throughout our inventory of the research on generous behaviors, there has been a noticeable lag in investigating and understanding the consequences of these behaviors. Examples of potential unexamined consequences are:

- Whether informal volunteering is more, less, or equally helpful to beneficiaries than formal volunteering.
- How does private philanthropy contribute to the public good compared to more generous social provisions by governments?
- While we still differentiate between helping and altruism (albeit rather inconsistently), research is currently unable to tell us how the consequences of each are similar or different.
Evaluation Criteria

The criteria by which the proposals will be judged are:

**Significance**
- Does the proposed study address an important problem or question in research on generosity?
- Does it account for and build upon the most important findings of prior research?
- If successful, how will scientific knowledge about generosity be advanced?
- What will be the effect of this study on the concepts or methods that currently define the research on generosity?

**Approach and Methods**
- Are the conceptual framework, research design, methods, and analyses adequately developed and specified and are they rigorous and fitting for the specific questions and goals of the project?
- Does the project seek to understand real causal mechanisms involved in generosity and not merely the association between observed variables?
- Is the applicant aware of potential problems and challenges involved in their approach and have they considered alternates?

**Innovation**
- Does the project employ fresh and creative concepts, approaches, or methods?
- Does it challenge or innovate upon existing frameworks or develop new methodologies or analyses in appropriately creative ways?

**Investigators**
- Are the researchers well qualified to execute the project, including demonstrating a genuine interest in the origins, manifestations, and/or consequences of generosity?
- Do the investigators have the ability to communicate the significance of their research findings beyond academia?
- Does the project involve identifying, recruiting, and training young scholars?

**Financial Responsibility**
- Do the detailed financial documents convey reasonable uses of funds and smart budgeting for the proposed scope of the project?
- Does the project employ effective collaborative arrangements or take advantage of special opportunities or available synergies in the research enterprise?

**Potential Scholarly Influence**
- How publishable will the results of the project be?
- What scholarly networks or communities will the results engage and influence?
- In what ways might the project help to build larger momentum of interest in generosity research?

**Institutional and Collateral Support**
- Is there evidence of real institutional support for the project?
- Are resources available to leverage support for the longer-term development of the ongoing research project?
Award Obligations

Notice of Awards

A Notice of Awards will be posted on the Generosity website: [http://generosityresearch.nd.edu](http://generosityresearch.nd.edu). Letters will also be sent, via mail, to Principal Investigators informing them of the Science of Generosity’s intent to enter into a contract. Approval will be contingent upon confirmation of eligibility criteria and upon possible adjustments to the proposal before the final award letter is sent out. The award letter will stipulate all terms and conditions of payment.

Award Obligations

The investigators of all funded projects will be brought together for two national conferences over the course of the initiative to network with and share their research and findings with other generosity scholars. Acceptance of project funding entails a commitment to prepare for, be present at, and participate in both conferences. Winners of Wave 1 grant awards will additionally be obligated to serve as reviewers for Wave 2 grant proposals. Fulfillment of this obligation includes reading and evaluating LOIs and full proposals, as well as attending the face–to–face review meeting.

Documents Required at Award Stage

Award recipients from this request for proposals (RFP) may be required to furnish some of the following additional documents: Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) Approval Letters, Tax–exempt Status, and Letter from Statistical Consultant. For grantees who are affiliated with foreign institutions, copies of the institution’s most recent audited financial statements will be requested if selected as a grantee. All award recipients will be prompted to submit such additional materials after the grant award winners are announced.

1. IRB and IACUC Approvals (if applicable)
Evidence of IRB approval (or submission for approval) for research involving human subjects is required. Please submit IRB requests early, and in the event they have not been fully approved by the time of full proposal submission, status and assurance number of the pending approval on the Cover Sheet Template. PIs will be required to submit current IRB or IACUC Letter of Approval. Documentation of IRB and/or human subject approval authorization will be required before initial payment may be made. Please note that if human or animal subjects are involved in the research project, the PI must be affiliated with an institution since these studies require approvals from the institution’s IRB, or approval from the IACUC.

2. Tax–exempt Status
At the award stage, PIs need to provide evidence of tax–exempt status from the sponsoring institution. 501( c ) (3) organizations must include copies of IRS determination letters and EIN number.

3. Letter from Statistical Consultant (if applicable)
All proposals involving quantitative studies must include a letter from a statistician who has agreed to
approve the research design and methods of analysis of the data collected. This letter will be requested for PIs who are selected to receive an award.

**Other Terms and Conditions**

All awarded projects will need to comply with the following conditions.

1. **Authority to Bind the Principal Investigator’s Institution in to Contract:** Each PI must provide full name and university address. The proposal cover sheet must be signed by the PI and authorized institutional signatory. Failure to sign the proposal may disqualify it.

2. **Award Obligations:** Please be aware that attendance and active participation by PIs in the Science of Generosity events are required in order to enter this final level of competition. Furthermore, if PIs are awarded a grant as a result of this RFP, funds received are contingent upon attendance and active participation in two mandatory project meetings. If a PI is unable to attend one or more of these project events, notification will need to be sent immediately.

3. **Communications:** All PIs will be required to work with the Science of Generosity project Communications Coordinator to help disseminate their research findings periodically throughout the course of, and upon completion of, their projects. This will require working with the Notre Dame-based Communications Coordinator to develop updates on their project findings suitable for the Science of Generosity project website, reports, and press releases.

4. **Additional Information Requested:** Please indicate if the PI, and/or affiliated research administration has been cited and/or fined within the last five (5) years by any Federal, State or Local regulatory agency. If so, PIs will need to provide the following information: Date; Identity of the agency issuing the citation or fine; Description of the violation; and Final rulings of the agency.

5. **Right of Rejection:** The project reserves the right to reject any proposal, to waive any informalities or irregularities in proposals, and/or to negotiate separately the terms and conditions of all or any part of the proposals as determined to be in Notre Dame’s best interests in its sole discretion.

6. **Advice of Omission or Misstatement:** In the event it is evident to a PI responding to this RFP that Notre Dame has omitted or misstated a material requirement to this RFP and/or the services required by this RFP, the responding PI shall advise the Project Manager of such omission or misstatement.

7. **Cost of Preparation:** The University of Notre Dame will not pay any costs incurred in full proposal preparation, printing or demonstration process.

8. **Notification of Withdrawal:** Full proposals may be withdrawn prior to the deadline specified for submissions with a formal written notice by an authorized representative of the PI. Proposals submitted will become the property of the University of Notre Dame after the submission deadline.

9. **Rights to Pertinent Materials:** All responses, inquires, and correspondence relating to this RFP and all reports, charts, displays, schedules, exhibits and other documentation produced by the PIs, that are
submitted as part of the RFP, shall become the property of the University of Notre Dame after the RFP submission deadline.

**Point of Contact**
The Project Manager for the Science of Generosity project at the University of Notre Dame, shall be the sole point of contact regarding this Request for Proposals. All questions concerning both the administrative and technical aspects of this RFP can be e–mailed to generous@nd.edu.
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The Science of Generosity Board of Advisers:

Roy F. Baumeister, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Florida State University

David Campbell, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of Notre Dame
Author of: *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life* (Princeton, 2006)

William Damon, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Stanford University
Author of: *Taking Philanthropy Seriously: Beyond Noble Intentions to Responsible Giving* (Indiana University Press, 2006) and *Some Do Care: Contemporary Lives of Moral Commitment* (Free Press, 1994)

Glen H. Elder, Jr., Ph.D.
Research Professor of Sociology and Psychology
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Author of: *Children of the Great Depression* (Westview Press, 1999)

William Enright, Th.M., Ph.D.
Executive Director
Lake Institute on Faith & Giving
Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

William Galston, Ph.D.
Ezra Zilkha Chair in Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

Jonathan Haidt, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
University of Virginia
Lisa A. Keister, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Duke University

Paulette V. Maehara, CFRE, CAE
President and CEO
Association of Fundraising Professionals
Author of: Hank Rosso’s Achieving Excellence in Fund Raising (Jossey Bass, 2004)

Theodore Roosevelt Malloch, Ph.D.
Chairman and CEO
The Roosevelt Group
Author of: Being Generous, (Templeton, 2009) and Spiritual Enterprise: Doing Virtuous Business (Encounter Books, 2008)

Michael E. McCullough, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology and Religious Studies
University of Miami

Keith G. Meador, M.D., Th.M., M.P.H.
Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and Co-Director, Center for Spirituality, Theology and Health
Duke University Medical Center

A. Abigail Payne, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
McMaster University
Author of: “Government Grants to Private Charities: Do They Crowd-Out Giving or Fund-Raising?” American Economic Review, 93(3), 792-812, June 2003 (with James Andreoni)

Cathy Pharoah, Ph.D.
Professor of Charity Funding and Co-Director, Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy
Cass Business School
Author of: Charity Market Monitor 2008 (Waterlow, 2008)

Stephen G. Post, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Medical Humanities, Compassionate Care, and Bioethics
Stony Brook University
Author of: Why Good Things Happen to Good People: How to Live a Longer, Healthier, Happier Life by the Simple Act of Giving (Broadway, 2007)
Miroslav Volf, Th.D.
Director, Yale Center for Faith and Culture
Yale University Divinity School
Author of: *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Abingdon, 1996)

Paul J. Zak, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for Neuroeconomics Studies
Claremont Graduate University
Editor of: *Moral Markets: The Critical Role of Values in the Economy* and “Monetary sacrifice among strangers is mediated by endogenous oxytocin release after physical contact” (2008), by V. Morhenn, J. Park, E. Piper, P. Zak. *Evolution and Human Behavior*
Frequently Asked Questions

1. Is the deadline to submit a letter of inquiry (LOI) a "postmark" deadline or a "received by" deadline?

   **Answer:** LOIs for Wave 2 funding must be received by the deadline of 5 p.m. December 1, 2009. LOI packets will only be accepted if delivered in person, by mail or by courier. No electronic submissions will be accepted. Each delivered LOI packet must contain 7 copies (coversheet attached to 3-page letter) in order to be considered complete and eligible for consideration for further evaluation. Any LOIs received after December 1, 2009 will not be considered as part of the proposal. If you have any questions, please contact the Project Manager at generous@nd.edu or 574.631.2173.

2. Is the invitation deadline to submit a full proposal a "postmark" deadline or a "received by" deadline?

   **Answer:** Your full proposal must be postmarked by the respective deadlines (September 1, 2009 for Wave 1 and May 1, 2010 for Wave 2). Full proposal packets will only be accepted if delivered in person, by mail, or by courier. Each Full Proposal packet and must contain 12 complete copies of all required materials in order to be considered complete. Any full proposal postmarked after each respective deadline will not be considered, and cannot be appealed. If you have any questions, please contact the Project Manager at generous@nd.edu or 574.631.2173.

3. Am I allowed to submit more than one LOI and/or full proposal?

   **Answer:** Individual scholars are allowed to submit only one LOI per wave of funding for which they are the Principal Investigator. Scholars may be listed as Co-Investigators on multiple LOIs/projects, but again they may only submit one LOI per wave of funding as the Principal Investigator. Individual scholars may not be listed on more than one full proposal as either a Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator.

4. I am submitting an LOI. Do I include my CV or the CV(s) of my collaborator(s)?

   **Answer:** No. Your LOI packet should only contain one official coversheet stapled to each of the seven (7) copies of your 3-page letter of inquiry, respectively.
5. I am not affiliated with a university or institution. How does this affect my eligibility and my award disbursement if chosen as one of the grantees?

Answer: You are still eligible for this grant competition even if you are not affiliated with a university or institution. However, if your proposal involves the use of human or animal subjects, you must be affiliated with an organization that can provide Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approvals. If you are selected as one of the grant winners who are not affiliated with a university or institution, and are not using human or animal subjects in your research, you will be consulted by our project on an individual basis regarding your award disbursement.

6. If I am awarded a grant through Wave 1 funding, must the start date be January 15, 2010? Or, if I am awarded a grant through Wave 2 funding, must the start date be October 1, 2010?

Answer: Yes.

7. Do I need to include a detailed, full budget in my LOI?

Answer: No, an itemized budget is not mandatory for the LOI. However, it is expected that your LOI indicate a description of the prudent use for the proposed requested funding.

8. Am I allowed to include money for course buyout as well as summer salary in my proposed budget? Am I allowed to include travel expenses related to other conferences and meetings that are related to my research? Is there a cap on the salary that a Principal Investigator may claim as part of the direct costs of a proposed research budget?

Answer: Summer salary and course buyout are allowable items to include in your proposed budget, as well as trips to other meetings and conferences directly related to your funded research for the Science of Generosity project. In addition, there is no cap on the salary that a Principal Investigator may claim as part of the direct costs of a proposed research budget. However, you should be very prudent with regard to the degree to which your proposed research program can be justified if a substantial portion of the requested grant funds goes toward the direct salary support of the Principal Investigator.

9. How are "indirect costs" defined? What line items can be applied to indirect costs, and what line items cannot?

Answer: Indirect costs are any costs that are not directly allocable to the supported activity. The prescribed limit of 15% on indirect costs applies to any subcontracting institutions on the proposed project, or administrative fees incurred by the affiliated institution’s research
administration. Indirect costs may not be applied to overhead on prizes, other sub-grants that may be included in a funded program or sub-contract, consultant expenses, or equipment.

10. Will an award from this program provide additional monies for indirect costs?

Answer: No. The upper limit for indirect costs is set at 15% of the total direct costs for the project. Any needed indirect costs that exceed the 15% upper limit will need to be funded by other outside sources.

11. Can an award from this program be used to support on-going research that is also supported by other funds? Can this award be used as a basis for seeking other funds?

Answer: Yes. If you plan on doing this, be sure to list the other awards you are using and how this award would allow you to expand or improve your current research. If you have received funding from other sources for a proposed research project, you must use this award to support something new within your existing research. Also, you can apply for other grants and assistance to go along with the Science of Generosity award, should you receive it. However, we need to know about your plans at the time of submission of your proposal, and will request notification of successful funding requests. Our intent is to encourage strongly co-funding and/or follow on funding of the research, provided that the funding is used for budget items not already funded by a Science of Generosity award. In fact, we are committed to do whatever we can to help you with this process both scientifically and administratively.

12. How will each of the grant awards be disbursed?

Answer: Wave 1 funding will award individual grants in the range of $250,000-$500,000 and Wave 2 will award individual grants of up to $150,000. Care should be taken when constructing the detailed project budget submitted with the full proposal since it is one of the factors that we will take into account when selecting the grantees. Note: All awards will formally be made on a cost-reimbursable basis. Awardees must invoice for costs that have actually been incurred during the invoice period. Invoicing against the budget is not allowed (i.e. dividing the budget by the number of budget months). The invoice must be signed by a person who has responsibility for official financial data and can certify its validity. The PI is usually not this person. Payment will be provided within 30 days of invoice receipt. Invoices can be submitted monthly, quarterly, or annually for costs of $1,000 or more. Progress reports will be required half way through project completion and upon the conclusion of the project in order to complete reimbursement. In the event that the work is not completed by the end date of the project, we will consider requests for "no cost extensions" on a case-by-case basis.
13. I reside and conduct my research in a foreign country. How does this affect my award disbursement if chosen as one of the grantees?

**Answer:** If you are selected as one of the grant winners and are a foreign resident, affiliated or not affiliated with a university or institution, you will be consulted by our project on an individual basis. For all awardees who are affiliated with foreign institutions, we would require (at the award stage) the most recent audited financial statements for that institution. Research budgets will need to be realistic given expected exchange rates between relevant currencies.

14. Who will serve as the judges of the invited full proposals?

**Answer:** Members of the expert judging board is composed of scholars highly qualified to evaluate the **LOIs** and **full proposals**, including some members of the **Board of Advisers** and other scholars recruited as needed to evaluate and judge the LOIs and proposals.

15. What are the specific evaluation criteria used by the judges to select the winners of this competition?

**Answer:** The following is a list of the evaluation criteria that will be used by peer evaluators and judges:

- **Significance:** Does the proposed study address an important problem or question in research on generosity? Does it account for and build upon the most important findings of prior research? If successful, how will scientific knowledge about generosity be advanced? What will be the effect of this study on the concepts or methods that currently define the research on generosity?
- **Approach and Methods:** Are the conceptual framework, research design, methods, and analyses adequately developed and specified, and are they rigorous and fitting for the specific questions and goals of the project? Does the project seek to understand real causal mechanisms involved in generosity and not merely the association between observed variables? Is the applicant aware of potential problems and challenges involved in the project’s approach and has the applicant considered alternates?
- **Innovation:** Does the project employ fresh and creative concepts, approaches, or methods? Does it challenge or innovate upon existing frameworks or develop new methodologies or analyses in appropriately creative ways? Does it bring a new approach to a traditional topic, integrate learning from multiple fields in the data collection or analysis, or explore an underdeveloped aspect of existing literature? Does the project attempt to address issues of underlying causal mechanisms by employing new methodologies or combinations of methodologies?
- **Investigators:** Are the researchers well qualified to execute the project, including demonstrating a genuine interest in the origins, manifestations, and/or consequences of generosity? Do the investigators have the ability to communicate the significance of their research findings beyond academia? Does the project involve identifying, recruiting, and training young scholars in generosity research?
• **Financial Responsibility:** Do the detailed financial documents convey reasonable uses of funds and smart budgeting for the proposed scope of the project? Does the project employ effective collaborative arrangements or take advantage of special opportunities or available synergies in the research enterprise?

• **Potential Scholarly Influence:** How publishable will the results of the project be? What scholarly networks or communities will the results engage and influence? In what ways might the project help to build larger momentum of interest in research on generosity?

• **Institutional and Collateral Support:** Is there evidence of real institutional support for the project? Are resources available to leverage support for the longer-term development of the ongoing research project?

16. I mailed in my LOI or proposal and then realized that my packet was incomplete or contained errors. What do I need to do to correct this?

**Answer:** As long as the correction is made before the published deadlines, you may withdraw your problematic submission and repeat the same application process to submit a revised version of your LOI or full proposal. If you need to do this, be sure to do the following: (1) Send an e-mail to generous@nd.edu to request that we remove your initial application; and (2) Once you have received an e-mail notification that your application has been formally removed from the pool, you may resubmit a revised version of your LOI or full proposal. Also, remember to re-submit all grant packet content, including the portions that did not need revisions. This way, the new version will arrive to us in one complete package of finalized materials.

17. I am submitting a full proposal as the Principal Investigator with an additional collaborator(s). Do I include the CV(s) of my collaborator(s)?

**Answer:** Yes. Your full proposal includes the submission of full-length curriculum vitas of the Principal Investigator, Co-Investigators, and dedicated senior collaborators.

18. I am not a resident of the United States. If I am chosen as one of the grant awardees, would I have to establish residency within the United States for any extended period of time?

**Answer:** No. The Science of Generosity project seeks to globalize scholarly inquiry into the sources, manifestations, and consequences of generosity. We definitely want to involve international scholars from outside of the United States. Your research may be conducted in the country in which you reside. Only two short visits to the United States are required of all grant awardees. Wave 1 grant awardees are additionally required to attend the face-to-face Wave 2 full proposals review meeting. See our [timeline](#) to view the Science of Generosity schedule of project events and activities.
19. I applied as one of a team of scholars. If awarded, will all members of my team be invited to attend the Science of Generosity events?

**Answer:** No. Only a single Principal Investigator per project is invited to attend the events where he/she will represent the interests of the entire group. Airfare, hotel, and some meals will be funded for the Principal Investigator to attend these events.

20. I am a person with a disability who will need specific accommodations when attending the Science of Generosity events. Who do I contact?

**Answer:** If you are an individual with a disability and require a reasonable accommodation, please contact, the *Project Manager* as soon as possible at 574.631.2173 or generous@nd.edu