

Sage Journals

We value your privacy

We and our [partners](#) store and/or access information on a device, such as cookies and process personal data, such as unique identifiers and standard information sent by a device for personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development. With your permission we and our partners may use precise geolocation data and identification through device scanning. You may click to consent to our and our 1467 partners' processing as described above. Alternatively you may click to refuse to consent or access more detailed information and change your preferences before consenting. Please note that some processing of your personal data may not require your consent, but you have a right to object to such processing. Your preferences will apply to this website only. You can change your preferences or withdraw your consent at any time by returning to this site and clicking the "Privacy" button at the bottom of the webpage.

ACCEPT ALL

MORE OPTIONS

DECLINE ALL

Bowman W. (2006). Should donors care about overhead expenses? Do they care? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 288–310.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Buchheit S., Parsons L. M. (2006). An experimental investigation of accounting information's influence on the individual giving process. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 25(6), 666–686.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Buhrmester M., Kwang T., Gosling S. D. (2011). Amazon's mechanical turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5.

[Crossref](#)

[PubMed](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Calabrese T. D., Gupta A. (2019). A replication of “agency problems of excess endowment holdings in not-for-profit firms” (Journal of Accounting and Economics, 2006). *Public Finance Review*, 47(4), 747–774.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Caviola L., Faulmüller N., Everett J. A., Savulescu J., Kahane G. (2014). The evaluability bias in charitable giving: Saving administration costs or saving lives? *Judgment and Decision Making*, 9(4), 303–316.

[Crossref](#)

[PubMed](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Charles C. (2018). Nonprofit arts organizations: Debt ratio does not influence donations—Interest expense ratio does. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(7), 659–667.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Chikoto G. L., Neely D. G. (2014). Building nonprofit financial capacity: The impact of revenue concentration and overhead expenses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3), 570–588.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Coupet J., Berrett J. L. (2019). Toward a valid approach to nonprofit efficiency measurement. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 29(3), 299–320.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Denison D. V., Beard A. (2003). Financial vulnerability of charitable organizations: Lessons from research. *Journal for Nonprofit Management*, 7(1), 23–31.

[Google Scholar](#)

Duncan B. (2004). A theory of impact philanthropy. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9), 2159–2180.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Eckhart-Queenan J., Etzel M., Lanney J., Silverman J. (2019). *Momentum for change: Ending the nonprofit starvation cycle*. <https://www.bridgespan.org/ending-the-nonprofit-starvation-cycle>

[Google Scholar](#)

Financial Accounting Standards Board. (1993). *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 117: Financial statements of nonprofits*.

[Google Scholar](#)

Garven S. A., Hofmann M. A., McSwain D. N. (2016). Playing the numbers game. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 26(4), 401–416.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Gneezy U., Keenan E. A., Gneezy A. (2014). Avoiding overhead aversion in charity. *Science*, 346(6209), 632–635.

[Crossref](#)

[PubMed](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Greenlee J. S., Brown K. L. (1999). The impact of accounting information on contributions to charitable organizations. *Research in Accounting Regulation*, 13, 111–126.

[Google Scholar](#)

Greenlee J. S., Bukovinsky D. (1998). Financial ratios for use in the analytical review of charitable organizations. *Ohio CPA Journal*, 57(1), 32–38.

[Google Scholar](#)

Greenlee J. S., Tuckman H. P. (2007). Financial health. In Young D. R. (Ed.), *Financing nonprofits: Putting theory into practice* (pp. 315–338). AltaMira Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Gregory A. G., Howard D. (2009). The nonprofit starvation cycle. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 7(4), 49–53.

[Google Scholar](#)

Grey Matter Research. (2018). *The Donor Mindset Study IV*. Grey Matter Research; Op4G.

[Google Scholar](#)

GuideStar. (2013). *The overhead Myth: A GuideStar initiative to improve donor choice*. <http://overheadmyth.com/>

[Google Scholar](#)

Hager M. A., Flack T. (2004). *The pros and cons of financial efficiency standards* (Nonprofit Overhead Cost Project, Brief No. 5). The Urban Institute.

[Google Scholar](#)

Hager M. A., Greenlee J. (2004). How important is a nonprofit's bottom line? The uses and abuses of financial data. In Frumkin P., Imber J. B. (Eds.), *In search of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 85–96). Transaction Publishers.

[Google Scholar](#)

Hager M. A., Pollak T., Wing K., Rooney P. M. (2004). *Getting what we pay for: Low overhead limits nonprofit effectiveness* (Nonprofit Overhead Cost Project, Brief No. 3). The Urban Institute.

[Google Scholar](#)

Helmig B., Spraul K., Treppe K. (2012). Replication studies in nonprofit research: A generalization and extension of findings regarding the media publicity of nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(3), 360–385.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

James R. III. (2017). Natural philanthropy: A new evolutionary framework explaining diverse experimental results and informing fundraising practice. *Palgrave Communications*, 3, 1–12.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Karlan D., Wood D. H. (2017). The effect of effectiveness: Donor response to aid effectiveness in a direct mail fundraising experiment. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 66, 1–8.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kim M., Van Ryzin G. G. (2014). Impact of government funding on donations to arts organizations: A survey experiment. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 910–925.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Knowlton C. (2016). Why funding overhead is not the real issue: The case to cover full expenses. *Nonprofit Quarterly*, 2015, 71–76.

[Google Scholar](#)

Krishnan R., Yetman M. H., Yetman R. J. (2006). Expense misreporting in nonprofit organizations. *The Accounting Review*, 81(2), 399–420.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Lammers J. (2003). Know your ratios? Everyone else does. *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, 10(1), 1–4.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lecy J. D., Searing E. A. (2015). Anatomy of the nonprofit starvation cycle: An analysis of falling overhead ratios in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(3), 539–563.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Marwell N. P., Calabrese T. (2014). A deficit model of collaborative governance: Government–nonprofit fiscal relations in the provision of child welfare services. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(4), 1031–1058.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

McDowell E. A., Li W., Smith P. C. (2013). An experimental examination of US individual donors' information needs and use. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 29(3), 327–347.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Metzger L., Günther I. (2019). Making an impact? The relevance of information on aid effectiveness for charitable giving: A laboratory experiment. *Journal of Development Economics*, 136, 18–33.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Mitchell G. E. (2017). Fiscal leanness and fiscal responsiveness: Exploring the normative limits of strategic nonprofit financial management. *Administration & Society*, 49(9), 1272–1296.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Mitchell G. E., Calabrese T. D. (2019). Proverbs of nonprofit financial management. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 49(6), 649–661.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Newman G. E., Shniderman A., Cain D. M., Sevel K. (2019). Do the ends justify the means? The relative focus on overhead versus outcomes in charitable fundraising. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 48(1), 71–90.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Pallotta D. (2008). *Uncharitable: How restraints on nonprofits undermine their potential*. Tufts University Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Parsons L. M., Pryor C., Roberts A. A. (2017). Pressure to manage ratios and willingness to do so: Evidence from nonprofit managers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(4), 705–724.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Pollak T. H., Rooney P. (2003). Management and general expenses: The other half of overhead. *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, 10(1), 30–32.

[Google Scholar](#)

Portillo J. E., Stinn J. (2018). Overhead aversion: Do some types of overhead matter more than others? *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 72, 40–50.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Ryazanov A. A., Christenfeld N. J. (2018). On the limited role of efficiency in charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(5), 939–959.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Sargeant A., Woodliffe L. (2007). Gift giving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12(4), 275–307.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Schubert P., Boenigk S. (2019). The nonprofit starvation cycle: Empirical evidence from a German context. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 48(3), 467–491.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Sloan M. F. (2009). The effects of nonprofit accountability ratings on donor behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(2), 220–236.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Stout W. D. (2001). Planning materiality in audits of nonprofit organizations. *The CPA Journal*, 71(12), 47–48.

[Google Scholar](#)

Tinkelman D. (1999). Factors affecting the relation between donations to not-for-profit organizations and an efficiency ratio. *Research in Government and Nonprofit Accounting*, 10(1), 135–161.

[Google Scholar](#)

Tuckman H. P., Chang C. F. (1991). A methodology for measuring the financial vulnerability of charitable nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20(4), 445–460.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Van Der Heijden H. (2013). Charities in competition: Effects of accounting information on donating adjustments. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 25(1), 1–13.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Vanhove A. J., Miller A., Harms P. (2018, July). Unemployed and Turking: Is Amazon Mechanical Turk a viable source for unemployment research? In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2018, No. 1, p. 17538). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Weisbrod B. A., Dominguez N. D. (1986). Demand for collective goods in private nonprofit markets: Can fundraising expenditures help overcome free-rider behavior? *Journal of Public Economics*, 30(1), 83–96.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Wong J., Ortmann A. (2016). Do donors care about the price of giving? A review of the evidence, with some theory to organise it. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(2), 958–978.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Yan W., Sloan M. F. (2016). The impact of employee compensation and financial performance on nonprofit organization donations. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(2), 243–258.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Biographies

Cleopatra Charles is an associate professor in the School of Public Affairs and Administration at Rutgers University—Newark. She is a public finance scholar whose research focuses on financial management and fiscal policy issues that affect nonprofit organizations such as fiscal slack and creating rainy day funds, debt management, revenue diversification, measuring performance and impact, program evaluation, and revenue structure. Her most recent research has focused on nonprofit organizations and the relationship between governance decisions and financial preparedness in dealing with adverse circumstances.

Margaret F. Sloan is professor of Strategic Leadership Studies and Advisor for Nonprofit and Community Leadership at James Madison University. Prior to teaching, she worked in the nonprofit sector for ten years in a variety of management roles with a focus on youth programs, the arts, and resource development. Her research focuses primarily on nonprofit finance and leadership.

Peter Schubert is a doctoral student and research assistant at Universität Hamburg. His research interests include nonprofit management, accountability, and finance. His current research projects focus on overhead costs and the nonprofit starvation cycle.

Similar articles:



Restricted access

[Is "Overhead" A Tainted Word? A Survey Experiment Exploring Framing Effects of Nonprofit Overhead on Donor Decision](#)

Show Details ▾



Free access

[The Nonprofit Starvation Cycle: Does Overhead Spending Really Impact Program Outcomes?](#)

Show Details ▾



Restricted access

[Anatomy of the Nonprofit Starvation Cycle: An Analysis of Falling Overhead Ratios in the Nonprofit Sector](#)

Show Details ▾

[View More](#)

Sage recommends:

SAGE Knowledge

Book chapter

[Managing Fundraising Programs](#)

Show Details ▾

SAGE Knowledge

[Charity Fraud](#)

Show Details ▾

CQ Researcher

Report

[Charitable Giving](#)

Show Details ▾

[View More](#)

You currently have no access to this content. Visit the [access options](#) page to authenticate.

[View full text](#) | [Download PDF](#)

Also from Sage

CQ Library

Elevating debate

Sage Data

Uncovering insight

Sage Business Cases

Shaping futures

Sage Campus

Unleashing potential

Sage Knowledge

Multimedia learning resources

Sage Research Methods

Supercharging research

Sage Video

Technology from Sage

We value your privacy We and our partners store and/or access information on a device, such as cookies and process personal data, such as unique identifiers and standard information sent by a device for personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development. With your permission we and our partners may use precise geolocation data and identification through device scanning. You may click to consent to our and our 1467 partners' processing as described above. Alternatively you may click to refuse to consent or access more detailed information and change your preferences before consenting. Please note that some processing of your personal data may not require your consent, but you have a right to object to such processing. Your preferences will apply to this website only. You can change your preferences or withdraw your consent at any time by returning to this site and clicking the "Privacy" button at the bottom of the webpage.