How Organizational Perceptions Influence Donation Behavior

Grant Donovan

University of Central Florida, College of Community Innovation & Education

PAD6700: Research Methods in Public Administration

Dr. Dan Stephens

April 24th, 2024

Author Note:

University Address: 4000 Central Florida Blvd, Orlando, FL 32816

College Address: 12494 University Blvd, Orlando, FL 32816

All correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Grant Donovan through email at gr558207@ucf.edu.

Abstract

Nonprofit organizations are an essential part of American society. Because of government budget cuts since the 1980s, communities have increasingly come to rely on nonprofits to provide vital public services like childcare, disaster relief, and much more. Yet, these nonprofits often do not have stable revenue streams with which to fund these services. Instead, many rely on raising charitable donations from those with an interest in their work. Yet only so much money is donated in the U.S. each year. Nonprofits must therefore compete with one another to secure these donations, which they do through fundraising efforts designed to improve the perception of their organization relative to others. This paper proposes a study that seeks to explain exactly how individuals' perceptions of a given nonprofit influence their donations to that specific organization. Data collection will take place through in-person interviews with participants selected through a multi-stage cluster sampling process. The data will then be analyzed using a multilevel regression model. The results of this study should reveal which organizational perceptions are most influential in determining the distribution of an individual's charitable donations. With these findings, nonprofit organizations will be able to cultivate the perceptions that best encourage donations to their organization specifically. This will allow them to bring in greater and more reliable revenues, improving the effectiveness of the essential work they do in communities across America.

Statement of the Study Problem

The American people are voracious donators. In 2018 alone, Americans donated over $427 billion to over a million different nonprofit organizations. It is important to note that these donations are quite different from the membership fees many nonprofits collect. While paying membership fees typically gives one access to various organizational benefits, donations are given away for nothing in return beyond personal satisfaction. Many nonprofit organizations rely heavily on both membership fees and donations to fund their activities. However, there is also a large group of nonprofits that collect revenue almost solely through donations. For example, one can be a member of a Catholic church, the Sierra Club environmental advocacy organization, or the Democratic Socialists of America political activist organization for free. As a result, the success of these organizations in pursuing their goals entirely depends on the personal whims of those with an interest in donating. Researchers have dedicated much effort to understanding this donation behavior, aiming to enhance the effectiveness of these donation-reliant organizations' fundraising efforts. While most of these studies have focused on discovering who these donors are, this study's interest is instead in the distribution of their donations. What perceived organizational characteristics lead one to donate to one donation-reliant nonprofit over another when there are so many constantly vying for their support?

Significance of the Study Problem

In the United States, nonprofit organizations are responsible for a wide variety of vital social services. They provide job training, education, childcare, housing, healthcare, disaster relief, advocacy for underprivileged populations, opportunities for collective action, opportunities for artistic expression, religious community, and much more (Paxton et al., 2020). Nonprofits have therefore become associated with social cohesion, decreasing crime rates, the mitigation of neighborhood poverty, and the promotion of subjective well-being (Ressler, 2020). Without nonprofits, thousands of communities and millions of people across America would lack the necessary resources to prosper and lead fulfilling lives.

The vital role of nonprofits in American society has roots dating back to the 1960s, when the government began to shift towards a public-nonprofit partnership model for providing public services (Paxton et al., 2020). This meant that, rather than providing many such services directly, the government would instead fund nonprofits that would provide the services themselves. However, in the decades since the establishment of this model, the "public" half of the equation has disappeared in many ways. Repeated budget cuts to local, state, and federal government agencies have left public organizations unable to continue funding the nonprofits that provide community services (Ressler et al., 2020). The result has been that, for many communities in the United States, the provision of vital public services has become reliant on nonprofit organizations' abilities to find other revenue streams, the most important being charitable donations (Ressler et al., 2020). Because of this, the wellbeing of thousands of communities across the United States is dependent on nonprofits' ability to solicit charitable donations.

Yet, there is only so much money that is donated to nonprofits each year. In 2018, that number was $427.71 billion (IUPUI, 2019). This has created an ecosystem in which thousands of vital nonprofit service providers must constantly compete for people's donations in order to stay solvent. Donors' perceptions often determine which organizations emerge victorious in this competitive environment. For example, if one nonprofit is perceived to be highly impactful, it is assumed that they will outcompete others and thus capture more donations for themselves (Kesberg & Keller, 2021). The present study is designed to evaluate these assumptions by discovering how individuals' perceptions of nonprofit organizations actually impact their donation behavior. With this information, non-profits will know what organizational perceptions are most likely to attract donations. They can then invest in improving and promoting these perceptions, which will allow them to be more competitive in the nonprofit ecosystem, bring in more revenue, and better fund the vital services their communities have come to rely upon.

Literature Review

In making sense of individuals' donation behavior, many scholars rely upon microeconomic models of utility maximization. Wong & Ortman (2016) propose one such model, which suggests that three variables interact to influence the decision to donate: the benefits of donating, the charity price, and information costs. Beginning with the benefits of donating, Wong & Ortmann intentionally leave this variable vague. One may find benefit in donating because they value the output provided by a nonprofit, because they feel a "joy of giving," because they seek to fulfill some duty they believe they are bound to, or for some other reason. Individuals with a tendency towards altruistic motivations, high trust in others and civil institutions, high education or incomes, or strong religious convictions are those most likely to find a high benefit in donating (Neumayr & Handy, 2017; Understanding, 2006). Yang & Liu (2021) further identified political ideology as a variable that independently impacts the benefit one finds in donating. However, these authors admit that their findings reveal little as to how the characteristics of a given nonprofit organization influence the utility one finds in donating to it specifically (Neumayr & Handy, 2017).

Research overwhelmingly confirms that people prefer to donate to organizations they trust to be responsible stewards of their money (Karlan & List, 2007). For example, many donors diverted their funds from United Way and the Red Cross to other charities when news of their misuse of donations emerged (Wong & Ortmann, 2016). In most cases, this means individuals prefer to donate to organizations that use the majority of their donations to fund social services rather than administrative expenses, fundraising activities, executive compensation, and the like (Jacobs & Marudas, 2009). The percentage of a donation that goes to these extraneous spending categories is what Wong & Ortman (2016) refer to as the charity price. According to their model, the higher the perceived charity price, the less likely it is that an individual will donate. However, discovering this charity price is often difficult and requires an information cost. Wong & Ortman propose that one can predict all donation behavior by subtracting charity prices and information costs from the expected benefits of donating to a specific cause. If this were the case, the only way nonprofits could increase their donations would be by decreasing their charity price and using fundraising activities to disseminate that information.

Despite the parsimony of Wong & Ortman's model and the many microeconomic models like it, most scholars see it as far too reductive to fully explain donation behavior. In particular, they criticize these models for treating donors as rational calculators rather than as complex people who make decisions based on preferences, emotions, and the context of their environment (Paxton et al., 2020). Beginning with preferences, empirical studies have identified many organizational characteristics that donors value beyond the charity price. Take, for example, the organization's overall impact. While the microeconomic model of donation behavior predicts that donors primarily care about immediate outputs – the number of dollars put towards pursuing a goal – a survey by Bodem-Schrötgens & Bekker (2019) instead found that donors placed more value on long-term impacts. Respondents expressed a great desire to "make a difference" and thus gravitated towards nonprofits they perceived as having strategic plans for making a lasting impact on society.

Another observed preference is for nonprofits that emphasize values compatible with those held by the donor. Kesberg & Keller (2021) conducted a survey which revealed that German individuals were more inclined to donate to organizations that aligned with their values, such as universalism or benevolence, compared to others focused on similar causes. Before moving on, it is important to note that these preferences are different from Wong & Ortman's conception of benefits. Preferences explain why individuals are likely to donate to one nonprofit organization over another, even when either would provide them with the same stand-alone benefit they find in donating.

Studies have also demonstrated that emotional and environmental factors can influence individuals' donation behavior. One study by Paxton et al. (2020) analyzed how the emotional appeals in nonprofits' online mission statements corresponded to donation receipt data. According to their analysis, a 10% increase in positive emotional words was correlated with a 0.5% increase in donations, while a 10% increase in negative emotional words was correlated with a 0.67% increase in donations. These findings are consistent with psychological theory: humans are emotional creatures whose actions can be manipulated through feelings as well as material considerations (Berridge, 2018).

Psychology also stresses humans' role as social creatures, and this too shows up in donation behavior research. One study from Ressler et al. (2020) found that individuals develop obligations to donate from their friendship networks and community connections. According to the authors, "more extensive social networks (a greater number of ties between the organization and people) increase the possibility of receiving a donation from those connected individuals." (Ressler et al., 2020) This same study goes on to find that geographic proximity is another important characteristic that can help nonprofits raise donations. People demonstrate a preference for nonprofits they perceive as active in their local community (Ressler et al., 2020). By leaning into this perception, as many nonprofits do by adding a geographic label to their names, they increase their number of donations and revenues.

The factors that motivate individuals' donations to nonprofits are numerous and interact in complex ways. How any one donor makes their donation decisions is a result of the stand-alone benefit they find in donating based on their personal characteristics, their perceptions of different organizations, their preferences, their emotions, and their social network (Neumayr & Handy, 2017; Bodem-Schrötgens & Becker, 2019; Paxton et al., 2020; Ressler et al., 2020). While many studies have investigated each of these variables' impact on donations individually, very few have analyzed them in relation to one another (Leardini et al., 2020). Because of this, it is difficult to determine how donors prioritize these perceptions when considering them altogether. Katz (2018), however, is one such study that does this. This study surveyed Israeli citizens to discover how their various perceptions of nonprofit organizations interacted to influence their donation behavior. This study found that perceptions of fiscal responsibility and impact effectiveness were the most important in determining donation behavior; trust and value compatibility, however, had little effect on donation behavior in the presence of these other factors (Katz, 2018). However, even this study did not include perceptions of nonprofits' social connections, geographical proximities, or emotional impacts. Because of this, the present study attempts to replicate Katz's design in an American context, improving upon it by adding survey questions regarding these missing independent variables.

Research Method

To reiterate, the proposed study seeks to answer the research question, "What perceived organizational characteristics lead an individual to donate to one donation-reliant nonprofit organization over another when there are so many vying for their support?" The purpose of this study is explanatory, as it aims to theorize why people make the donations they do, rather than merely describe their donation behavior (Babbie, 2023). Furthermore, because this study searches for the few factors that can explain most donation behavior in general rather than all the factors that can fully explain the donation behavior observed in some specific instance, it is also nomothetic in nature (Babbie, 2023). This study's design will revolve around the collection of quantitative data and its analysis through statistical hypothesis testing, similar to most nomothetic explanatory studies (Babbie, 2023).

But before diving into the specific methods to be employed, it is first necessary to identify and define the variables of interest. The dependent variable in this study will be individuals' donation behaviors, as this is the phenomenon that the study seeks to explain more fully. Donation behavior here will be defined specifically as any transfer of money to a nonprofit organization that offers a free membership tier with no organizational benefits in return. This definition was chosen to exclude membership fees and the nonprofit organizations that rely on them for the majority of their revenues from consideration, as they are outside the particular interests of this study.

The independent variables of interest, meanwhile, have all been selected based on their prevalence in the broader donation behavior literature. These variables are a given nonprofit's perceived charity price, perceived overall effectiveness and impact, perceived alignment with an individuals' personal values, perceived emotional impact, perceived social connection, and perceived geographic proximity. For each of these independent variables, there are reputable studies that establish a theoretical or empirical connection between them and individuals' donation behaviors. While there certainly are other factors that influence donation behavior beyond these, they are outside of the purview of this nomothetic study. Additionally, note that each independent variable is a perception rather than an actual, verifiable organizational characteristic. One assumption of this study design is that an individual's perception of an organization is what influences their donation behavior, rather than some material reality they may be unaware of (Wong & Ortmann, 2016; Bodem-Schrötgens & Becker, 2019). For this reason, these perceptions can be collected directly from donors themselves and this study design includes no independent fact-finding dimension.

Perceived charity price will be defined as the amount of each donation an individual believes a given organization wastes on administrative and fundraising costs rather than funding their primary social service (Wong & Ortmann, 2016). Perceived overall effectiveness and impact will be defined as whether an individual sees a given organization's work as making a difference and leaving a lasting impact on society (Bodem-Schrötgens & Becker, 2019). Perceived alignment with personal values will be defined as how similar an individual considers the values emphasized by a given organization to the values they prioritize in their life (Kesberg & Keller, 2021). Perceived emotional impact will be defined as the positivity or negativity of the emotions a given organization conjures in an individual (Paxton et al., 2020). Perceived social integration will be defined as how many of an individual's friends and family are also members or supporters of a given organization (Ressler, 2020). Finally, perceived geographic proximity will be defined as how active an individual considers a given organization to be in their local community (Ressler, 2020).

However, the scholarly literature has also identified many personal characteristics that have a strong influence on individuals' donation behaviors beyond their perceptions of any nonprofit organization. These personal characteristics typically affect the benefit that one receives from donating to any organization at all. For instance, Neumayr & Handy (2017) predict that an individual with a high level of education would benefit more from donating to a given organization than someone with a low level of education would. Failure to account for these variables could potentially skew the results of this study. For example, if the sample of respondents analyzed included many highly educated people who see a given organization as involved in their local community as well as many uneducated people who see the same organization as not involved in their local community, the study would conclude that perceived geographic proximity has a large impact on individuals' donation behaviors. Yet, in reality, perceived geographic proximity may not be associated with more donations among either group were they to be analyzed separately. It was only the composition of the sample in terms of the education variable that created the illusion of a positive correlation between geographic proximity and willingness to donate. For this reason, any personal characteristic the scholarly literature connects to donation behavior that is not a perception of an organizational characteristic will be included in this study as a control variable. These control variables will include individuals' ages, genders, ethnicities, education levels, incomes, political leanings, generalized trust, and level of altruism (Neumayr & Handy, 2017; Understanding, 2006; Yang & Liu, 2021).

Most of these control variables will be defined identically to how they are understood in everyday conversation. Age will be defined as the number of years since an individual's birth, gender will be defined as an individual's self-identified gender identity, and so on. That said, the final three control variables deserve more explanation. Scholars have long noted the relationship between an individual's political ideology and their willingness to donate. However, scholars originally believed this relationship to be spurious (Yang & Liu, 2021). Scholars asserted that political ideology merely correlated with religiosity, which was the true variable impacting individuals' willingness to donate. However, recent literature reveals that ideology itself may play a role in individuals' donation behaviors. Scholars now theorize that ideologies that stress the role of the government in maintaining social welfare, like liberalism and progressivism, make individuals less likely to donate to social causes they see as the government's responsibility (Yang & Liu, 2021). Meanwhile, ideologies that stress the need to constrain government power, like libertarianism and conservatism, make individuals more likely to donate to social causes. For this reason, this study will also include a variable measuring individuals' political ideologies on a scale from those seeking less government intervention in society to those seeking more.

Researchers have also linked an individual's inherent willingness to donate to their generalized trust and level of altruism. Donors often have difficulty monitoring the effectiveness of an organization's work or how they use their donations. For this reason, individuals must have some trust in the organization to use their money wisely when they donate (Neumayr & Handy, 2017). Interestingly, though, some studies have found that the trust an individual has in a specific nonprofit organization does not impact their willingness to donate to them specifically (Katz, 2017; Bodem-Schrötgens & Becker, 2019). This is likely because their trust in that organization to use their money wisely is already included in the perceived charity price variable. However, studies have found that the general level of trust an individual has in others does affect the benefit they find in donating at all (Konrath & Handy, 2017). Those who place a high level of trust in other people and civil organizations are more likely to benefit from donations in general, and vice versa. Since this is not an organizational perception and does not impact an individual's distribution of donations to different nonprofits, generalized trust is included in this study as a control variable. An individual's level of altruism is very similar. Research has shown that individuals with high levels of altruism find more benefit in donating, but this variable has little impact on an individual's distribution of donations to different organizations (Neumayr & Handy, 2017; Kats, 2018). For this reason, the level of altruism is also included in this study as a control variable.

Finally, special concern must be given to how this study seeks to incorporate donations to religious nonprofit organizations. There are many kinds of nonprofits that offer free membership tiers, but by far the most common is the house of worship. Over 350,000 religious congregations exist in the U.S., and they collectively receive tens of billions of dollars in donations every year (Nonprofits, 2023). Yet, many of these donations are not motivated by the perceived organizational characteristics that are the focus of this study. Yes, houses of worship are non-profit organizations like any other: they manage finances, pursue goals, and emphasize certain values over others. But, in another sense, they are also a material embodiment of the faith in which an individual believes. Donations to houses of worship may therefore represent an individual's commitment to their faith and its teachings just as much as they represent their perceptions of the actual organization to which they are donating (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008). If donations to houses of worship are to be included in this study, then it will also be necessary to control for the effects of personal religiosity.

In order to collect quantitative data for all of these variables, this study will utilize a survey design. Surveys are particularly well-suited for the collection of public opinion data (Babbie, 2023). Given that one’s perception of an organization can also be considered their opinion of that organization, surveys are the best choice for collecting the perceptions necessary for measuring this study’s independent variables. Furthermore, a survey design will allow for the direct collection of demographic and donation history data from each individual under study.

This will allow the study to reveal how perceptions of an organization's characteristics influence donation behavior at the individual level. This makes individuals both the unit of analysis and the unit of observation (Babbie, 2023). The study will conduct one survey for each individual respondent, allowing for conclusions about individual behaviors to be drawn without the risk of ecological fallacy. This should be a significant strength of this study's design, as most studies on donation behavior instead attempt to draw conclusions on individual donors' behaviors from fluctuations in a given organization's aggregate amount of donations (Krawczyk et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 2020; Paxton et al., 2020; Leardini et al., 2020; Harris & Neely, 2018).

This study will be designed to provide insight into the behavior of all people living in the United States. This makes the target population of the study all U.S. adults. Analyzing such a large population will make the conclusions of this study much more generalizable and useful, but it comes at the cost of making a complete list of population elements administratively impossible to assemble. Therefore, this study design will employ multistage cluster sampling, a method that selects a probability-weighted sample without requiring a complete list of population elements (Babbie, 2023). First, the research will be conducted entirely within Illinois, as this is the state with demographics most closely matching those of the United States as a whole (McCann, 2024). This makes Illinois the only element in the cluster at the state level, which should reduce administrative expenses. At the second level, a randomly selected cluster of five U.S. House Congressional Districts in Illinois will be selected. These geographic regions equally divide the state's population into groups of 640,000 people and should maintain representativeness while further reducing administrative burden (U.S., 2024).

Lastly, at the third level, a randomly selected cluster of twenty-four households from these districts will be mailed an invitation to participate in an in-person survey. Every adult living in these households will be asked to participate to prevent another stage of clustering and the addition of unnecessary sampling errors (Babbie, 2023). To ensure participation, the researcher will offer a monetary incentive and be prepared to travel to participants to conduct each interview in person. Assuming 2.5 adults live in each household and the study achieves a participation rate of 67%, two hundred respondents will be included in the sample. These two hundred people will likely be representative of the entire United States population, given the care with which the potential for sampling error was reduced at each stage in the clustering process. The sample, then, satisfies the size and representativeness conditions necessary to draw conclusions about the donation behavior of the entire United States population (Babbie, 2023). With more resources, this sampling design might even be repeated in additional states in order to further reduce the potential for sampling error.

Note that, again due to administrative cost concerns, only one interview is planned to be had with each respondent in the sample. This means that the data will come from one specific moment in time, making this a cross-sectional study. As such, it will not be appropriate to draw casual conclusions from this study's findings, nor would it be appropriate to draw conclusions as to how the effects of perceived organizational characteristics on individuals' willingness to donate have changed over time (Babbie, 2023). Regardless, the results of this study will still be useful for discovering correlations between variables. These can still be useful for drawing theoretical conclusions. For example, a lack of correlation between perceived charity price and individuals' willingness to donate to an organization would lend support to the theoretical conclusion that other organizational perceptions are more important for encouraging donations. Additionally, if successful, this study could easily be replicated in future years to allow for longitudinal cohort analysis over time.

After the sampling process, but before data collection activities begin, selected households will be mailed an invitation to participate in the study. This invitation will include a full description of the study's methods, the significance of its research question, and a description of the monetary award they are entitled to for completing the in-person survey. It will also include a full copy of the informed consent form that each respondent will be expected to sign. See Appendix A for a full copy of the study invitation and informed consent form. The informed consent form is designed to share three pieces of crucial information. First, it will detail the design considerations included to protect participants from harm. The most important of these considerations is that participation in the study is completely voluntary at all stages. No individual will face a penalty for not participating beyond forfeiture of the financial reward. Respondents will also be encouraged to skip any uncomfortable questions in the interview, without forfeiting their financial reward. The interviewer will also be trained to conduct the survey quickly, so as not to take up too much of the respondent's day, and will provide each respondent with their contact information in the event any problems arise later.

Second, the informed consent form will outline the mechanisms to be utilized to maintain the respondent's anonymity. This will primarily be accomplished by forgoing the use of names in recording survey results. Instead, each interview will be recorded under a randomly generated numerical code unique to the respondent. Addresses will also not be recorded. Furthermore, all data collected will be kept confidential. This means that no one outside of the research team will have access to individual-level data – only the aggregate numbers necessary for reaching conclusions. However, this will not completely remove all the risks of participating in the study. There is the potential that the individual-level data could be made public under threat of legal action or due to the carelessness of a member of the research team. In that case, someone may be able to piece together a respondent's identity from their demographic information and organizational affiliations. With this, they may be able to reveal the respondent's political leanings, donation history, and other sensitive information. Third, and finally, the informed consent document will give a warning of this potential risk so that respondents can consider it before choosing to participate or not.

Once households have been selected and mailed the invitation and informed consent form, they will be encouraged to follow up with the researcher through email and telephone. The researcher will send a second invitation later in the week to any household that does not follow up after the initial invitation, again inviting them to participate and offering a financial incentive. Once contact has been established, all adults in the household will verify whether they wish to participate in the survey. For all those who answer yes, the researcher will arrange an interview time and date with them. At that time and date, the researcher will travel to the participant's residence. First, they will have each participant sign the informed consent form. The researcher will then conduct six stages of survey questions verbally with each participant. Each stage collects quantitative data from respondents on a different set of variables that are relevant to this study. See Appendix B for a full copy of the survey instrument to be utilized by the interviewer when conducting these in-person interviews.

Beginning with the first stage, these seven questions are designed to collect the demographic data this study's literature review has identified as valuable controls. The first question asks when the respondent was born; this information will be used to calculate their age in years. Note that only ages between 18 and 100 will be accepted, as those outside of this range are likely not earning enough money to consider giving much away in donations and thus fall outside the interests of this study. For the second question, the interviewer will ask the respondents for their self-identified gender. This is a nominal measure, where the quantitative coding scheme means little besides separating respondents into easily identifiable groups. For this reason, self-identified women will arbitrarily be coded as a 1 for this variable, men as a 2, non-binary individuals as a 3, and all other self-reported genders as proceeding numbers as the need arises. For the third question, the interviewer will ask respondents for their ethnicity, which is similarly a nominal measure. African Americans will arbitrarily be coded for this variable as a 1, Asian Americans as a 2, Caucasians as a 3, Native Americans as a 4, Pacific Islanders as a 5, those with two or more ethnicities as a 6, and those who prefer not to answer the question as a 9. In fact, for any question that the respondent prefers not to answer, their coded value for the corresponding variable will be 9. For the fourth question, the interviewer will go on to ask the respondent whether they are Hispanic or Latino. This variable will be coded for each respondent as a nominal dummy variable, where a "yes" response is coded as a 1, while a "no" response is coded as a 0.

For the fifth question, the interviewer will ask the respondents for the highest level of education they have attained. This is an ordinal measure where low levels of education will be coded as lower quantitative values. Respondents that have only completed some high school will be coded on this variable as a 1, those that have completed high school as a 2, those with an associate degree as a 3, those with a bachelor's degree as a 4, those with a master's degree as a 5, and those with a doctorate degree as a 6. For the sixth question, the interviewer will ask respondents for their general level of household income. In order to reduce the respondent's cognitive burden and prevent respondents from being unwilling to share specific financial details, only the general range a respondent's household income falls in will be recorded. This makes it an ordinal variable rather than a ratio measure. Respondents that expect to make less than $25,000 in the present year will be coded for this variable as a 1, those that expect to make between $25,000 and $50,000 as a 2, those that expect to make between $50,000 and $75,000 as a 3, those that expect to make between $75,000 and $100,000 as a 4, those that expect to make between $100,000 and $150,000 as a 5, those that expect to make between $150,000 and $200,000 as a 6, and those that expect to make more than $200,000 as a 7. Note that household income is being collected by this question rather than personal income. This operationalization assumes that spouses collaboratively decide to donate only after meeting their collective needs. Finally, for the seventh demographic question, the interviewer will ask for the respondent's self-described political ideology. Responses have been organized from those ideologies that seek less government intervention in society to those that seek more. Low values for this variable therefore represent lower levels of preferred government intervention. Respondents that consider themselves libertarians will be coded for this variable as a 1, conservatives as a 2, moderates as a 3, liberals as a 4, and progressives as a 5. Respondents will also be given the opportunity to describe their ideology outside of these reductive labels. However, after the survey, the researcher will use their discretion to assign any self-described ideologies to the groups already included in the coding scheme which they most closely resemble.

The next two stages of the interview focus on the final control variables included in the study: religiosity, generalized trust, and altruism. Beginning with religiosity, social science researchers have long identified this variable as difficult to measure. There are many different kinds of religiosity, which makes it difficult to fully capture the concept in a single interview question. That is why this study will instead measure religiosity as an index. The scores on this index will range from 0 being not religious to 5 being deeply religious, based on the respondents' answers to three questions. First, the interviewer will ask whether the respondent strives to follow religious teachings in their day-to-day life. This is what is called the devotional dimension of religiosity. An answer of “yes” will increase the respondent’s religiosity score by 1, while an answer of “no” will leave it unchanged. Second, the interviewer will ask whether the respondent prays or studies religious texts every day. This is what is known as knowledge religiosity. A "yes" response will increase their religiosity score by 2, while a "no" response will prompt a follow-up question. For the follow-up question, the interviewer will ask whether the respondent prays or studies religious texts every week. A "yes" response to the follow-up question will increase their religiosity score by 1, whereas a "no" response will leave it unchanged. Finally, the interviewer will ask whether the respondent attends church every week. This is what is known as ritual religiosity. A "yes" response will raise their religiosity score by 2, while a "no" response will prompt a follow-up question. For the follow-up question, the interviewer will ask whether the respondent attends church at least once a month. A "yes" response to the follow-up question will increase their religiosity score by 1, whereas a "no" response will leave it unchanged.

In the third stage, the interviewer will ask two questions to collect data on the respondent’s levels of general trust and altruism. While many researchers use indexes to measure these variables, these concepts are much simpler than religion. Accurate data should still be collected with only one question relating to each, and this will also serve to speed up the interview process and reduce the cognitive burden on the participant. To measure the respondent’s general level of trust, the interviewer will ask them to respond to the following statement: “You cannot be too careful in dealing with other people.” This question is taken directly from Bekker (2003), which many scholars purport the validity of and have repeatedly utilized. Respondents are offered five responses corresponding to a reverse-coded Likert scale: a “strongly agree” response is coded as a 1, “agree” is coded as a 2, “neither agree nor disagree” as a 3, “disagree” as a 4, and “strongly disagree” as a 5. With this coding scheme, greater disagreement with the statement is recorded as increasing levels of generalized trust. To measure the respondent’s level of altruism, the interviewer will then ask them to respond to the following statement: “Other people’s problems don’t usually bother me.” This question was similarly taken from Bekker (2003). Respondents are again offered five responses corresponding to the same reverse-coded Likert scale as the previous question. This coding scheme records greater disagreement with the statement as increasing levels of inherent altruism. Reverse-coded questions were specifically chosen to counteract respondents’ natural tendency to signal virtuous behavior.

In the fourth stage of the interview, the researcher will attempt to discover the donation-reliant nonprofit organizations the respondent is affiliated with and has likely donated to. Yet, to ease the cognitive burden on the respondent, this question will not be asked directly. Instead, the interviewer will sequentially ask the respondent if they are a member of or support any nonprofits that belong to six different categories: houses of worship, local boys and girls clubs, local hobby and arts groups, political parties or advocacy organizations, activist or educational organizations, and charitable organizations. Most donation-reliant nonprofits fall into one of these six categories, and asking about each separately should allow the respondent to recall relevant organizations more accurately. However, note that respondents are asked to recall any nonprofits that come to mind in order to ease the cognitive burden. The interviewer will therefore go through all the organizations mentioned after conducting each interview to verify that they are nonprofits that raise most of their revenue through charitable donations. If they do not fit this criterion, the organization and the data attached to it will be discarded from the study. Note that no quantitative information is being collected at this stage. The organizations mentioned here will only be used to properly label the quantitative data to be collected in stages five and six for later data analysis.

The interviewer will add each organization that respondents reveal during the fourth stage of the interview to the tables in the sections of the survey instrument that correspond to the fifth and sixth stages of the interview. There are spaces for seven organizations to be listed on each table. If a respondent reports affiliation with more than seven organizations, the interviewer will have on hand another copy of the survey instrument. They will label the second copy with the individual's unique identification number and fill in the tables in the fifth and sixth sections with the remaining observations. Any returned survey instrument with an identification code and no data besides the tables in sections five and six will be understood to have been used for this purpose.

In the fifth stage of the interview, the interviewer will ask each respondent how much money they donate in a typical month to each organization they mentioned in stage four. Respondents can and will be highly encouraged to report any organizations with which they are affiliated to which they do not donate. The interviewer will mention each organization separately, each time giving the respondent a moment to think and answer. If the respondent struggles to provide an answer for any organization, the interviewer will prompt them to base their response on their donations from the previous six months. They will also state that the respondent's best estimate will suffice. However, the interviewer will mark any number the respondent provides after a long hesitation with an asterisk. The data for this variable will be recorded as a straight-count ratio measure equal to the number directly provided by the respondent.

In the sixth and final section, the interviewer will ask each respondent six questions with respect to each of the organizations they mentioned during the fourth stage. Crucially, including those organizations to which they reported no donations. These questions are designed to discover the respondent's perceptions of the organizations in order to later determine whether their donation behavior is correlated with any specific perceptions. All six of the questions ask the respondent to respond to a statement with a response from an ordinal five-point Likert scale: a response of "strongly agree" with any statement will be coded as a 5 with respect to the specific organization in question, "agree" will be coded as a 4, "neither agree nor disagree" as a 3, "disagree" as a 2, and "strongly disagree" as a 1. With this coding scheme, higher values will reveal increasingly positive perceptions of an organization to the respondent. Each of the statements corresponds to one of the six organizational perceptions identified in the literature review as influential on individuals' donation behavior.

The first statement of the sixth stage is, "This organization wastes little of the money that is donated to it." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of each organization's charity price. The second statement is, "This organization does effective work that leaves a lasting impact on society." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of each organization's overall effectiveness and impact. The third statement is, "The values emphasized by this organization align closely with my own personal values." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of each organization's alignment with their personal values. The fourth statement is, "This organization makes me feel happy and uplifted." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of each organization's emotional impact. The fifth statement is, "Most people I know are also members or supporters of this organization." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of how each organization is integrated into their social environment. Finally, the sixth statement is, "This organization is very actively involved in my local community." The responses to this statement reveal the respondent's perception of each organization's geographic proximity. After the respondent responds to each of these statements with respect to each organization they mentioned during the fourth stage, the researcher will conclude the interview and thank the respondent for their time. They will then mark the interview as completed so that the financial reward will be sent to the respondent at a later date.

This survey design is unique in that it collects two different levels of quantitative data. The first, second, and third stages of the interview focus solely on collecting data corresponding to individual respondents. This will be referred to as the individual level. The fifth and sixth stages, however, gather data at the organizational sublevel, linking each data point to a specific organization with which the respondent is affiliated. This hierarchical structure, known as nested data, sees each data point collected with respect to a given organization as nested within the broader level of the individual respondent (Preacher, 2016). Leveraging this design, data analysis for this study will be conducted through multilevel model regression. This approach accommodates variations in donation behavior at both the organizational sublevel, driven by differences in individuals' perceptions of each organization, and the individual level, where respondents may prioritize these perceptions differently. The coefficients of this multilevel regression model will therefore reveal the effect of each perception on the average respondent's willingness to donate to a specific organization.

However, a multilevel regression model does not require the collection of all variables at both levels of the data hierarchy (Preacher, 2016). The data from the interview's first three sections can also be incorporated into the model to account for some of the observed variation in donation behavior at the individual level. For instance, including religiosity in the model can help to account for its impact on the variation between individuals' donations, separating it from the influence of organizational perceptions. Including the control variables collected, then, will prevent the model from inflating the impact of organizational perceptions on individuals' donation behaviors. Yet, it would not be wise to uncritically include all of the control variables collected. Including any additional variables in the model will detract from the impact of organizational perceptions, regardless of whether it actually improves the model's explanatory power (Harrell, 2015). For this reason, each of the control variables collected will be evaluated using backward selection stepwise regression analysis. All the control variables will initially be included in the model. They will then be removed one at a time, starting with the variable that contributes the least to the model (has the smallest coefficient), until removing additional variables begins to significantly detract from the model's explanatory power as revealed by the R^2 coefficient. Through this process, unnecessary controls will be removed to improve the parsimony of the final model utilized.

An assumption of this data analysis design is that any perception of a nonprofit organization will have the same effect on individuals' donation behaviors, regardless of the kind of organization it is attached to. But this might not necessarily be the case. For example, positive perceptions of emotional impact might be correlated with more donations to houses of worship but fewer donations to advocacy organizations. In this situation, including both in the same model would cancel out their effects and make emotional impact perceptions appear to be insignificant. In order to guard against these results, six additional datasets will be constructed. Each of these datasets will include only results from the interview's fifth and sixth stages collected with respect to one category of nonprofit organization. For instance, the first will include only data on how individuals perceive houses of worship, the second will include data on how they perceive boys and girls clubs and public schools, and so on. Each of these datasets will then be fed into the multilevel regression model in order to discover whether organizational perceptions affect different categories of nonprofits in unique ways. If any of these results significantly differ from the results of the full dataset's model, they will be removed from the full dataset and analyzed separately. The full dataset will then be refitted into the final multilevel regression model without these data points included.

While this study will utilize many sophisticated sampling, data collection, and data analysis techniques, it is nevertheless subject to reliability and validity concerns. With regard to reliability, the primary threat is that participants may not put sufficient effort into formulating their responses (Babbie, 2023). While a participant may be quick to strongly agree to a statement during the actual interview, at another time they may think more deeply about the statement and neither agree nor disagree. The attitude or demeanor of the interviewer may also give rise to reliability concerns (Babbie, 2023). While during one interview, the interviewer might be patient and give the respondent ample time to consider their responses, during a later interview the interviewer may rush the respondent into giving different responses than they otherwise would. This concern would be amplified if the research team decided to use two different interviewers. One interviewer's attitude may bias respondents towards positive answers while the other interviewer's attitude may bias respondents towards giving negative answers. In order to mitigate these reliability concerns, this study's interviewers should take great care to approach every interview in the same way, as well as give respondents sufficient time to consider each question in every interview. In order to evaluate the reliability of the results collected, the researcher should also follow up with select recipients to verify the information they provided (Babbie, 2023). If their answers change the second time they are asked, the survey instrument and interview method will need to be revised to improve their reliability.

With regard to validity, the main concern is that the questions used to determine respondents' characteristics and perceptions are inadequate (Babbie, 2023). For example, only one question each is used to determine respondents' general levels of trust and altruism, whereas many studies use some sort of scale or index to measure these variables (Bodem-Schrötgens & Becker, 2019; Neumayr & Handy, 2017). Similarly, only one question each is used to determine respondents' various perceptions of nonprofit organizations. Any of these variables might be more adequately measured using an index, making the limited questions utilized in this study insufficient for establishing validity. Furthermore, each recipient's perceptions of nonprofit organizations are self-reported. Perhaps respondents are biased to provide positive answers to the perceptions of the organizations with which they are affiliated. This would make these perception questions insufficient for establishing validity.

One way to determine whether the measures collected by this study are valid would be to evaluate their construct validity (Babbie, 2023). Theoretically, scholarly literature shows that more positive perceptions of an organization should lead an individual to donate more to that organization. Should this study discover a lack of correlation, or a negative correlation, between more positive perceptions and an individual's willingness to donate, it would imply that these measures may not accurately gauge individuals' perceptions. This same process could be repeated with the trust and altruism variables as well. Theoretically, scholarly literature reveals that greater levels of trust and altruism are associated with a greater willingness to donate to any nonprofit organization (Neumayr & Handy, 2017). If this study does not uncover these same results, it could indicate that the interview questions are not accurately measuring these variables.

References

Babbie, E. R. (2023). *The practice of social research* (15th ed.). Cengage AU. https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Practice_of_Social_Research.html?id=lFvjDwAAQBAJ

Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 32(4), 596–615. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764003258102

Bekkers, R., & Schuyt, T. (2008). And Who Is Your Neighbor? Explaining Denominational Differences in Charitable Giving and Volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research,* 50(1), 74–96. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20447529

Berridge, K. (2018). Evolving concepts of emotion and motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01647

Bodem-Schrötgens, J., & Becker, A. (2019). Do you like what you see? How nonprofit campaigns with output, outcome, and impact effectiveness indicators influence charitable behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(2), 316–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019868843

Harrell, J. F. E. (2015). Regression modeling strategies. *In Springer Series in Statistics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19425-7

Harris, E., & Neely, D. (2018). Determinants and consequences of nonprofit transparency. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 36(1), 195–220. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558x18814134

IUPUI Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2019). Giving USA 2019: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2018. In *Giving USA.* Retrieved April 24, 2024, from https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2019-americans-gave-427-71-billion-to-charity-in-2018-amid-complex-year-for-charitable-giving/

Jacobs, F. A., & Marudas, N. P. (2009). The Combined Effect of Charity price and Administrative Inefficiency on Donations to US Nonprofit Organizations. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 25(1), 33–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.2008.00464.x

Karlan, D., & List, J. A. (2007). Does Price Matter in Charitable Giving? Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment. *The American Economic Review*, 97(5), 1774–1793. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.5.1774

Katz, H. (2017). The impact of familiarity and Perceived trustworthiness and Influence on donations to nonprofits: an Unaided Recall study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 30(2), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2017.1326874

Kesberg, R., & Keller, J. (2021). Donating to the 'right' cause: Compatibility of personal values and mission statements of philanthropic organizations fosters prosocial behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 168, 110313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110313

Krawczyk, K., Wooddell, M., & Dias, A. (2017). Charitable Giving in Arts and Culture Nonprofits: The impact of organizational characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 46(4), 817–836. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764017692038

Leardini, C., Rossi, G., & Landi, S. (2020). Organizational factors affecting charitable giving in the environmental nonprofit context. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 8947. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218947

McCann, A. (2024, February 20). *Electorate Representation Index*. WalletHub. March 2, 2024 from https://wallethub.com/edu/electorate-representation-index/18190

Neumayr, M., & Handy, F. (2017). Charitable giving: What influences donors' choice among different causes? *Voluntas*, 30(4), 783–799. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9843-3

Nonprofits Source. (2023, October 4). *2023 Charitable Giving Statistics, Trends & Data: The Ultimate List of Charity Giving Stats*. https://nonprofitssource.com/online-giving-statistics/

Paxton, P., Velasco, K., & Ressler, R. W. (2020). Does use of emotion increase donations and volunteers for nonprofits? *American Sociological Review*, 85(6), 1051–1083. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122420960104

Preacher, K. (2016). *Introduction to Multilevel Models* [Slide show; PowerPoint Slides]. A PDHP Workshop, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America. University of

Michigan Institute for Social Research. https://pdhp.isr.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2021-08-19-Introduction-to-Multilevel-Models-workshop-Kris-Preacher.pdf

Ressler, R. W., Paxton, P., & Velasco, K. (2020). Donations in social context. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 31(4), 693–715. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21449

Understanding philanthropy: A review of 50 years of theories and research. (2006). [Presentation]. In R. Bekkers & P. Wiepking (Eds.), *35th Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action*. University of Gronigen. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/148194198.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2024). *Apportionment Population and Number of Seats in U.S. House of Representatives by State*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://data.census.gov/

Wong, J., & Ortmann, A. (2015). Do Donors Care About the Price of Giving? A Review of the Evidence, with Some Theory to Organise It. *Voluntas*, 27(2), 958–978. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9567-1

Yang, Y., & Liu, P. (2021). Are Conservatives More Charitable Than Liberals in The U.S.? A Meta-Analysis of Political Ideology and Charitable Giving. *Social Science Research*, 99, 102598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2021.102598

Appendix

Appendix A

Informed Consent Document

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

12494 University Blvd, Orlando, FL 32816

Informed Consent Form for Selected Research Participants

This consent form is for all adult members of the household selected to participate in the research study "How Organizational Perceptions Influence Donation Behavior."

Principle Researcher: Grant Donovan, gr558207@ucf.edu
Organization: University of Central Florida, College of Community Education & Innovation
Sponsor: Dr. Dan Stephens
Project: How Organizational Perceptions Influence Donation Behavior

This Informed Consent Form has two parts:

- Information Sheet (to share information about this study with you)
- Certificate of Consent (for signatures if you choose to participate)

You may keep this copy of the Informed Consent Form. Another copy to be signed will be provided by the interviewer before conducting your research interview.

Part I: Information Sheet

Introduction

Hello! My name is Grant Donovan and I am a graduate researcher currently studying in the University of Central Florida's College of Community Innovation & Education. I am conducting research into how people's perceptions of nonprofit organizations influence their donation behavior. I am going to share some information with you and invite you to be a part of my study. **You do not have to participate in this research.** In fact, if any of the information I share with you here makes you at all uncomfortable, I encourage you to not participate. Also, please feel free to discuss with those close to you whether or not you should participate and take as much time as you need to come to your final decision. If you do not understand any of the information presented here, please reach out to me through the email I left next to my name above. You may also discuss any concerns you have with the interviewer immediately preceding your interview. If you have any other questions later on, or wish to reverse your participation decision at any time, please do not hesitate to reach out to me through email.

Purpose of Research

Nonprofit organizations are an essential part of American society. They provide vital public services like job training, education, childcare, healthcare, disaster relief, advocacy, opportunities for artistic expression, religious community, and more. Most of these nonprofit organizations largely rely on charitable donations from people like you in order to continue funding these essential services. This study is designed to discover why people choose to donate to certain nonprofit organizations over others. Is it because they believe certain nonprofits will use their money more wisely than others? Is it because certain nonprofits are more active in their local community than others? It is my hope that you can help me answers these questions by providing me with information on the nonprofit organizations you donate to and why. More specifically, I am interested in learning how your perceptions of various nonprofit organizations influences the amount of money you've chosen to donate to them.

Significance of Research

Nonprofit organizations are always trying to manipulate your perceptions of them. They invest in fundraising efforts that advertise to you the impact of their work. They put locations in their names to establish a connection to your local community. They may even change the entire way their organization operates in order to better appeal to you. None of these actions are motivated by greed. Instead, they are simply trying to bring in more money so that they can continue providing the essential services your community needs to flourish. By participating in this study, you will help to inform these actions so that nonprofits know how they can better appeal to you. This may result in nonprofit organizations taking more actions that you approve of, rather than wasting money on the things you don't care about. Additionally, this information might allow the nonprofits in your community to raise money more effectively. This would mean more job training opportunities, educational opportunities, low-cost healthcare services, low-cost childcare services, disaster relief services, and the like for people like you.

Sampling Process

You have been selected to take part in this survey because you live in a community of interest. Three U.S. Congressional House Districts in Illinois were selected to be a part of this study. Within these districts, twenty-four households were selected to take part in the in-person interviews. Every adult member of your household is invited to take part in this research opportunity, and each individual will be eligible for the financial reward that accompanies participation. Even if you do not donate to any nonprofit organizations, or do not associate with any nonprofit organizations, your participation would still be greatly beneficial to this study.

Procedure

This research will be conducted through in-person interviews. This means that a researcher will travel to your residence (or, if you would prefer, an agreed upon third location) at a time that is convenient to you. You will then be asked twenty-five questions. These questions will ask you to reveal your age, gender identity, ethnicity, level of education, a general range of your annual income, a self-description of your political ideology, your religious behavior, your level of trust and altruism towards others in society, your organizational affiliations, your donation history, and your perceptions of various nonprofit organizations. The interviewer will be trained to complete this survey in under thirty minutes, so as to not take up too much of your day. Once the study is complete, you will be provided with a copy of the report before publication. This will allow you to see how the information you provided has been analyzed. If you dislike how your information has been used in the report, you will maintain the ability to withdraw from the study. In this case, the information you provided in your in-person interview will be destroyed and the report will be re-written with the data you provided excluded.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. It is your choice whether you wish to participate or not. Again, if any of the information I share with you here makes you at all uncomfortable, I encourage you to not participate. If you choose not to participate, you will not face repercussions of any kind. You may change your decision and withdraw from participation in this study at any time, even after you have completed the in-person interview. If you do this, then all information collected from you will be discarded from this study. You will also be encouraged to skip any and all questions you dislike during the in-person interview for any reason. Note that skipping any amount of questions will not disqualify you from receiving the financial reward for participation. However, only those you go through the entire interview process will receive the financial reward.

No Harm

This research fully commits to the principle of No Harm, which is a promise not to harm any person who agrees to participate in this study. Again, **your participation in this study is entirely voluntary.** If you choose not to participate, you will not face repercussions of any kind. Additionally, if any question that is asked of you during the in-person interview makes you feel at all uncomfortable, you will be encouraged not to answer and the question will be skipped over. You may also reverse your decision to participate at any time, in which case all information collected from you will be destroyed. If at any point you feel as though you have been harmed by this study, please do not hesitate to contact me via email and we will work together to find a suitable remedy. Furthermore, all information collected from you will be kept anonymous and its confidentiality protected.

Confidentiality

All information collected from you will be kept anonymous. This means that your name will not be recorded anywhere. Instead, your responses will be recorded underneath a numerical ID unique to you, but which has no connection to any of your personal characteristic. Your home address will also not be recorded anywhere. With this design, even I should not be able to connect your responses back to you after the in-person interview is completed. You will be allowed to retain your numeric ID after the interview in the case that you later wish to withdraw from the study and have the information you provided destroyed. Furthermore, all information collected will remain confidential. This means that no one outside of myself and my sponsor will have access to the responses from your interview. Instead, all that will be published publicly will be the aggregate findings of the study. With this design, no one should be able to reveal the personal information you provide in your in-person interview.

Risks

Even with this study's commitments to No Harm and confidentiality, participation does not come without some risks. There is the potential that your anonymous responses could be made public under threat of legal action or due to the carelessness of a member of the research team. In that case, someone may be able to piece together your identity from the demographic information and organizational affiliations you provided. With this, they may be able to reveal your political leanings, donation history, religious activities, and other sensitive information. There is also the risk that some of the interview questions make you feel uncomfortable, and you may feel some social pressure to answer them regardless. Your decision to participate in this study should be made with these risks in mind.

Benefits

All participants who go through the entire interview process will receive a $25 gift card of their choice as a thank you for participating. You need not answer every question in order to receive this reward. Withdrawing at any time after completing the interview will similarly not whether you receive the financial reward. The only instance in which you are not eligible to receive a gift card is if you decide not to participate before the interview is conducted. In this case, you will not face any repercussions beyond forfeiting the financial reward. Another, indirect, benefit of participating is that nonprofits in your community may take more actions that you approve of, rather than wasting money on the things you don't care about. Additionally, this information might allow nonprofits to raise money more effectively and better fund the services they provide to your community.

Right to Withdraw or Refuse

You will be allowed to withdraw from participation at any time. In this case, all information collected from you will be destroyed. You may also refuse to answer any question asked of you during the in-person interview.

IRB Review

This study has not been reviewed or approved of by an IRB committee.

Part II: Certificate of Consent

I have been to participate in a exploratory research study on how organizational perceptions influence donation behavior.

I have read the preceding information. I have had the opportunity to ask questions, and the questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent voluntarily to be a participant in this study.

Print Name of Participant:____

Signature of Participant:____

Date (day/month/year):____

Statement by the Interviewer Taking Consent:

I have accurately read out the information sheet to the potential participant, and to the best of my ability made sure that the participant understands that the following will be done:

1. An in-person interview will be conducted at a place and time convenient to the participant. Questions regarding their demographic characteristics, donation history, and their perceptions of various nonprofit organizations will be asked in this interview.

2. The participant may withdraw from the survey at any time and it has been explained that their participation is completely voluntary.

3. The participant’s name will not be linked to their responses, and all information collected will be kept strictly confidential.

I confirm that the participant was given an opportunity to ask questions about the study, and all the questions asked by the participant have been answered correctly and to the best of my ability. I confirm that the individual has not been coerced into giving consent, and the consent has been given freely and voluntarily.

A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been provided to the participant.

Print Name of Interviewer:____

Signature of Interviewer:____

Date (day/month/year):____

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Randomly Generated Respondent ID #: ___________________

Stage 1. Demographics:

1. What year were you born? **(Valid answers: 1924 - 2006)**

   ____

2. What gender do you identify with?

   ☐ Male

   ☐ Female

   ☐ Non-Binary

   ☐ Other

3. What is your ethnicity?

   ☐ African American

   ☐ Asian

   ☐ Caucasian

   ☐ Native American

   ☐ Pacific Islander

   ☐ Two or More

   ☐ Prefer Not to Say

4. Are you Hispanic or Latino? **(yes or no)**

   ____

5. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

   ☐ Some High School

   ☐ High School Diploma

☐ Associate degree

☐ Bachelor's Degree

☐ Master's Degree

☐ Doctorate Degree

6. What is your annual household income? **->** ***Probe If Necessary:*** **"the combined income of you and your spouse"**

☐ Less than $25,000

☐ $25,000 - $50,000

☐ $50,000 - $75,000

☐ $75,000 - $100,000

☐ $100,000 - $150,000

☐ $150,000 - $200,000

☐ More than $200,000

7. How would you describe your political ideology?

☐ Libertarian

☐ Conservative

☐ Moderate

☐ Liberal

☐ Progressive

☐ Other **-> "please specify": ____________________**

☐ None

Stage 2. Religiosity:

8. Do you strive to follow religious teachings in your day-to-day life? **(yes or no)**

____

9. Do you pray or study religious texts at least once every day? **(yes or no) ->** ***If No:*** **"How about every week?"**

☐ Yes: Once Every Day

☐ No – Yes: Once Every Week

☐ No – No

10. Do you attend a religious ceremony at least once every week? **(yes or no) ->** ***If No:*** **"How about every month?"**

☐ Yes: Once Every Week

☐ No – Yes: Once Every Month

☐ No – No

Stage 3. Trust and Altruism:

11. *Respond to this statement:* "You cannot be too careful in dealing with other people."

☐ Strongly Agree

☐ Agree

☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

☐ Disagree

☐ Strongly Disagree

12. *Respond to this statement:* "Other people's problems don't usually bother me."

☐ Strongly Agree

☐ Agree

☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

☐ Disagree

☐ Strongly Disagree

Stage 4. Organizational Affiliations:

Note: Add all specific nonprofit organizations mentioned to tables in the two sections below.

13. Do you belong to any houses of worship? **(yes or no)** ➔ ***If Yes****:* **"which ones?"**

____

14. Are there any public schools or boys and girls clubs to which you send a child? **(yes or**

no) ➔ ***If Yes:*** **"which ones?"**

____

15. Do you belong to any local hobby or arts groups? **(yes or no)** ➔ ***If Yes:*** **"which ones?"**

____

16. Do you regularly volunteer for or financially support any political parties or political advocacy organizations? **(yes or no)** ➔ ***If Yes:*** **"which ones?"**

____

17. Do you regularly volunteer for or financially support any activist or educational organizations? **(yes or no)** ➔ ***If Yes:*** **"which ones?"**

____

18. Do you regularly volunteer for or financially support any charitable organizations? **(yes or no)** ➔ ***If Yes:*** **"which ones?"**

____

Stage 5. Donations:

Note: this question will be asked in reference to each of the non-profit organizations mentioned by the respondent in answering questions 14-19.

Respondent's Affiliated Organizations:	Org. 1:	Org. 2:	Org. 3:	Org. 4:	Org. 5:	Org. 6:	Org. 7:
Question 19: How much money do you donate to this organization each month?							

Probe If Necessary: **"based on your donations in the past six months" or "an estimate will suffice" (*note any hesitation with an asterisk* next to the final recorded value*)**

Stage 6. Perceptions of Non-Profits:

Note: these questions will be asked in reference to each of the non-profit organizations mentioned by the respondent in answering questions 14-19.

Respondent's Affiliated Organizations:	Org. 1:	Org. 2:	Org. 3:	Org. 4:	Org. 5:	Org. 6:	Org. 7:
Question 20: *Respond to the statement:* "This organization wastes little of the money that is donated to it."	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
Question 21: *Respond to the statement:* "This organization does effective work that leaves a lasting impact on society."	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
Question 22: *Respond to the statement:* "The values emphasized by this organization align closely with my own personal values."	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
Question 23: *Respond to the statement:* "This organization makes me feel happy and uplifted."	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Question 24: *Respond to the statement:* "Most people I know are also members or supporters of this organization."	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
Question 25: *Respond to the statement:* "This organization is very actively involved in my local community."	☐ ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree	☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree