



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Revista de Administração

RAUSP
Management Journal

Revista de Administração xxx (2017) xxx–xxx

<http://rausp.usp.br/>

Social Responsibility

What motivates money donation? A study on external motivators

O que motiva a doação de dinheiro? Estudo sobre motivadores externos

¿Qué factores motivan la donación de dinero? Un estudio sobre motivadores externos

Nivea Coelho Degasperi*, Emerson Wagner Mainardes

Fundação Instituto Capixaba de Pesquisa em Contabilidade, Economia e Finanças, Vitória, ES, Brazil

Received 27 April 2016; accepted 1 December 2016

Scientific Editors: Paula Sarita Bigio Schnaider and Flavio Hourneaux Junior

Abstract

The objective of this study is to identify external motivating factors that favor individual money donation. Methodologically, we adopted a descriptive and quantitative cross-sectional study. In order to collect data, we prepared a questionnaire containing 49 statements based on external motivating variables of regular individual money donation found in the literature on the subject. After testing the questionnaire, we applied it to 1073 Brazilians, regular money donors and we performed an exploratory factor analysis. Conclusively, we identified 8 external factors that motivate individual money donation: Trust, Reward, Leadership influences, Characteristics of the organization, Environmental influences, Personal benefits, Characteristics of beneficiaries and Future Interests. We expect that these 8 factors combined, could become a useful tool to improve the management of charitable organizations, especially in defining campaigns or other marketing strategies to attract new donors and raise funds on occasions that are favorable to individual money donation.

© 2017 Published by Elsevier Editora Ltda. on behalf of Departamento de Administração, Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade da Universidade de São Paulo – FEA/USP. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Philanthropy; Individual donation; Motivators for donation; Money donation

Resumo

Neste estudo, Buscou-se identificar os fatores motivadores externos que favorecem a doação individual de dinheiro. Metodologicamente adotou-se uma pesquisa descritiva, quantitativa com corte transversal. Para coleta dos dados foi elaborado um questionário contendo 49 afirmativas baseadas nas variáveis motivadoras externas de doação individual regular de dinheiro encontradas na literatura sobre o tema. Depois de testado, o questionário foi aplicado a 1073 brasileiros, doadores regulares de dinheiro e realizada a análise fatorial exploratória. Conclusivamente, foram identificados oito fatores externos que, na visão dos doadores pesquisados, motivam a doação individual de dinheiro: Confiança, Recompensa, Influências de lideranças, Características da organização, Influências do ambiente, Benefícios pessoais, Características dos beneficiários e Interesses futuros. Espera-se que esses oito fatores, conjuntamente, possam se tornar uma ferramenta útil para melhorar a gestão das organizações de caridade, principalmente na definição de campanhas ou outras estratégias de *marketing* para atrair novos doadores e angariar fundos em ocasiões favoráveis à doação individual de dinheiro.

© 2017 Publicado por Elsevier Editora Ltda. em nome de Departamento de Administração, Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade da Universidade de São Paulo – FEA/USP. Este é um artigo Open Access sob uma licença CC BY (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Palavras-chave: Filantropia; Doação individual; Motivadores para a doação; Doação de dinheiro

* Corresponding author at: Avenida Fernando Ferrari, 1358 CEP 29075-505, Vitória, ES, Brazil.

E-mail: ncdegasperi@gmail.com (N.C. Degasperi).

Peer Review under the responsibility of Departamento de Administração, Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade da Universidade de São Paulo – FEA/USP.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rausp.2017.08.002>

0080-2107/© 2017 Published by Elsevier Editora Ltda. on behalf of Departamento de Administração, Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade da Universidade de São Paulo – FEA/USP. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Resumen

El objetivo en este estudio es identificar los factores motivadores externos que favorecen la donación individual de dinero. Se ha adoptado como metodología un estudio descriptivo, cuantitativo, con sección transversal. Para la recopilación de datos se ha elaborado un cuestionario con 49 afirmaciones que tenían como base las variables motivacionales externas de donación individual regular de dinero encontradas en la literatura sobre el tema. El cuestionario, previamente puesto a prueba, se ha aplicado a 1073 brasileños, donantes regulares de dinero, y se ha realizado el análisis factorial exploratorio. Como conclusión, se han identificado ocho factores externos que, en la opinión de los encuestados donantes, motivan la donación individual de dinero: confianza, recompensa, influencias de liderazgo, características de la organización, influencias del ambiente, beneficios personales, características de los beneficiarios e intereses futuros. Se espera que estos ocho factores, juntos, puedan convertirse en una herramienta útil para mejorar la gestión de las organizaciones de caridad, sobre todo en la definición de campañas y otras estrategias de marketing destinadas a atraer a nuevos donantes y a recaudar fondos en ocasiones favorables a la donación individual de dinero.

© 2017 Publicado por Elsevier Editora Ltda. en nombre de Departamento de Administração, Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade da Universidade de São Paulo – FEA/USP. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Palabras clave: Filantropía; Donación individual; Motivadores para la donación; Donación en efectivo

Introduction

Philanthropy, briefly defined as a private action for the public good (Payton, 1988), represents contributions (of money, time, goods and specializations) voluntarily donated to the common good (Schuyt, Smit, & Bekkers, 2004). These donations can be intermediated by the third sector or non-profit organizations, such as religious, educational, scientific, health, charitable, among other bodies (Payne, 1998).

In face of the acknowledgment of the collaboration that philanthropy brings to the economic and social development of a nation, Wiepking (2009) states that the pillars of future prosperity will be sustainable economic growth, political democracy and a basic level of social services. In this context, social and public welfare institutions, will possibly be financially supported by three sources of fundraising: government financing, fees and charges and philanthropy. However, due to changes in social, political and economic environments in the world, resources that ought to be provided or financed by the government have been made increasingly more scarce toward the support of charitable organizations (Grace & Griffin, 2006).

Based on this scenario, an overall increase in individual donations of money is estimated for charitable organizations. In 2013, for example, the amount donated to charity worldwide was 335.17 billion USD, with 72% being from individual donations. In the Brazilian reality, 22% of individuals are already donors or have donated to civil society organizations (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014).

With that taken into account, this subject has been much discussed in the academia, Bekkers and Wiepking (2011d) reviewed approximately 550 articles with the purpose of better knowing the behavior of the individual donor and the attributes that are tied to these donors. Other researchers, in addition to the previous authors, such as Grace and Griffin (2009), Verhaert and Van den Poel (2011), Michel and Rieunier (2012) and Casale and Baumann (2013), also seek to understand the reasons why individuals donate to charity by identifying variables that are directly related to the behavior of this individual donor. However, most of these studies have concentrated their research on factors, mechanisms or set of variables that shape the donor behavior. As an

exception, Bekkers and Wiepking (2007, 2011b) grouped variables in 8 donation mechanisms, however, they did not separate the external motivators from the internal ones, despite the differences between them. Moreover, we did not test the models empirically.

As a way of filling the literature gap, especially on the lack of empirical studies and with regard to the grouping of external motivators of donation, this study intends to answer the following question: What are the external motivating factors that favor individual donations of money by Brazilians?

We highlight that understanding the behavior of the individual donor through the external motivating factors that favor the donation of money is relevant for two reasons: the first concerns academic contribution, since the existing literature lacks research on the subject, mainly focused on grouping variables and conducting empirical research. The second reason refers to the practical field, since charitable organizations increasingly have the need of knowing the external motivators that favor donation, mainly due to a possible transition in which these organizations are inserted, which provides for a considerable reduction of government funding and the consequent need to increase the individual donation of money. In this environment, for a good performance of charitable organizations, a constant refinement of fundraising techniques is required in order to obtain potential donors to finance charitable projects (DeHaven, 2010).

As a result of not finding national studies that approach the external motivators of the individual donation of money, we opted to identify them in international literature to verify the adherence of these external motivators in Brazil. The motivators are possibly the same for all of society, regardless of which country it is, and some motivators appear as having more or less strength depending on the country. However, in general terms, these external motivators tend to be the same or very similar among the various countries, which also makes the use of these motivators become a possibility within the Brazilian reality.

Besides this introduction, this study contemplates a theoretical framework, covering the behavior of the donor and it adopts as its main focus, identifying the largest possible number of variables related to external motivators that favor the individual

donation of money. In this research, we were able to identify 49 external motivators that favor the donation of money, presented in this study through a framework. In order to verify if the variables contained in the literature motivate the behavior of the Brazilian individual donor, we conducted a quantitative research with 1073 frequent donors of money. And, as a way to reduce the amount of variables, we propose its grouping through the factorial analysis that allowed us to identify 8 external motivating factors that favor the donation of money.

Theoretical framework

It is estimated that rich individuals, middle-class entrepreneurs, as well as ordinary people, i.e., the majority of citizens, are becoming increasingly involved with the common good (Schuyt et al., 2004). In this situation, philanthropic organizations already know that individuals are prone to donating money and/or goods (Bachke, Alfnes, & Wik, 2014).

In view of this scenario, academia efforts are aimed at knowing the reasons why individuals make their donations. Bekkers and Wiepking (2011c), for example, argued that acts of philanthropy can be inspired by a concern for the welfare of beneficiaries. This leads to an understanding of what had been pointed out by Grace and Griffin (2006), by stating that individual personality characteristics and demographic factors can provide a range of information to explain donation behavior.

On the other hand, researchers such as Bennett (2003) questioned the fact that motivations predictors of donation are related only to the desire to help or by demographic issues. In Bennett's (2003) view, there are other factors that supposedly influence the propensity to donate, such as: the image and brand of the charitable organization; the perception that the organization is efficient; the fact that people's generosity is often related to their affiliation with a network, society, political group, social movement or a religious, artistic or scientific community.

In this line of research, Knowles, Hyde, and White (2012) corroborate these arguments and emphasize that, despite the importance and the amount of research conducted on donations to charity focusing on demographic variables, they do not provide an explanation of why people choose to get involved with a determined donation and do not foresee strategic goals to encourage them to donate more.

It seems that before engaging with charity, individuals go through a process of deciding which organization they should support with donations of money and/or goods. Thus over the years one begins to consider a range of influences on charitable donations, including external motivations to donate (Smith & McSweeney, 2007).

At the end of the 20 century, researchers such as Amos (1982), Guy and Patton (1989), Kelly (1995) and Bendapudi, Singh, and Bendapudi (1996) identified that some issues external to the individual could influence the donation of money/goods to charitable organizations. Amos (1982), for example, observed that people may be induced by their employer so to contribute to charitable organizations. The author also identified that people tend to donate for religious motivation as a way to secure their salvation. It is further stated that people can develop the habit

of giving money and/or goods for political reasons, i.e., when a political aspirant contributes to a charitable organization aiming to build a reputation as a solid community leader.

At the end of the eighties, Guy and Patton (1989) made considerations about the need for philanthropic organizations to seek money donations to help them fulfill their purpose. They warned that the volume of money collection would determine the success of organizations in the mission of helping others. The authors also argued that organizations should be able to show, through historical data, positive results on the philanthropic work developed, as the reputation of a charity can obtain a new donor.

Furthermore, other authors (Banks & Tanner, 1999; Bendapudi et al., 1996; Kelly, 1995) compose the historical evolution of the first investigations on the external motivators of money and/or goods donation. The study by Kelly (1995), for example, noted that the credibility of the recipient organization could be an important attribute to positively influence the donation, as well as when the donor is benefited and/or rewarded by the act of charity, there may be greater interest in donating (Bendapudi et al., 1996). It was also found that seasonal effects may motivate donations, with a higher probability of it occurring in the fourth quarter (Banks & Tanner, 1999).

Giving continuity to studies which revealed external variables that motivate the acts of money donation, more research emerged with this focus from the year 2000 onwards and the approaches range from the appearance of the recipient of the donation (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007) to transparency in the accountability of charitable organizations, which, in this case, tends to be fundamental for the maintenance of money and/or goods donation (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013). In this regard, for Van Iwaarden, van der Wiele, Williams, and Moxham (2009), the need for better management of charitable organizations rises, aiming at the development of measures of internal efficiency and external effectiveness, since despite the amount of donations received, there are signs that donors are not satisfied with the performance of charitable organizations and most of them would like to know more about what happens with their donations.

Therefore, it is relevant to highlight that attributes related to the characteristics of charitable organizations were evidenced as important predictors of money donation. The very type of organization and the cause it advocates can interfere positively or negatively in a person's decision to donate money/goods (Okten & Weisbrod, 2000). In this context, according to Bowman (2006), the clarity of an organization's mission and the trust assigned to its leader tend to interfere positively with the decision to donate, which can generate more trust in charitable organizations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011c), as well as the influence of image and brand, studied by Michel and Rieunier (2012), also tends to be related to the choice of charitable organization to which the individual will assist with money and/or goods donation.

Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013) found positive effects on seven external variables that tended to interfere in some way with the behavior of money/goods donor: Rules and regulations, transparency in accountability, media influence, interest in sweepstakes, beneficiaries seen as innocent, influential donors

and geographic range of campaigns. In the last item, it should be noted that there is a strong tendency for donors to prefer donating to national causes, i.e., for campaigns intended to benefit people from their own country.

In the same way that the characteristics of the organizations related to their management can interfere positively in money donation, we also observed that other external motivators tend to promote donation, such as climate influence. In the study by Bekkers and Wiepking (2007), it is evidenced that people are more likely to donate money to charity when the weather is milder. In this same study, the authors pointed out that individuals are more likely to donate at commemorative times, such as Christmas, however, in cases of economic recession, this behavior may not be repeated, because according to Breeze and Morgan (2009), individuals tend to donate less in periods of economic crisis.

For Smith and McSweeney (2007), a catastrophic natural phenomenon tends to significantly raise the level of contribution from individual donors, suggesting that the consciousness of need of a population influences charitable donations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011c). In another study, Bekkers and Wiepking (2011b) conducted an extensive research on predictors of donation and highlighted several other attributes that tend to have a strong relationship with individual money donation: the fact that the individual is accompanied when one is asked to donate; the fact that the individual obtains a gift from the recipient of the donation; the very act of requesting or inviting the individual to donate, and, in this regard, when the request is done personally, the tendency of the response being positive increases even more if the requestor has some physical appeal. In addition, the requestor's gender can also positively influence donations, since men tend to donate more when they receive requests from attractive women (Landry, Lange, List, Price, & Rupp, 2005). The use of celebrities in donation campaigns is also considered in the investigations by Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013), as they tend to increase the level of public confidence in charitable organizations, since ordinary citizens may feel a special bond with a celebrity and become more willing to donate.

In a recent study on the external motivators of donations of money/goods conducted by Mainardes, Laurett, Degasperi, and Lasso (2015), the author identified that the choice for the charitable organization can also be motivated when individuals perceive that the beneficiary organization does not receive government aid. Moreover, this same study shows that the value of the regular contribution tends to interfere with the decision to donate money to a charity, i.e., the lower the value of the contribution, it is possible to increase the number of donors of money and consequently the amount collected. Mainardes et al. (2015) also emphasized that the service provided to the donor tends to be essential in maintaining this donation.

In summary, through the various studies cited in this literature review, we identified forty-nine external variables that, in some way, can favor the individual donation of money. These variables are shown in Table 1.

In this topic, we sought to identify as many external motivating variables as possible that favor the individual donation of money. However, we consider that it may be very difficult for

managers of charitable organizations to manage a wide range of variables such as those presented in Table 1, thus rises the need to group them as to facilitate the understanding of all of them by the managers of charitable organizations. Their use can be encouraged to stimulate potential donors or even direct marketing campaigns focusing on those individuals most likely to donate.

Research methodology

To achieve the objective of this study, which is to identify external motivating factors that favor individual money donations by Brazilians, we adopted a quantitative approach, with a cross-sectional and descriptive character.

The population defined for this research is formed by regular Brazilian individual donors of money. Therefore, to participate in this study, the individual should claim to be a regular donor of money, even if one does not have a defined regularity (weekly, monthly, etc.).

We chose a non-probabilistic sampling procedure by accessibility, since the quantity of the population investigated is unknown. In this regard, as part of the sample we included 1073 Brazilian individuals of various ages, gender, level of education, residents in small and large cities who claimed to make regular, individual money donations. We aimed at obtaining the sample as diversified as possible, avoiding to focus on only one type of donation or charitable organization.

For the data collection, we elaborated a questionnaire that contemplated 49 statements based on the external motivating variables of individual money donation identified in the literature review (Table 1), 11 questions for the characterization of the sample and one control question.

At the top of the questionnaire we present the first three questions, with the first one being related to the control question and the other two on the characterization of the sample. For the control question we asked: "Do you make regular money donations?". The options were "Yes, money (or new goods, such as food, for example)", "No". If the respondent reported "No", they were excluded from the sample. Then, two questions were inserted to start the characterization of the sample, one to know the frequency with which the respondent made the donations and the other to know how long the donations were conducted for. In the sequence, we requested the respondent to answer the questionnaire thinking in a general manner, how the donor of money behaves, indicating their degree of agreement with respect to the 49 statements. These statements were accompanied by a Likert scale, in which the respondents' answers ranged from 1 ("Totally disagree") and 5 ("Totally agree"). At the end of the questionnaire, a further nine questions were inserted to finalize the characterization of the sample: age, gender, marital status, whether one has children, level of education, occupation, monthly income, region where one lives in and the size of the city.

The questionnaire was created in "Googledocs" and its first application was an initial test conducted with a controlled sample of 16 interviewed donors who belonged to the study population. After the validation of the content, the questionnaire link was

Table 1
External motivators that favor the donation of money.

No.	Variables	Definition of variables
01	Campaigns geographical amplitude	Donors tend to donate more for national campaigns (Casale & Baumann, 2013; Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
02	Appearance of the donation beneficiary	A beneficiary with a good image tends to be more likely to be considered worthy of donation (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007)
03	Donor service	Donor service is essential for maintaining the donation of money and/or goods (Mainardes et al., 2015)
04	Beneficiaries seen as innocent	Donor's perception of beneficiary being innocent increases donation propensity (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
05	Catastrophe	Individuals tend to donate in times of environmental catastrophes and public calamities (Smith and McSweeney, 2007)
06	Climate conditions	Individuals are more likely to donate money to charity when the weather is mild, neither too hot nor too cold (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007)
07	Trust in the organization	When the beneficiary organization inspires trust, individuals are more willing to make donations (Van Iwaarden et al., 2009)
08	Trust in the organization's leadership	The donor knowing the founder or director of the beneficiary organization can influence the donation process (Bowman, 2006)
09	Contribution value	Low, regular and fixed donation contribution tends to increase donation of money (Mainardes et al., 2015)
10	Conditional cooperation	Individuals donate more money when they have the information that other individuals also donate (Wiepking & Heijnen, 2011)
11	Credibility of the organization	The credibility of the beneficiary organization tends to influence the donation process (Kelly, 1995)
12	Influential donors	Releasing influential donor names can promote positive donor engagement (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
13	Leadership effect	Observing other individuals donating can influence donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007)
14	Seasonal effects	Individuals tend to donate more in the fourth quarter of the year (Banks & Tanner, 1999)
15	Efficiency and effectiveness of the organization	The beneficiary organization being efficient and effective in using the resources and executed projects tends to obtain more donors (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011c; Scaife et al., 2012)
16	Companion influence	Individuals accompanied at the time of being invited to make the donation are more likely to donate (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b)
17	Requestor's gender	Male individuals tend to donate more when they receive requests from attractive women (Landry et al., 2005)
18	Image of the organization	The image that donors have in relation to the beneficiary organization contributes to the donation (Michel & Rieunier, 2012)
19	Celebrity influence	Using a celebrity as a spokesperson tends to increase donation (Michel & Rieunier, 2012)
20	Economy influence	Individuals tend to donate less in case of economic recession (Breeze & Morgan, 2009)
21	Church influence	Frequency of church attendance increases the amount donated (Schuyt et al., 2004)
22	Acquaintances influence	An individual can donate because their acquaintances actively support this behavior (Grace & Griffin, 2006)
23	Influence of commemorative dates	At commemorative dates, individuals tend to be more prone to donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007)
24	Employer influence	When an individual is induced by an employer to make donations (Amos, 1982)
25	Brand image of the organization	The brand image of the beneficiary organization tends to influence donors (Michel & Rieunier, 2012)
26	Mission of the organization	Clarity about the mission of the beneficiary organization may favor donation (Bowman, 2006)
27	Religious motivation	Individuals tend to donate to religion in exchange for spiritual benefits or eternal salvation (Amos, 1982)
28	Political motivation	Individuals tend to donate to the beneficiary organization to build up a political image (Amos, 1982)
29	Lack of public funding	Individuals donate more money and/or goods when they realize that the beneficiary organization does not receive government aid (Mainardes et al., 2015)
30	Tax benefit	It refers to tax benefits when making donations (Wiepking, 2009)
31	Participating in specific groups	The individual who is part of a particular group (e.g., Association, Club) tends to increase the donation (Wiepking & Maas, 2009)
32	Interest in sweepstakes	Donate and win a ticket to participate in a prize draw (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
33	Interest in future service	Donor may require that organization in the future (Amos, 1982)
34	Social pressure	Individuals feeling pressured to donate tend to donate less (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007)
35	Reciprocity	The individual tends to donate for reciprocity, for example, when one receives an invitation from any organization for a dinner (DeHaven, 2010)
36	Public acknowledgment	Publicly acknowledging the donor's name tends to increase donation (DeHaven, 2010)
37	Rules and regulations	Beneficiary organizations being subject to well-defined donation rules and regulations tend to increase receiving donations (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
38	Reputation of the organization	The reputation of the beneficiary organization tends to interfere in the decision of the individual to make the donation (Guy & Patton, 1989)
39	Receiving reward	Benefits perceived by the individual when making donations. Ex: gifts, among others (Bendapudi et al., 1996)
40	Consciousness of need	When the donor becomes aware of the need to donate to that purpose (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007)
41	Identification of the donor	The individual uses some object to be identified as a donor (Grace & Griffin, 2009)
42	Receiving gifts	Individuals tend to donate more to obtain a present from the beneficiary of the donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b)
43	Being invited to donate	The request/invitation tends to increase donors' donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b)
44	Donation request held personally	The individual tends to accept the donation request when it is done personally (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b)
45	Physical appearance of the requestor	Individuals who are more physically attractive tend to get more donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b)
46	Type of organization	The type of organization and the cause it advocates interfere with the decision to donate (Okten & Weisbrod, 2000)
47	Transparency in accountability	Transparency in accountability tends to be fundamental for maintaining the donation (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
48	Use of media and technology	Media use via technology tends to increase donation (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013)
49	Use of the "love" concept	Using the concept of "love" in campaigns can promote donation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011c)

Source: Prepared by the author.

distributed, electronically by e-mail to 2200 individuals. The link of the questionnaire was also shared through social media such as Facebook and the Whatsapp application, with the respondent being invited to share the questionnaire in their contacts network. Furthermore, we distributed in technical schools, colleges and churches, 750 printed questionnaires, of which 480 returned. The survey was conducted between the months of May to July 2015. At the end of the data collection, we obtained 1073 answers, all considered as valid.

In order to verify that the sample used in the research was adequate to respond to the purpose of this investigation, we performed the characterization of the profile of the donors participating in the research. In this analysis, we observed that 66.4% of respondents were female. Most were married (40.4%) and that 51.7% do not have children. With regard to age, a higher concentration was observed among people aged from 25 to 30 (21.01%), 19 to 24 years (18%) and 31 to 36 years (17.5%). Regarding education, 42.5% of respondents had completed secondary education and 27.3% had completed higher education. In addition, the majority of respondents declared that they were employees (70.1%), whose most frequent individual income is above 1 and up to 3 minimum wages. The sample was formed by respondents living in urban areas (68.7%), however, the majority reside in small cities (46.4%). With regard to the periodicity of donation, the majority of respondents (58%) admitted to donating frequently, but with no regularity defined. Next is the monthly donation (19.1%). Among those who donate regularly, 28.8% assumed to making donations for over 10 years and 21% between 3 and 5 years.

Finally, upon completion of this first analysis, we found that the typical donor profile described in the literature diverged at some points to the profile observed in the used sample. That is, we can consider that, except for some particularities, such as age, number of children and level of education, the Brazilian donor resembles the donor from different parts of the world, a result of the characteristics observed in the scientific literature on the subject. Therefore, we consider that the sample obtained is adequate for the exploratory factor analysis, presented in the following section.

Analysis of results

In order to identify the external motivating factors that favor individual money donations and to achieve the central objective of this research, we performed an exploratory factor analysis. Thus, after performing the varimax orthogonal rotation, 46 variables were synthesized resulting in 8 factors, as described in [Table 2](#).

The result of the analysis organized the variables by order of importance of each variable for each factor. By observing [Table 2](#), we were able to verify the loading of each component in the factor composition. A factor loading represents the correlation between an original variable and the factor. That is, it indicates how much each variable is associated with each factor generated. The minimum acceptable value for the contribution of the variable to a factor loading is 0.40. However, the contri-

Table 2
Components of factors with varimax rotation.

Factor	Variable	Factor loading
F1	Trust in the organization	.760
	Credibility of the organization	.632
	Trust in the organization's leadership	.616
	Catastrophe	.591
	Consciousness of need	.536
F2	Image of the organization	.535
	Receiving gifts	.748
	Identification of the donor	.737
	Reciprocity	.691
	Receiving a reward	.684
	Public acknowledgment	.450
F3	Physical appearance of the requestor	.427
	Leadership effect	.616
	Seasonal effects	.605
	Influential donors	.574
	Conditional cooperation	.565
	Requestor's gender	.536
	Celebrity influence	.528
	Efficiency and effectiveness of the organization	.495
F4	Companion Influence	.485
	Type of organization	.653
	Transparency in accountability	.644
	Use of media and technology	.608
	Use of the "love" concept	.563
	Being invited to donate	.508
	Rules and regulations	.484
F5	Church influence	.682
	Acquaintances influence	.672
	Influence of commemorative dates	.526
	Economy influence	.456
	Employer influence	.456
	Brand image of the organization	.405
	Lack of public funding	.382
F6	Contribution value	.596
	Mission of the organization	.590
	Political motivation	.555
	Tax benefit	.543
	Religious motivation	.465
F7	Physical appearance of the requestor	.750
	Donor service	.559
	Campaigns geographical amplitude	.543
	Beneficiaries seen as innocent	.518
	Climate conditions	.492
F8	Participating in specific groups	.648
	Interest in future service	.543
	Interest in sweepstakes	.501

Source: Research data. Developed by the authors.

bution of the variable "Lack of public financing" is 0.382, close to the acceptable minimum, and was therefore maintained.

Following the analysis, we performed the KMO test and the Bartlett's sphericity test. The KMO is used to verify how much of the data variance can be explained, simultaneously, by all the variables and consequently to say if the size of the sample was adequate to the number of variables. The KMO obtained a value of 0.946, and since the desirable parameter for this test is a value that is close to 1, we can consider that the sample used

Table 3

Factor names.

Factor 1 – trust	Factor 2 – reward
Trust in the organization	Receiving gifts
Credibility of the organization	Identification of the donor
Trust in the organization's leadership	Reciprocity
Catastrophe	Receiving a reward
Consciousness of need	Public acknowledgment
Image of the organization	Physical appearance of the requestor
Factor 3 – leadership influence	Factor 4 – characteristics of the organization
Leadership effect	Type of organization
Seasonal effects	Transparency in accountability
Influential donors	Use of media and technology
Conditional cooperation	Use of the concept of "love"
Requestor's gender	Being invited to donate
Celebrity influence	Rules and regulations
Efficiency and effectiveness of the organization	
Influence of the companion	
Factor 5 – environmental influences	Factor 6 – personal benefits
Church Influence	Contribution value
Acquaintances influence	Mission of the organization
Influence of commemorative dates	Political motivation
Economy influence	Tax benefit
Employer influence	Religious motivation
Brand image of the organization	
Lack of public funding	
Factor 7 – characteristics of beneficiaries	Factor 8 – future interests
Physical appearance of the requestor	Participating in specific groups
Donor service	Interest in future service
Campaigns geographical amplitude	Interest in sweepstakes
Beneficiaries seen as innocent	
Climate conditions	

Source: Research data. Developed by the authors.

in this research is adequate to the number of items investigated. Bartlett's sphericity test presented a p -value of 0.000. This means that data are not correlated as a null hypothesis and that there are relations between the questions, thus justifying the application of the exploratory factorial analysis.

Subsequently, as a way of demonstrating the proportion of contribution of the variance of each variable to the generation of the factors, we analyzed the commonalities between the indicators. For research in administration, loadings of a value greater than 0.30 are considered acceptable, above 0.50 are moderately important and above 0.70 are very important. Thus, out of the initial 49 variables (Table 1), the following variables did not meet the criterion of community acceptance and were excluded from the exploratory factor analysis: social pressure, reputation of the organization and donation request held personally. Thus, the exploratory factor analysis was performed with 46 variables.

After performing the validity tests of the analysis, we tried to name the 8 factors, as presented in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, we can affirm that the grouping of the original variables allowed in a coherent way, the generation of

Table 4

Total variance explained.

Components	Rotation sums of squared loadings		Cronbach's alpha
	Total % of variance	% accumulated	
1 – Trust	3.95	8.60	0.802
2 – Reward	3.92	8.53	0.812
3 – Leadership influences	3.71	8.07	0.84
4 – Characteristics of the organization	3.15	6.85	0.801
5 – Environmental influences	2.78	6.05	0.795
6 – Personal benefit	2.57	5.59	0.75
7 – Characteristic of beneficiaries	2.53	5.51	0.712
8 – Future interest	1.92	4.17	0.62

Source: Research data. Developed by the authors.

the 8 external motivating factors that favor individual money donation.

With the orthogonal varimax rotation, we estimate that the factors have a proportional variation in order to represent the data in the best possible way. Thus, Table 4 presents the 8 factors defined from the 46 variables tested with their respective variances and reliability indicators (Cronbach's alpha).

By observing Table 4, we can see that a value is attributed to each one of the factors, as well as their respective variances. The 8 factors together can explain 53.41% of the total data variability. Although the criterion of acceptability of the variance established by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2009) is 60%, given the exploratory nature of this study and considering that there are still the personal characteristics of the individual that can motivate the donations, which are independent of external motivations, possibly the remainder of the variance tends to be explained by internal donor motivators. This allows us to accept the variance of 53.41% pointed out in this study.

We can also note, by observing the percentage of the variance of each factor, that there is no predominant factor to explain the suggested model, that is, the explanatory percentages of each factor show a certain balance on the external motivators that favor individual donation of money. This means that external motivators vary from donor to donor, which shows that it is necessary to group the donors into groups that are homogeneous between each other and heterogeneous between groups, something that can be done in future studies.

We can further observe that, the first three factors presented, respectively, 8.6%, 8.5% and 8.0% of the total variability of the model, suggesting that the degree of importance of these first three factors are virtually the same, followed by factors 4 and 5, which explain 6.85% and 6.5% of the total variance of the model. Factors 6 and 7 then explained 5.59% and 5.51% of the total variance, and finally factor 8, which explained 4.17% of the total model variance.

By analyzing each factor generated individually, we notice that factor 1 "Trust", responsible for the responsible for the explanation of 8.6% of the variance, corroborates the studies by Kelly (1995), Bekkers (2003), Bowman (2006), Smith and

McSweeney (2007), Bekkers and Wiepking (2007), Van Iwaarden et al. (2009), and Michel and Rieunier (2012). This trust can be generated in donors by the level of credibility of the organization, possibly by the way it works its image before society, including by means of its leadership. Trust in a donation relationship can be so relevant that Bekkers (2003) conducted a research to investigate exclusively the trust in the process of donation and philanthropy of the Dutch. In this study, Bekkers (2003) concluded that, in addition to trust in the organization, individuals need to have a social trust, as if it were a broader level of trust, that involved the process of accreditation of society toward their own country. In this regard, by evaluating the “Trust” factor, one can consider that, according to the respondents, this factor is an important external motivator that favors the donation of money, consistent with the results of Bekkers (2003).

The second factor, “Rewards”, is responsible for explaining 8.53% of the variance, demonstrating consistency with the findings of Bendapudi et al. (1996), Grace and Griffin (2009), DeHaven (2010) and Bekkers and Wiepking (2011b). These authors also argued that individuals may be motivated to donate money when realizing that they will somehow be rewarded for the act of accomplished charity. This reward can be in the form of a physical gift, such as when the donor receives a gift for having donated (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b), or even receiving a ribbon identifying one as a donor (Grace & Griffin, 2009). The donor may also feel rewarded in receiving intangible gifts, such as public recognition, as highlighted by the researchers Grace and Griffin (2009) by claiming that the act of donating to charitable causes can be driven by the visible display of the donation made or the public recognition of the donation. Thus, consistent with previous research, we can suggest that, for the researched donors, individuals can donate money by being motivated by rewards.

The third factor, “Leadership influences” explained 8.07% of the total variance of the model and corroborate the investigations of Banks and Tanner (1999), Landry et al. (2005), Bekkers and Wiepking (2007), Wiepking and Heijnen (2011), Bekkers and Wiepking (2011b), Bekkers and Wiepking (2011c), Michel and Rieunier (2012), Scaife, McDonald, and Wiepking (2012) and Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013). This factor groups variables that are in some way linked to the act of giving, following the example and by the desire to repeat a behavior of some special person. This person can be an idol, a famous person or an admirable leader. According to Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013), people may be motivated to donate money by having rich, famous or respected individuals as their leaders and donors, since ordinary people can feel a special affection for a celebrity and become more willing to give. This motivation may also arise with seasonal effects at certain times of the year, such as in the third quarter for example, in which many people become more sensitive to donations of money because these are periods in which there are several donation campaigns and consequently many people donating (Banks & Tanner, 1999). Thus, according to the literature and as indicated by the result of this research we estimate that people may be motivated to donate by influences of leaderships considered significant by them.

Factor 4, “Characteristics of the organization”, explained 6.85% of the variance and pointed out the importance that people attribute to organizations regarding, for example, transparency in accountability, the type of organization and whether the rules and norms of the organization are clear. This factor the findings by Okten and Weisbrod (2000), Bekkers and Wiepking (2011a, 2011b, 2011c), and Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013). It is estimated that, according to the characteristics of the organization, the donor can become more or less sensitive to the donation of money (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). Thus, we perceived through the donors researched, the importance of the factor “Characteristics of the organization” as an external motivation for the individual donation of money.

Regarding factor 5, “environmental influences”, it is responsible for explaining 6.05% of the variance. The variables that composed this factor were also part of the research by Amos (1982), Schuyt et al. (2004), Grace and Griffin (2006), Bekkers and Wiepking (2007), Breeze and Morgan (2009), Wiepking (2009), Michel and Rieunier (2012) and Mainardes et al. (2015). This group indicates that individuals can be influenced to donate money by known people, governments, churches, the economy, employers and even by the brand of the charitable organization. According to Wiepking (2009), the influential role of the church over the behavior of the individual donor has grown considerably. This demonstrates the influence of the church in the process of individual donation of money. For Mainardes et al. (2015), the fact for the charitable organization not receiving public funding makes individuals more motivated to make their donations. Thus, these studies can be said to support the formation of the group “Environmental influences”, and suggests that the variables contained in this factor are grouped coherently, leading us to the finding that factor 5 brings together a set of external motivators that favor individual money donation.

With the lower percentages we present the last three factors: 6 “Personal benefits”, which explained 5.59% of the total variance of the model; 7 “Characteristics of beneficiaries”, responsible for the explanation of 5.51% of the variance; and, lastly, factor 8 “Future Interests” that explains only 4.17% of the variance. These constructs were also investigated by Amos (1982), Bowman (2006), Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007), Van Leeuwen and Wiepking (2013), Bekkers and Wiepking (2007), Wiepking and Maas (2009), Casale and Baumann (2013) and Mainardes et al. (2015).

In the case of factor 6, “Personal benefits”, it indicates that individuals can make donations when they realize that they will be benefited in some way, whether by saving on the total value being donated (by opting for a regular donation, but with a low value), or by receiving tax benefits, or even by receiving a spiritual benefit, as can occur when the motivation of the individual is of a religious nature. The study by Amos (1982), for example, had already addressed that people could start donating in exchange for spiritual benefits or to receive eternal salvation. Wiepking (2009) concluded that the strategy of some countries to encourage the use of tax benefit for income tax deduction can be very helpful in increasing the amount donated to charity. These benefits were also evidenced by the donors surveyed as important to motivate the donation of money.

On factor 7, “Characteristics of beneficiaries”, we can say that this factor reflects the importance that people attribute to the characteristics of those individuals who will benefit from their donation. Contrary to what many may imagine, a beneficiary with a good image tends to be considered more deserving of the gift (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007), as well as those who are seen as innocent (children and the elderly), for example, tend to receive more donations (Van Leeuwen & Wiepking, 2013). Thus, consistent with the existing literature, the respondents pointed out the importance of the variables that make up this factor.

The last factor is 8 “Future Interests”, which reflects people’s interest in donating money because they are involved in specific groups (associations and clubs) and wish in a certain way to remain in these groups; or even due to the concern in needing the services offered by certain charitable organizations, such as those focused on fighting cancer or those who care for the elderly. There may also be an interest in donating to participate in sweepstakes. For Wiepking and Maas (2009), for example, people may be motivated to donate simply by acting according to the social norms of their group and/or to be accepted by these groups. The authors also said that participation in specific groups, such as the Rotary Club, increases the likelihood of donations.

For Amos (1982), the donor can be motivated by direct personal interests, as in the case of contributions to cancer, heart or lung. It is estimated, in this case, that the individual may be motivated to donate due to their fear of needing these services in the future. In this regard, according to the respondents of this survey and as recommended in the literature, it can be said that factor 8 “Future interests” has been grouped coherently and also explains some of the external motivations that favor the donation of money.

As a way of validating the obtained factors, the reliability of each factor was extracted. The reliability of the factors can be classified into 5 levels: lower than 0.6 is considered low and unacceptable, between 0.6 and 0.7 moderate, between 0.7 and 0.8 good, between 0.8 and 0.9 very good and above 0.9 the reliability is excellent. Thus, when analyzing the reliability of each factor through Cronbach’s alpha (Table 4), we found that the first 4 factors have levels of reliability considered as “very good”, because the Cronbach’s alpha of these factors are greater than 0.8. Factors 5, 6 and 7 can be classified as of good reliability, since their alphas reached a rating between 0.7 and 0.8. Only factor 8 was rated with moderate reliability because its alpha was 0.62, which is considered acceptable in exploratory research.

Finally, the formation of the eight factors allows a greater understanding of the external motivators that favor individual donation of money within the scope of the research. It also allows new variables to be analyzed and included in the proposed groups as a way to seek the improvement and effectiveness of the marketing manager and/or charitable organizations that do the job of identifying and attracting new money donors.

In summary, one can consider that the factorial structure obtained coherently expresses the external motivating factors that favor money individual donation, because it converges the

opinion of the respondents with the researched literature on the subject.

Conclusions and recommendations

In the present study, we seek to identify external motivating factors that favor individual money donation. At the end of the analysis, we can conclude that the factors Trust, Reward, Leadership influences, Characteristics of the organization, Environmental influences, Personal Benefit, Characteristics of beneficiaries and Future interest systematize the various external motivators present in the literature that motivate the act of donating money. We also noticed that there is no predominant factor, which leads to the conclusion that, in the view of the donors from the sample, all 8 factors appear to be external motivators of individual donation of money.

The results of this study indicate theoretical contributions and practical implications. Theoretically speaking, the main contribution of this research is to synthesize in 8 factors the variables previously analyzed in isolation, something not yet identified in the current literature on the topic. Another contribution is to explore, exclusively, only the external motivators leading to money donation, which was not done by any other study used as a reference for the development of this research. The existing literature does not separate the internal and external motivators for the individual donation of money, although they are distinct.

Regarding practical implications, we analyzed in this study, in a systematic way, the external motivators that favor money donation, providing, through the 8 factors, information that may be useful to improve the management process of marketing managers of charitable organizations (Table 2). In knowing the reasons that lead to the individual money donation, the marketing manager can define the focus of their campaign, how to approach and the best time to do it. In addition, one can also devise strategies to implement, for example, a system of people’s trust indicator toward their charity. Another alternative is to partner with strong and well-established groups already established in the market, such as churches, Rotary, Masonic lodges, etc., as such organizations also appeared as influential in individual behavior of money donation. Managers will also be able to plan campaigns to attract new donors based on concrete information on the characteristics of beneficiaries and to better plan how to approach potential donors.

From the identified factors, society, generally speaking, will be able to promote discussions about the external motivators of money donating in the social groups in which they participate, such as churches, senior citizens groups, youth groups, family groups, among others, as a way to help increase money donations. Also, the results achieved here can contribute to the development of governmental or even social campaigns, encouraging money donation to charitable organizations. Knowing the external motivators that mobilize people to the act of donating money can be a powerful element in strengthening charitable organizations.

Despite the theoretical and practical contributions of the study, it should be noted that there are other variables and other factors that may be considered as external motivators

of individual money donation, with this presented as one of the study's limitations. With regard to the sample of regular donors, even though it is heterogeneous, as demonstrated in the characterization of the sample, it indicated a predominance of younger respondents, due to the application of the questionnaire being performed in schools of technical education, universities and electronic means, which is configured as a limitation of the study. We recommend in subsequent studies to broaden the sample and to reach more regular adult and elderly donors in order to verify whether the answers diverge from the ones obtained here. If this occurs, this could mean that external motivators vary according to the characteristics of the donor. This issue can be resolved with subsamples, separating them by groups of respondents who have similar characteristics or behaviors. For example, separating by age, since findings from previous surveys clarify that there are different behaviors between young people and older people (e.g., in Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008), or frequency of donation. The perceptions of women can also be evaluated, since the literature says that women donate more than men (Bachke et al., 2014).

Another limitation is related to the low percentage of variance explained. We assume that the personal characteristics of each individual also tend to interfere with the behavior of money donor and this may have affected the explained variance percentage. In this case, one can solve the issue by performing a research that also contemplates the personal characteristics as motivators for the individual donation of money.

Finally, for the accomplishment of future research that continue the study we begun here, we recommend applying a qualitative research to conduct an in-depth investigation of the 8 factors generated in this study, as a way of understanding how each of them can contribute to improve the marketing management of charitable organizations. We also recommend applying the research to other audiences, from different regions or even considering new variables not yet observed by researchers in the area.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq/Brazil) - project 303669/2015-2.

References

- Amos Junior, O. M. (1982). Empirical analysis of motives underlying individual contributions to charity. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 10(4), 45–52.
- Apinunmahakul, A., & Devlin, R. A. (2008). Social networks and private philanthropy. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(1), 309–328.
- Bachke, M. E., Alfnes, F., & Wik, M. (2014). Eliciting donor preferences. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(2), 465–486.

- Banks, J., & Tanner, S. (1999). Patterns in household giving: Evidence from UK data. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10(2), 167–178.
- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 596–615.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007). Understanding philanthropy: A review of 50 years of theories and research. In *35th annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action*, Chicago.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011a). Accuracy of self-reports on donations to charitable organizations. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(6), 1369–1383.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011b). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924–973.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011c). Testing mechanisms for philanthropic behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 291–297.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011d). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving part one: Religion, education, age and socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337–365.
- Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. N., & Bendapudi, V. (1996). Enhancing helping behavior: An integrative framework for promotion planning. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3), 33–49.
- Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 12–29.
- Bowman, W. (2006). Should donors care about overhead costs? Do they care? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 288–310.
- Breeze, B., & Morgan, G. G. (2009). Philanthropy in a recession: An analysis of UK media representations and implications for charitable giving. In *NCVO/VSSN researching the voluntary sector conference*, September.
- Casale, D., & Baumann, A. (2013). Who gives to international causes? A sociodemographic analysis of us donors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
- Charities Aid Foundation. *World giving index 2012: A global view of giving trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.cafonline.org/PDF/WorldGivingIndex2012WEB.pdf>
- DeHaven, B. (2010). *Principles of persuasion for nonprofit fundraisers* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Akron.
- Grace, D., & Griffin, D. (2006). Exploring conspicuousness in the context of donation behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11(2), 147–154.
- Grace, D., & Griffin, D. (2009). Conspicuous donation behaviour: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 8(1), 14–25.
- Guy, B. S., & Patton, W. E. (1989). The marketing of altruistic causes: Understanding why people help. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(1), 19–30.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2009). *Análise multivariada de dados*. São Paulo: Bookman Editora.
- Kelly, K. S. (1995). Utilizing public relations theory to conceptualize and test models of fund raising. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72(1), 106–127.
- Knowles, S. R., Hyde, M. K., & White, K. M. (2012). Predictors of young people's charitable intentions to donate money: An extended theory of planned behavior perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(9), 2096–2110.
- Landry, C., Lange, A., List, J. A., Price, M. K., & Rupp, N. G. (2005). *Toward an understanding of the economics of charity: Evidence from a field experiment*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Mainardes, E. W., Laurett, R., Degasperi, N. C. P., & Lasso, S. V. (2015). Personal characteristics and external motivators as antecedents to the act of money and/or goods donation. In *International congress of the International Association on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 14, 2015, Vitória (ES). Anais... Vitória: IAPNM.
- Michel, G., & Rieunier, S. (2012). Nonprofit brand image and typicality influences on charitable giving. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(5), 701–707.
- Okten, C., & Weisbrod, B. A. (2000). Determinants of donations in private nonprofit markets. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75(2), 255–272.

- Payne, A. A. (1998). Does the government crowd-out private donations? New evidence from a sample of non-profit firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 69(3), 323–345.
- Payton, R. L. (1988). *Philanthropy: Voluntary action for the public good*. New York: American Council on Education.
- Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Gift giving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12(4), 275–307.
- Scaife, W., McDonald, K., & Wiepking, P. (2012). Motives and barriers to bequest giving. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(1), 56–66.
- Schuyt, T., Smit, J., & Bekkers, R. (2004). Constructing a philanthropy-scale: Social responsibility and philanthropy. *Order*, 50(1), 5704.
- Smith, J. R., & McSweeney, A. (2007). Charitable giving: The effectiveness of a revised theory of planned behaviour model in predicting donating intentions and behaviour. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 17(5), 363–386.
- Van Iwaarden, J., van der Wiele, T., Williams, R., & Moxham, C. (2009). Charities: How important is performance to donors? *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 26(1), 5–22.
- Van Leeuwen, M. H., & Wiepking, P. (2013). National campaigns for charitable causes a literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(2), 219–240.
- Verhaert, G. A., & Van den Poel, D. (2011). Empathy as added value in predicting donation behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1288–1295.
- Wiepking, P. (2009). *The state of giving research in Europe: Household donations to charitable organizations in twelve European countries*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Wiepking, P., & Heijnen, M. (2011). The giving standard: Conditional cooperation in the case of charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(1), 13–22.
- Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1973–1995.