

THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL MOTIVATION FACTORS, SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND COMMUNICATION CHANNELS IN FREQUENCY OF DONATIONS TO NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Doria Bavčević¹, Ljiljana Najev Čačija² & Mario Pepur³

UDC / UDK: 061.2:658.14:316.628(497.5)

JEL classification / JEL klasifikacija: M14, M31

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22598/pi-be/2022.16.1.9>

Original scientific paper / Izvorni znanstveni rad

Received / Primitljeno: January 25, 2022 / 25. siječnja 2022.

Accepted for publishing / Prihvaćeno za tisak: April 19, 2022 / 19. travnja 2022.

Summary

Long-term trends indicate a steady increase in the number and importance of non-profit organizations in the community, which means increased competition, a market-oriented approach and a relentless struggle for less available financial resources. In the overall structure of funding sources, donations from individual donors play a significant role. Therefore, this research aims to determine the role of socio-demographic characteristics, external motivation factors, and communication channels in individual donors' donation frequency. Empirical research was conducted on a sample of individual donors in Croatia. The results show a statistically significant difference in the donation frequency in relation to self-assessment of the external motivational factors rewards, non-profit leadership, personal gain and future interests. The highest mean rank for external motivational factors is shown in the group of frequent donors. The differences were not determined for the factors environment, motivation, trust, organizational and user characteristics. For socio-demographic factors, differences among groups by donation

¹ Doria Bavčević, mag.oec., E-mail: doria.bavcevic1@gmail.com.

² Ljiljana Najev Čačija, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, University of Split, Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Croatia, E-mail: ljnajev@efst.hr, *corresponding author

³ Mario Pepur, Ph.D., Associate Professor, University of Split, Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Croatia, E-mail: mpepur@efst.hr.

frequency are determined by gender, age and employment status. Results showed no significant differences in the level of education. Finally, a significant difference was confirmed for communication channels usage, with a higher mean rank for donors using social networks than traditional channels. These results contribute to the existing body of knowledge of donors' behavior in the context of fundraising success, whose performance is one of the essential prerequisites for the sustainability of the non-profit sector.

Keywords: *non-profit organizations; fundraising; donation frequency; donors' motivation factors.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Non-profit organizations include all organizations that serve a particular public interest (Alfirević et al., 2013). Nowadays, the number of non-profit organizations grow, and their impact on the community increases (Cooper, 2017). At the same time, competition increases and the activities of organizations are taking a more professional form, especially in the activities focused on raising already limited funds (Pope et al., 2009). Although multiple constituency theory (Herman and Renz, 1997) emphasizes the importance of designing specific and tailored strategies and tactics for each group of key stakeholders, donors (along with beneficiaries) are and will remain essential in securing the financial resources necessary to operate. In order to successfully grow and develop, organizations need to provide sufficient financial resources from various sources. In that sense, individual donors are an important factor in achieving organizational goals oriented toward social justice and can ensure stability in their work (Li and Feng, 2021). Accordingly, one of the critical questions is how to increase the funds raised from individual donors (Kerlin and Pollak, 2010). To successfully establish relationships with their key stakeholder groups, including individual donors, non-profit organizations need to communicate with them. If this communication is ineffective, the desired level of donations will not be achieved (Parson, 2007). However, to maintain successful and effective communication and, consequently, donation process, it is necessary to know what motivates the donor. Given the unquestionable further growth of the non-profit sector and, thus, the reduction of available financial resources, non-profit organizations will have to face the need for further professionalization and (more) efficient implementation or adaptation of business tools and principles to ensure sustainability. In this sense, individual donors will become an even more important resource for any organization. Donor motivation has long been the focus of researchers and is studied from various aspects of organization and society (Green and Webb, 1997; Chapman et al.,

2018). An individual may be motivated to donate to charity because other individuals or groups to which they belong support this behavior (Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). According to Bekkers and Wiepking (2011), external variables that encourage donation can be grouped into five factors: environment, mental and political motivated factors, cause or situation of donation, characteristics of the organization, third party influences and personal rewards. Additionally, the donor may feel sensitized when faced with news or natural disasters and during a particular time of year (holidays). The political and environmental context of donors is crucial for raising and maintaining a donation. Donors may also be motivated by the cause or situation (Banks and Tanner, 1999; Smith and McSweeney, 2007), a belief that they might need services offered by the organization in the future (Amos, 1982) and become aware that others need help (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011). Characteristics of the non-profit organization itself influence the donation process (Bennett, 2003; Grace and Griffin, 2006). Individuals donate more to charity when they believe the funds raised are not wasted (Berman and Davidson, 2003; Behn et al., 2010), and increase donation amounts or frequencies when they have personal benefits such as tax breaks (Wiepking, 2009; Wiepking and Bekkers, 2012), political reputation (Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007) or public recognition through their donations (Grace and Griffin, 2006). Motivation is a prerequisite, and fundraising is a business discipline that needs to be strategically managed to raise funds (Hommerová and Severová, 2019), and at the same time increase motivation among potential donors who may not yet be aware of donation opportunities (Alfirević et al., 2013). Numerous studies focused on donor behavior and fundraising performance (Edmundson, 1986; Nichols, 1992; Schlegelmilch et al., 1997; Jackson, 2001; Mesch et al., 2006; Najev Čačija, 2013) highlight socio-demographic factors such as age, gender, income, education, marital status and religious beliefs as predictors of donation action. Given the complexity of the non-profit sector and the reduction of available funds, it is necessary to assess the motivation to donate and the donation frequency to increase fundraising efficiency. The frequency of donations is directly related to the retention of existing donors but does not necessarily mean loyalty (Wymer and Rundle-Thiele, 2016). Researchers' interest in various aspects of donor behavior has recently increased, including the donation frequency in the context of fundraising efficiency. This interest is not surprising, given the growing impact that non-profit organizations have on society. Their impact is growing faster than their capacity based on available resources. Various aspects of donor behavior directly related to the donation frequency are psychographic characteristics of the individual (Salido-Andres et al., 2021), demographic characteristics (Knowles et al., 2012; Opoku, 2013), type of organization (Okten and Weisbrod, 2000), loyalty factors (Wymer and Rundle-Thiele, 2016), communication via social networks (Unger et al., 2021).

For organizations not to "stumble" on their way and thus become a limiting factor in fulfilling the social mission, any research that will help them achieve better results with optimal use of available resources is desirable. In addition, any increase in the existing body of knowledge in a specific fundraising discipline represents a significant step forward in understanding the complex relationship between donors and non-profits.

2. LITERATURE OVERVIEW

By its existence, a non-profit organization ensures the well-being of society with the use of appropriate resources and based on the availability of proper physical goods or services. The goals of non-profit organizations are often intangible and immeasurable, and work results are challenging to communicate to targeted stakeholder groups, including donors. Due to inevitable financial stress and increased competition, innovation among non-profits has gained importance (Gras and Mendoza-Abarca, 2014). Innovation is nowadays one of the key factors in the sustainability of a non-profit organization (Choi et al., 2019), as donors are often motivated to donate based on the organization's innovativeness assessment. According to Bekkers and Wiepking (2011), eight predictors of donor motivation encourage donation action: awareness of need, solicitation, cost-benefit, altruism, reputation, psychological benefit, value, and efficiency. These predictors are mixed for every single donor as each individual has multiple and complex motives simultaneously (Degaspero and Mainardes, 2017). Even the type of organization, problem being addressed, and how it is being addressed can positively (or negatively) influence a donor's decision to donate money (Okten and Weisbrod, 2000). Degaspero and Mainardes (2017) identified the eight most common external motivational factors. They concluded that trust, rewards, leadership influence, organizational characteristics, environmental impact, personal gain, user characteristics, and future interests motivate donors. The same authors emphasize that there is no predominant external factor of motivation.

However, certain socio-demographic characteristics can more clearly define motivational factors related to behavior or donation frequency (Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). Bachke et al. (2014) and De Wit and Bekkers (2016) point out the relationship between external factors and gender in the intention to donate, emphasizing that women donate more often. Srnka et al. (2003) did not prove the role of gender in donation frequency, while, according to Opoku (2013), men show a higher level of donation frequencies, and women are more prone to annual and random donations. Srnka et al. (2003) indicate a positive impact of age on both the amount and donation frequency. The same authors emphasize that education level positively affects donation amount until

such a relationship is not determined for donation frequency. Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) point out that a positive relationship between age and education to donation action was found in most studies, emphasizing that the most common age at which donation decreases is 65 years of age. Shier and Handy (2012) claim that, among other characteristics of donors, income level, education level and employment status increase the likelihood of donation through online channels. Tietz and Parker (2014) claim that the difference in employment status between the self-employed and the employed can be significant for donation frequency. According to the same authors, the self-employed donors, due to a greater sense of responsibility towards the community in which they live and work, donate more than the general population and other employees, although they have the same priorities. The results of previous research on donor behavior in different contexts indicate that age and education, along with gender and income (Schloderer et al., 2014), are determinants of donor behavior.

Initially, social networks did not reach their full potential in the non-profit sector (Patel and McKeever, 2014). However, social networks are becoming the dominant tool for communicating with all key stakeholders, including donors (Unger et al., 2021). Nageswarakurukkal et al. (2020) point out that non-profit organizations using social networks have better communication with donors in order to explain how donations are used and, thus, build trust more efficiently. Building trust, a sense of belonging to the community, and the credibility of the non-profit in communicating with donors ultimately lead to repetitive donation action (Conrad et al., 2010). Choi et al. (2019) emphasize the importance of the possibility to donate through various platforms, most notably websites, blogs, social networks, and applications. Bhati and McDonnell (2020) state that social network platforms offer significant potential to non-profits to design, support, and conduct successful fundraising campaigns. Donor motivation to use social networks for the possibility of donating, such as compliments and (desired) recognition, leads to a higher probability of the donation action itself (Li et al., 2019).

The previously elaborated research results highlight the complexity of the relationship between donors and non-profit organizations. Accordingly, there is a real need to enlighten factors that affect these relationships and, consequently, fundraising success. Most research indicates the complexity of donor behavior, pointing out difficulties in identifying key elements that motivate donors and impact donation frequency. Therefore, this research explores the complex non-profit organization–donor relationship, contributing to the fundraising body of knowledge.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research objectives and questions

The main objective of this research is to determine the role of external factors of motivation, socio-demographic characteristics and communication channels on the individual donors' donation frequency by providing answers to the following research questions:

Q1: Is there a difference in the frequency of donations in relation to external motivational factors?

Q2: Is there a difference in donation frequency regarding donors' demographics?

Q3: Is there a difference in the frequency of donations regarding education level and employment status?

Q4: Is there a difference in the frequency of donations related to the use of different channels of donor communication with non-profit organizations?

The operationalization of the variables was made according to the research objective and in accordance with the research questions asked. External motivation factors were taken from Degasperri and Mainardes (2017) and adapted to research needs. The socio-demographic variables are operationalized based on Schloderer et al. (2014) and Bachke et al. (2014), while the channels of communication used between donors and non-profit organizations are adapted from Unger et al. (2021) and Bhati and McDonnell (2020).

3.2. Sample and questionnaire

The research was conducted by an online questionnaire from June to September 2021 on a sample of 430 respondents from Croatia. The questionnaire consisted of 14 closed-ended questions, divided into three categories. The first part consisted of general data on respondents. In the second part, questions related to donation behavior, including the assessment of donation frequency, were asked. The third part consisted of questions related to self-assessment of the importance of proposed external motivation factors for donation action. Questions from the first and second parts were on a nominal scale, while questions from the third part were on the Likert scale of 4 is 1- does not affect at all and 4-fully affects. A 4-point scale was used to avoid the possibility of a neutral answer and thus obtain more relevant answers.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Donors general characteristics

The results of the descriptive analysis for respondents' general information and donation behavior are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Respondents' general information

	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	146	34.0
Female	284	66.0
Total	430	100.0
Age		
0-18	3	.7
19-25	105	24.4
26-35	43	10.0
36-45	199	46.3
46-60	72	16.7
60+	8	1.9
Total	430	100.0
Education		
Primary	10	2,3
Secondary	77	17,9
Higher	343	79,8
Total	430	100,0
Employment status		
Self-employed	77	17,9
Employed	292	67,9
Unemployed	61	14,2
Total	430	100,0

Source: empirical research

The data presented in Table 1 show that most respondents are female (66%) and of working age (63,9%). As many as 79,8% of respondents have a high level of education and are employed (85,8%). According to the results, respondents have enough working experience and sufficient resources to contribute financially to the non-profit sector.

Considering that 72,3% (311) of the respondents declared themselves as donors, further analysis was conducted on a sample of 311 respondents in accordance with the research framework. The results indicate that 60,8% of donors occasionally donate (several times a year to once a month), and 32,5% rarely donate (once or at most twice a year). As expected, the lowest share of those who donate regularly or frequently (at least twice a month) is 6,8%. Given that one of the goals of this research is to determine the

role of different channels of communication between non-profit organizations and donors, it is important to emphasize that dominantly donors are social networks users (92,9%), and mostly (81,4%) decides to communicate with organizations through social networks.

Table 2. Donors' characteristics

	Frequency	%
Gender		
Donors	311	72,3
Non-donors	119	27,7
Total	430	100,0
Donation frequency (per year)		
Rare	101	32,5
Occasional	189	60,8
Often/regular	21	6,8
Total	311	100,0
Donors - social media users		
Users	289	92,9
Non - users	22	7,1
Total	311	100,0
Donors – searching for NGO to donate		
Traditional channels	58	18,6
Social media	253	81,4
Total	311	100,0

Source: empirical research

4.2. Donors characteristics and motivation – results analysis and discussion

In order to determine the importance of external motivation factors, Table 3 shows the mean values of the respondent's assessment of the selected external motivation factors importance. Results are grouped in the total sample (N=311) and the three groups formed by donation frequency: "rare" donors, or donors who donate once or at most twice a year (N=101), "occasional donors" or those who donate several times a year up to once a month (N=189), and "frequent" or regular donors (N=21), i.e., those who donate at least twice a month.

Table 3. Respondents' external motivation factor importance assessment

Donors groups (by donation frequencies)	Sample (N = 311)		Rare donors (N= 101)		Occasional donors (N= 189)		Frequent donors (N=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
External motivation factors								
Trust	3,534	,7034	3,347	,7929	3,667	,6102	3,238	,7684
Reward	1,833	,9216	1,277	,5314	2,116	,9437	1,952	1,0235
NGO leadership	2,125	,9125	1,772	,8589	2,296	,8974	2,286	,8452
NGO characteristics	3,068	,7130	3,020	,7998	3,090	,6663	3,095	,7003
Environment	2,360	,8570	2,168	,8493	2,460	,8535	2,381	,8047
Personal benefit	1,814	,9318	1,139	,4007	2,127	,9253	2,238	1,0911
NGO users characteristics	2,965	,8004	2,871	,8907	3,005	,7544	3,048	,7400
Future interests	1,984	,9553	1,584	,8633	2,169	,9413	2,238	,9437

Source: empirical research

As expected, the largest group is a group of occasional donors, which is in line with previous research on donor behavior in relation to the donation frequency (Degaspero and Mainardes, 2017; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). The results show the highest mean value for external motivation factor importance, in all groups, for the factor trust (from 3,238 to 3,667), and the lowest for reward (1,277 to 2,116) and personal benefit (1,139 to 2,238). Although it was assumed that the mean of external motivational factors importance would increase with the donation frequency, the highest mean values are split between Occasional and Frequent donors groups. For factors trust, reward, leadership and environment in Occasional donors group and for organization and user characteristics, personal benefit and future interests in the Frequent donors' group. However, as the group of Frequent donors is relatively small (21), these results should be taken with caution.

To answer the first research question, "Q1: Is there a difference in the frequency of donations in relation to external motivational factors?", the Kruskal Wallis test was conducted. Eight identified external motivational factors were tested to determine the existence of a statistically significant difference in donation frequency. Respondents were

grouped into four groups according to each external motivation factor impact assessment. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis descriptives and test significance results for assessment of external motivation factors importance

		<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=4,968$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,174$)			<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	
TRUST	<i>No impact</i>	9	1,56	,726	127,11
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	11	1,64	,674	139,64
	<i>Some impact</i>	96	1,69	,670	146,1
	<i>Total impact</i>	195	1,78	,502	163,13
	<i>Total</i>	311			
		<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=25,315$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,000$)			<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	
NGO LEADERSHIP	<i>No impact</i>	90	1,50	,566	122,17
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	114	1,82	,584	166,70
	<i>Some impact</i>	85	1,84	,508	169,76
	<i>Total impact</i>	22	1,95	,486	185,77
	<i>Total</i>	311			
		<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=7,071$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,070$)			<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	
ENVIRONMENT	<i>No impact</i>	10	1,62	,596	139,02
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	39	1,69	,592	149,05
	<i>Some impact</i>	182	1,83	,545	168,91
	<i>Total impact</i>	80	1,80	,500	165,40
	<i>Total</i>	311			
		<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=3,904$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,272$)			<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	
NGO USERS CHARACTERISTICS	<i>No impact</i>	151	1,52	,602	125,05
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	85	1,71	,554	152,67
	<i>Some impact</i>	57	1,77	,572	159,89
	<i>Total impact</i>	18	1,75	,572	157,51
	<i>Total</i>	311			
		<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=47,234$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,000$)			<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	
REWARD	<i>No impact</i>	145	1,53	,613	125,52
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	90	1,84	,517	170,78

	<i>Some impact</i>	59	2,00	,371	193,29
	<i>Total impact</i>	17	2,12	,332	208,35
	<i>Total</i>	311			
<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=3,057$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,383$)		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
NGO CHARACTERISTICS	<i>No impact</i>	10	1,50	,707	119,50
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	39	1,69	,521	150,36
	<i>Some impact</i>	182	1,77	,575	160,26
	<i>Total impact</i>	80	1,73	,573	153,63
	<i>Total</i>	311			
<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=83,591$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,000$)		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
PERSONAL BENEFIT	<i>No impact</i>	151	1,46	,586	115,40
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	85	1,94	,418	185,12
	<i>Some impact</i>	57	2,07	,371	201,96
	<i>Total impact</i>	18	2,17	,383	213,50
	<i>Total</i>	311			
<i>Donation frequency</i> ($\chi^2=36,253$; $df=3$; $Sig=0,000$)		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>KW Mean Rank</i>
FUTURE INTERESTS	<i>No impact</i>	151	1,51	,580	123,04
	<i>Mostly no impact</i>	85	1,90	,503	178,30
	<i>Some impact</i>	57	1,85	,557	170,78
	<i>Total impact</i>	18	1,95	,464	186,63
	<i>Total</i>	311			

Source: empirical research

The results of the Kruskal Wallis test show a statistically significant difference among groups created by external motivation factor impact assessment regarding donation frequency for the following factors: reward, leadership, personal benefit and future interests. These results are in line with the existing non-profit marketing body of knowledge. For example, the reward is usually perceived positively. It can significantly impact the regular donation frequency for those donors who need to receive gratitude as a recognition for their actions. Donors guided by the example of others will decide to donate funds rather than those that have no one that inspires or motivates them.

Furthermore, almost every donor has a certain personal benefit, which is most often expressed in personal satisfaction, a sense of prestige and superiority over others, or publicity by non-profit organizations. Some donors like to receive recognition for their

work, so, by donating, they expect in return that non-profit organizations will publicly thank and highlight them. In that way, their image in public is raised, which can be considered as personal benefit. In addition to personal benefits, each donor (and each individual in general) has particular future interests. Some donors may, for example, have family members who suffer from a disease. That could be a trigger to donate to non-profit organizations dealing with that particular disease with the hope that a cure eventually will be found. Likewise, donors may feel that future interests, such as strengthening their reputation in society, can lead to professional or workplace benefits, both financial and non-financial. Significant differences among groups were not determined for remaining motivation factors: trust, environment, non-profit organization characteristics and user characteristics.

The obtained results are partly due to the limitations of the research (relatively small and biased sample in which data are not normally distributed) and partly due to the social context of the environment in which the research was conducted. Croatia does not have a long tradition of philanthropy, nor is there an intense professionalization of non-profit organizations that use business principles and tools in their work to ensure sustainability and achieve goals. Approach to the fundraising discipline, and therefore approach to existing and potential donors, is still on an ad-hoc basis instead of strategically planned activities. Consequently, it can be assumed that donors rather evaluate elements that are easier to assess at the subjective level when evaluating the organizations they will donate to. This attitude excludes quantitative assessments of the performance and impact of a particular organization. For example, in assessing the impact of organizational characteristics on donation frequency, it is necessary to have specific measurable and comparable performances, based on which personal attitudes and preferences in choosing an organization and donation frequency could crystallize. The characteristics of an organization include everything that makes up an organization, including an approach to donors, communication, agility in fundraising activities, and finally, the number of successfully conducted fundraising campaigns. Every donor will want to donate to an organization that they believe is directing funds to what they believe is the proper purpose. Interestingly, no significant difference in donation frequency regarding trust as an external motivation factor was determined. Trust is an important factor in the donation frequency in numerous studies. A donor who has confidence in what a non-profit is doing will donate more often than a donor who believes the funds are not directed to the right cause. The results for the trust factor can be explained by the weak professionalization and consequently poor results of the non-profit sector. Too much publicity for negative examples in which the funds raised was not used properly can also explain it. Negative cases undoubtedly affect the credibility of the entire sector.

Furthermore, the results indicate no differences in the donation frequency concerning the characteristics of users, which is not in line with previous studies. It can be due to a lack of trust as a motive to donate. Assessment of the importance of the goals focused on users and their needs has its origin in trust towards the organization's activities and, consequently, performances in the past. Another reason could be this research's previously noted limitations, as user characteristics are important factors that the donor considers when deciding how often to donate to a non-profit organization.

In conclusion, the impact of external motivation factors such as reward or personal benefit will be easier to assess on a personal level compared to external motivation factors such as characteristics of the organization or the users, which may not necessarily be objective. However, non-profit organizations should be able to distinguish the strength of the factors' impact and, based on the objective assessment, design marketing communication tools that can address donors in the right way. In addition, the results suggest that characteristics of non-profit organizations are viewed through the prism of the entire non-profit sector and the "desirability" of the organization's area of activity more than through objective performance and the impact that the organization has in the community assessment. In the same way, external motivation factor users' characteristics can be explained. Unfortunately, users' characteristics are still insufficiently, or even incorrectly, presented in communication with the public.

Since differences were determined in half of the proposed external motivation factors and the highest mean ranks are expressed in the occasional or frequent donors group, it can be concluded that external motivational factors only partially play a significant role in the donation frequency.

For the second research question, "Q2: Is there a difference in the donation frequency regarding donors' demographics?" Mann Whitney and Kruskal Wallis tests were conducted.

Table 5. Mann Whitney and Kruskal Wallis descriptives and test significance results for demographic characteristics gender and age

Donation frequency (U=9214; Z=-3,331; Sig=0,001)		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	MW Mean Rank	Donation frequency ($\chi^2=107,591$; df=5; Sig=0,000)		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	KW Mean Rank	
GENDER	Male	119	1,88	,570	174,57	AGE	0-18	2	2,5	,707	248,50	
	Female	192	1,66	,557	144,49		19-25	58	1,21	,450	80,31	
	Total	311					26-35	26	1,31	,471	95,62	
							36-45	163	1,98	,376	190,88	
							46-60	57	1,79	,700	159,16	
							60+	5	1,60	,548	138,00	
							Total	311				

Source: empirical research

According to the results shown in Table 5, there are significant differences in the donation frequency in relation to gender and age. The results indicate differences in donation frequency by gender but with higher frequency for men. At first glance, it may seem that the results are not in accordance with previous studies. Based on psychological characteristics and levels of altruism, women have a higher tendency to donate (Simmons and Emanuelle, 2007). However, as this research is focused on donation frequency rather than intentions to donate, results can contribute to the field and be a starting point for future research that might clarify the role of gender in donors' behavior. The results confirming the existence of differences in relation to age are in line with previous research. Namely, for the working population in middle age, it is assumed that they have already achieved (or are on their way to achieving) personal and business goals and have more financial resources available that are willing to donate. According to research results, it can be concluded that there are differences in donation frequency regarding gender and age.

To answer the third research question, "Q3: Is there a difference in the donation frequency regarding education level and employment status?" Kruskal Wallis was conducted, with the results presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis descriptive and test significance results for education and employment status

		Donation frequency ($\chi^2=4,862$; $df=2$; $Sig=0,088$)				Donation frequency ($\chi^2=19,818$; $df=2$; $Sig=0,000$)					
		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	KW Mean Rank	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	KW Mean Rank		
EDUCATION	Primary	7	2,14	,900	199,57	EMPLOYMENT	Self-employed	55	1,96	,507	186,36
	Secondary	46	1,63	,679	138,07		Employed	225	1,73	,560	155,02
	Higher	258	1,75	,537	158,02		Unemployed	31	1,42	,620	109,23
	Total	311					Total	311			

Source: empirical research

The presented results indicate that respondents with a higher education level are more likely to donate frequently than those with secondary education. However, the highest donation frequency was determined for the group with the lowest level of education. These results are not in line with existing knowledge about the role of education in donation intentions and frequency and can be explained by the previously mentioned research limitations, primarily the sample structure. In addition, the determined difference is not statistically significant, so the assumption about the role of education in the donation frequency should be rejected. Comparison of data for the type of employment role in donation frequency shows that the self-employed tend to donate funds most often. As expected, the unemployed donate the least, probably since they have to worry more about their existence. The identified differences between groups by type of employment are statistically significant at the level of significance of 5%. According to the presented results, it can be concluded that there is a difference in the donation frequency in relation to the type of employment, but not for the level of education, and thus only partially provides an answer to the third research question.

Finally, given the growing role of social networks in the relationship between non-profits and their key stakeholders, an analysis of differences in donation frequency related to the use of communication channels between donors and organizations was conducted to answer the latest research question. The Mann-Whitney test results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Mann Whitney descriptives and test significance results for communication channels

Donation frequency (U=5622; Z=-3,225; Sig=0,001)		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	MW Mean Rank
COMM. CHANNELS	Traditional channels	58	1,53	,598	126,43
	Social networks	253	1,79	,556	162,78
	Total	311			

Source: empirical research

The results indicate differences in the donation frequency regarding the used communication channels, with a higher mean rank for donors who use social networks (162,78) than donors who use traditional communication channels (126,43). Given the increasing use of Internet marketing and social networks in the non-profit sector, both for ease of use and economic viability, this result indicates that non-profits in their communication must make intensive use of all available digital tools. In that way, organizations can increase reach and impact in presenting their results to all target stakeholder groups, especially donors. The identified differences are statistically significant at the level of significance of 5%. An answer to the research question “ Q4: Is there a difference in the frequency of donations related to the use of different channels of donor communication with non-profit organizations? ” is positive.

5. CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary goal of this research was to determine whether there are differences in the behavior of individual donors in the donation frequency related to external motivational factors, socio-demographic characteristics and channels of communication with non-profit organizations. The results show the highest mean and mean ranks of donation frequency for external motivation factors rewards, leadership, personal gain and future interests with statistically significant differences identified. Differences have not been determined for other external motivation factors: trust, environment, organizations and the users' characteristics. The socio-demographic characteristics analysis revealed differences between donor groups in the donation frequency related to gender, age, and type of employment. Unlike other research, the mean rank of donation frequency is higher for men. The highest donation frequency rate is shown by respondents who, by age,

belong to the working population with accumulated work experience and consequently partially achieved professional and personal goals. Given that studies on the role of employment status in donation frequency are scarce, the determined difference is interesting. Namely, the results indicate that self-employed persons have a higher donation frequency, which different intrinsic motives for donations can explain.

Namely, the existing literature suggests that self-employed people have arisen awareness for the community's culture and needs in which they live and work. Therefore, more aware of the needs of organizations trying to achieve goals for the common good. Accordingly, they are more willing to support the work of such organizations through financial donations. Although the higher mean ranks were found for respondents with a high level of education compared to secondary level of education, it cannot be confirmed with certainty that the level of education plays a significant role in the donation frequency due to mixed results. Finally, in line with the development of Internet communication channels between non-profit organizations and key stakeholders, including individual donors, a higher frequency of donations was found for respondents who use social networks than those who communicate through traditional channels. Although the results are not unambiguous, they can be valuable to every non-profit organization planning to succeed in fundraising activities. By shaping their strategy and thus, improving donation frequency, the role of external motivation factors, socio-demographic characteristics and communication channels are of great importance. For every non-profit organization, regardless of the field of activity, those elements should be considered when planning fundraising activities. The reason for the inconsistency of the results stems from the limitations of the research: a relatively small sample of individual donors, uneven representation of groups of respondents in terms of donation frequency, representation of respondents from only one country without a developed culture of philanthropy and generalized approach to non-profit organizations without distinction according to the field of interest.

In order to better understand the observed relationships and further confirm or refute the assumptions and findings of this research, recommendations for future research include a larger sample based on individual donors donation frequency in all groups, respondents from countries with different philanthropic cultures and classification of organizations by field of interest and performance metrics as a predictor for donation intentions.

Although this research only partially answers research questions, the results contribute to a complex non-profit marketing and management body of knowledge, particularly in the fundraising discipline. Under the growing non-profit sector importance trend, unique and tailored marketing and management tools to monitor and manage fundraising activities, whose success will ultimately determine all other activities, is

necessary. In other words, the donor-organization relationship and the user-organization relationship are crucial to achieving the organizational mission and goals. Nowadays, that is becoming difficult given the limited resources available. Therefore, further professionalization of non-profit organizations in all segments can be expected in the future, with a particular focus on sustainable growth and development if they want to fulfil all key stakeholders' needs and make a significant social impact on the community.

REFERENCES:

1. Alfrević, N., Pavičić, J., Najev Čačija, L., Mihanović, Z., & Matković, J. (2013). Osnove marketinga i menadžmenta neprofitnih organizacija. *Školska knjiga, Zagreb*.
2. Amos, O. M. (1982). Empirical analysis of motives underlying individual contributions to charity. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 10(4), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02300194>
3. Apinunmahakul, A., & Devlin, R. A. (2008). Social networks and private philanthropy. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(1-2), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2007.07.005>
4. Bachke, M. E., Alfnes, F., & Wik, M. (2014). Eliciting donor preferences. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(2), 465-486. [DOI 10.1007/s11266-012-9347-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9347-0)
5. Banks, J., & Tanner, S. (1999). Patterns in household giving: Evidence from UK data. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10(2), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021477922789>
6. Behn, B. K., DeVries, D. D., & Lin, J. (2010). The determinants of transparency in nonprofit organizations: An exploratory study. *Advances in Accounting*, 26(1), 6-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adiac.2009.12.001>
7. Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). Who Gives? A Literature Review of Predictors of Charitable Giving Part One: Religion, Education, Age and Socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080511X6087712>
8. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.198>
9. Berman, G., & Davidson, S. (2003). Do donors care? Some Australian evidence. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 14(4), 421-429. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:VOLUME.0000007467.74816.a4>

10. Bhati, A., & McDonnell, D. (2020). Success in an online giving day: The role of social media in fundraising. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(1), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019868849>
11. Chapman, C. M., Louis, W. R., & Masser, B. M. (2018). Identifying (our) donors: Toward a social psychological understanding of charity selection in Australia. *Psychology & marketing*, 35(12), 980-989. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21150>
12. Choi, S., Kim, H., Chung, M., & Lee, S. Y. (2019). Online donation experiences, donation awareness, and intention of future donation among teenagers in South Korea. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 45(5), 622-633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1487363>
13. Conrad, J., Levinson, J., & Gibson, S. (2010). Guerrilla social media marketing. *Entrepreneur Media Inc.*
14. Cooper, K. R. (2017). Nonprofit participation in collective impact: A comparative case. *Community Development*, 48(4), 499-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2017.1332654>
15. De Wit, A., & Bekkers, R. (2016). Exploring gender differences in charitable giving: The Dutch case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(4), 741-761. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015601242>
16. Degasperi, N. C., & Mainardes, E. W. (2017). What motivates money donation? A study on external motivators. *Revista de Administração (São Paulo)*, 52, 363-373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rausp.2017.08.002>
17. Edmundson, B. (1986). Who gives to charity. *American Demographics*, 8(11), 45-49.
18. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.24>
19. Gras, D., & Mendoza-Abarca, K. I. (2014). Risky business? The survival implications of exploiting commercial opportunities by nonprofits. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(3), 392-404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.05.003>
20. Green, C. L., & Webb, D. J. (1997). Factors influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 5(3), 19-40. https://doi.org/10.1300/J054v05n03_03
21. Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1997). Multiple constituencies and the social construction of nonprofit organization effectiveness. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 26(2), 185-206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764097262006>
22. Hommerová, D., & Severová, L. (2019). Fundraising of nonprofit organizations: Specifics and new possibilities. *Journal of social service Research*, 45(2), 181-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1479678>

23. Jackson, T. D. (2001). Young African Americans: A new generation of giving behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(3), 243-253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.150>
24. Kerlin, J. A., & Pollak, T. H. (2010). Nonprofit Commercial Revenue: A Replacement for Declining Government Grants and Private Contributions? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(6), 686-704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010387293>
25. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00932.x>
26. Li, B., Hou, F., Guan, Z., & Chong, A. (2019). How Social Experience Encourages Donation Intention to Charitable Crowdfunding Projects on Social Media: Empathy and Personal Impulsiveness. *Twenty-Third Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems, China, PACIS 2019 Proceedings*, 195. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/pacis2019/195>
27. Li, X., & Feng, L. (2021). Impact of donors' financial fairness perception on donation intention in nonprofit organizations after COVID-19 outbreak. *PloS one*, 16(6), e0251991. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251991>
28. Mesch, D. J., Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S., & Denton, B. (2006). The effects of race, gender, and marital status on giving and volunteering in Indiana. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(4), 565-587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006288288>
29. Nageswarakurukkal, K., Gonçalves, P., & Moshtari, M. (2020). Improving fundraising efficiency in small and medium sized non-profit organizations using online solutions. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 32(3), 286-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2019.1589627>
30. Najev Čačija, L. (2013). Fundraising in the context of nonprofit strategic marketing: Toward a conceptual model. *Management: journal of contemporary management issues*, 18(1), 59-78.
31. Nichols, J. E. (1992). Targeting Older America. *Fund Raising Management*, 23(3), 38-41.
32. Okten, C., & Weisbrod, B. A. (2000). Determinants of donations in private nonprofit markets. *Journal of public economics*, 75(2), 255-272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(99\)00066-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(99)00066-3)
33. Opoku, R. A. (2013). Examining the motivational factors behind charitable giving among young people in a prominent Islamic country. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(3), 172-186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1457>

34. Parsons, L. M. (2007). The impact of financial information and voluntary disclosures on contributions to not-for-profit organizations. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 19(1), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.2308/bria.2007.19.1.179>
35. Patel, S. J., & Weberling McKeever, B. (2014). Health nonprofits online: The use of frames and stewardship strategies to increase stakeholder involvement. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(4), 224-238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1507>
36. Pope, J. A., Isely, E. S., & Asamoah-Tutu, F. (2009). Developing a marketing strategy for nonprofit organizations: An exploratory study. *Journal of Nonprofit & public sector marketing*, 21(2), 184-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495140802529532>
37. Salido-Andres, N., Rey-Garcia, M., Alvarez-Gonzalez, L. I., & Vazquez-Casielles, R. (2021). Mapping the field of donation-based crowdfunding for charitable causes: systematic review and conceptual framework. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32(2), 288-302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00213-w>
38. Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Gift giving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12(4), 275-307. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.308>
39. Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1997). Responses to different charity appeals: the impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(8), 548-560. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569710176574>
40. Schloderer, M. P., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2014). The relevance of reputation in the nonprofit sector: The moderating effect of socio-demographic characteristics. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(2), 110-126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1491>
41. Shier, M. L., & Handy, F. (2012). Understanding online donor behavior: the role of donor characteristics, perceptions of the internet, website and program, and influence from social networks. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(3), 219-230. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1425>
42. Simmons, W. O., & Emanuele, R. (2007). Male-female giving differentials: are women more altruistic?. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 34 (6), 534-550. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443580710830989>
43. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.906>

44. Srnka, K. J., Grohs, R., & Eckler, I. (2003). Increasing fundraising efficiency by segmenting donors. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 11(1), 70-86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3582\(03\)70119-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3582(03)70119-0)
45. Tietz, M. A., & Parker, S. C. (2014). Charitable donations by the self-employed. *Small Business Economics*, 43(4), 899-916. [DOI 10.1007/s11187-014-9580-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-014-9580-6)
46. Unger, A., Papastamatelou, J., & Arpagaus, J. (2021). Do social networks increase donation frequency? The Swiss context. *Current Psychology*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01335-6>
47. Wiepking, P. (Ed.). (2009). *The state of giving research in Europe: Household donations to charitable organizations in twelve European countries*. Amsterdam University Press.
48. Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part Two: Gender, family composition and income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 217-245. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080511X6087712>
49. Wymer, W., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2016). Supporter loyalty: Conceptualization, measurement, and outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(1), 172-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014564579>

ULOGA VANJSKIH FAKTORA MOTIVACIJE, SOCIO-DEMOGRAFSKIH OBILJEŽJA I KANALA KOMUNIKACIJE U UČESTALOSTI DONIRANJA NEPROFITNIM ORGANIZACIJAMA

Doria Bavčević, Ljiljana Najev Čaćija & Mario Pepur

Sažetak

Višegodišnji trendovi ukazuju na stalan porast broja te značaja neprofitnih organizacija za okolinu što podrazumijeva sve veću konkurenciju, tržišno orijentiran pristup te bespoštednu borbu za sve manje raspoloživim financijskim resursima. U ukupnoj strukturi izvora sredstava donacije individualnih donatora imaju značajnu ulogu. Stoga je svrha ovog istraživanja utvrditi ulogu socio-demografskih čimbenika, vanjskih faktora motivacije te korištenih kanala komunikacije u učestalosti doniranja individualnih donatora. Empirijsko istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku individualnih donatora u Hrvatskoj a rezultati ukazuju na postojanje statistički značajne razlike u učestalosti doniranja u odnosu na samoprocjenu utjecaja dijela vanjskih faktora motivacije kao što su nagrada, vodstvo neprofitne organizacije, osobna korist i budući interesi, pri čemu su najveći srednje vrijednosti rangova utjecaja vanjskih faktora motivacije iskazani u grupi redovitih donatora. Za faktore motivacije okruženje, povjerenje, karakteristike organizacije i korisnika navedene razlike nisu utvrđene. S obzirom na socio-demografske čimbenike rezultati pokazuju postojanje razlika u učestalosti doniranja u odnosu na spol, dob te status zaposlenja, dok razlika nije utvrđena za stupanj obrazovanja. Konačno, potvrđena je i značajna razlika u učestalosti doniranja u odnosu na korištene kanale komunikacije, pri čemu su srednje vrijednosti rangova učestalosti doniranja značajno više za donatore koji koriste društvene mreže u komunikaciji s organizacijama. Ovim rezultatima daje se dodatni doprinos postojećoj bazi znanja o ponašanju donatora u kontekstu uspješnosti prikupljanja sredstava čije su performanse jedan od ključnih preduvjeta održivosti neprofitnih organizacija.

Ključne riječi: *neprofitne organizacije; prikupljanje sredstava; učestalost doniranja; faktori motivacije donator.*