

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

ScholarWorks@UARK

Graduate Theses and Dissertations

5-2023

Health-Oriented Nonprofit Organizations: The Influence of Framing and Altruism on Intention to Donate

Abbey Dilatush

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [Nonprofit Studies Commons](#), and the [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#)

Citation

Dilatush, A. (2023). Health-Oriented Nonprofit Organizations: The Influence of Framing and Altruism on Intention to Donate. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/5052>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, uarepos@uark.edu.

Health-Oriented Nonprofit Organizations:
The Influence of Framing and Altruism on Intention to Donate

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Communication

by

Abbey Dilatush
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Communication, 2020

May 2023
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Lindsey Aloia, Ph.D.
Thesis Director

Matthew Spialek, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Robert Wicks, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Abstract

This study investigated the influence of framing and altruism on individuals' intentions to donate to a health-oriented nonprofit organization. One hundred ninety-three participants were recruited from social media to complete an experiment online. Participants reviewed fundraising messages using either a statistical frame or a narrative frame. Following the presentation of a fundraising message participants completed close-ended self-report scales to evaluate their perceptions of the ad, their intentions to donate, and their personal altruism. Results demonstrated there was a correlation between intention to donate and ad evaluation. Next, there was no relationship between altruism and intention to donate and neither frame was more persuasive in producing an intention to donate. Lastly, altruism was positively correlated with ad evaluation and there was a significant interaction effect between altruism and frame; however, there was not a significant interaction effect between altruism, intention to donate, and frame. Theoretical and practical implications of the findings are discussed.

Keywords: nonprofit organization, framing, statistical frames, narrative frames, altruism, donation

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Aloia. I am extremely grateful for her guidance, patience, and commitment to this project. It truly has been an honor to work with and under such an intelligent, strong, and kind individual. This project would not have been possible without her continued support, encouragement, and enthusiasm.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Mengfei Guan, Dr. Matthew Spialek, and Dr. Robert Wicks. Although Dr. Guan could not finish this project, I am very grateful for her efforts and contributions during her time as a committee member. Dr. Spialek's quantitative knowledge and research experience has played a major role in my understanding of quantitative research methods, and for that I am truly grateful for his expertise. Lastly, I am very grateful to Dr. Wicks for agreeing to serve as a committee member and for his support and insight.

Finally, I would like to give a special thanks to my friends, family, and peers. Without their support I would have never made it through the most challenging, yet rewarding two years of my academic career. I am forever grateful for their love and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Nonprofits.....	2
Framing.....	4
Altruism.....	5
Methods.....	8
Participants.....	8
Measures.....	9
Results.....	10
Discussion.....	11
References.....	15
Tables and Appendices.....	20

Health-Oriented Nonprofit Organizations:

The Influence of Framing and Altruism on Intention to Donate

A nonprofit organization is defined as “a group organized for purposes other than generating profit and in which no part of the organization's income is distributed to its members, directors, or officers” (Cornell Law School, para. 1). Nonprofits fill the gap between public organizations like a community library (Arnsberger et al., 2008) and private organizations like a clothing boutique. Unlike public or private institutions, nonprofits perform a crucial advocacy role by creating a space for people to act in union without the influence of consumerism or coercion. Nonprofit organizations are instead motivated by the “public good”. Given their independence from government funding, nonprofits depend on donations. Donations are key to the operation of nonprofits and their subsequent social impact. Advertising is imperative to solicit donations for nonprofit organizations.

Advertisements are defined as “paid communication used to persuade someone to buy a product or service” (Einstein, 2017, p. 5). Persuasive advertisements rely on frames, or “abstractions that work to organize or structure message meaning” (Arowolo, 2017, para. 3). According to Entman (1993), framing is a common communication strategy used in marketing. How information is labeled or framed influences the consumers’ judgments and decisions surrounding the product or service. Two types of frames are prevalent in advertising literature, namely statistical frames and narrative frames. Statistical frames refer to strategies that summarize quantitative information across a population (Zebregs et al., 2014). Narrative frames refer to strategies that describe case stories or examples (Allen & Preiss, 2009).

In addition to the qualities of persuasive advertisements, donating behavior also depends on the traits of the individual. One trait that is particularly relevant to an individual’s decision to

donate is altruism. Altruism is defined as “a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another's welfare” (Batson & Shaw, 1991, pg. 108). More specifically, altruism is described as unselfish behavior that places the good of the others ahead of personal interests. It may be individual or collective in nature, meaning it may involve the actions of one individual, those of a group, or society as a whole (Barclift, 2011).

Drawing from both framing theory and altruism literature, the goal of this study is to investigate the influence of framing and altruism on individuals' intentions to donate to a health-oriented nonprofit organization. In the paragraphs below, I first, review nonprofit organizations and the importance of donations to function. Second, I discuss framing theory and the utility of both statistical and narrative frames. Third, I define altruism and consider the influence of altruism on charitable giving.

Nonprofits

The origin of nonprofit organizations dates back to the colonial era in western civilizations. In the early 19th century, during European colonization, the notion of charity was established. Donating to charity was not optional; it was considered a religious responsibility, mandated by the church. As such, churches and seminaries were considered the first nonprofit organizations (Hammack, 2002). Religious nonprofit organizations introduced the culture of fundraising, established the tax-exemption status of charities, and encouraged the boom of philanthropic organizations.

Since the establishment of nonprofit organizations, researchers identified five structural characteristics, namely (a) formal constitution, (b) nongovernment, (c) self-government, (d) nonprofit-distribution, and (e) voluntary participation (Salamon & Anheier, 1992). Nonprofit organizations are required to formally constitute as a 501(c)(3), allowing the organization to

operate as tax-exempt. In addition, nonprofit organizations are not controlled or operated by the government. Instead, nonprofits self-govern through a board of directors. Nonprofits are also nonprofit-distributing, meaning that revenue returns to the organization. Lastly, participation in nonprofit organizations is voluntary and affiliation is not compensated.

Within the ‘nonprofit sector’, there are eight categories of organizations, including (a) arts and humanities, (b) education, (c) environmental and animals, (d) human services, (e) international and foreign affairs, (f) public benefit, (g) religion, and (h) health (Boris & Steuerle, 2006). More specifically, health-related nonprofits describe organizations that promote health equity, or equal access to health resources for all individuals (Tulane University, 2020). Health-focused and healthcare nonprofit organizations play a crucial role in many communities, because “nonprofit health organizations provide not only treatment, but also important support programs for patients and their families. They fund vital research that may not be conducted otherwise, and they engage in advocacy efforts that help change social, economic, political, and environmental factors affecting health” (McKeever, 2013, p. 307).

Renowned health-related nonprofit organizations committed to providing support for individuals and communities include St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the American Diabetes Association, and the American Cancer Society. St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital is one of the largest health nonprofits in the United States, providing treatment, travel, housing, and food for families at no cost during child medical care. The American Diabetes Association arranges resources for individuals living with diabetes and funds research related to finding a cure for diabetes. The American Cancer Society supports research to cure cancer and affords treatments for uninsured individuals. Such organizations rely on donations to support families,

individuals, and research. Without donations, nonprofit organizations would cease to exist. Furthermore, without advertisements, donations would be minimal.

Framing

Framing theory considers how the design of messages influence media interpretation (Potter, 2019). Entman (1993) noted that frames emphasize certain aspects of an issue or event and make other elements less salient. Framing is acutely relevant for nonprofit fundraising campaigns. In fundraising campaigns, how the fundraising message is framed determines not only how the fundraising ad is evaluated, but the success of the solicited donations.

Two important frames for nonprofit organizations are statistical frames and narrative frames. Statistical frames use quantitative data to persuade donors (Han & Fink, 2017). Statistical evidence provides a “summary information across a large number of cases or data from many, perhaps tens of thousands of, respondents” (Feeley, 2006). Furthermore, “statistical evidence provides more representative and typical information on a topic; sources may also reference sample groups that are more similar in demographics and attitudes to a target audience for heightened effects” (pg. 90). This technique appeals to an individual’s values. Values are defined as shared beliefs among society that remain relatively stable over time (Manfredo, et al. 2017). Accordingly, statistical frames that target individuals’ values provide long-term appeal.

In addition to statistical frames, narrative frames present cohesive stories that describe a setting, goal, plan, action, and outcome (Zebregs et al., 2014). According to Mazor and colleagues (2007), narratives are considered more familiar and vivid than statistical messages. Similarly, So et al. (2017) noted that narratives are more comprehensible forms of information compared to statistical frames in their study on statistical and exemplar-based risk information. This framing technique is appealing because narratives stimulate and evoke emotion-laden

memories such as anger, guilt, and sadness (Han & Fink, 2017). Emotions, however, are relatively fickle. In their study on how emotions affect logical reasoning, Jung and colleagues (2014) found that the effect of emotion could be credited to how emotion is stored in the same cognitive working systems used for reasoning. Accordingly, narrative frames that target individuals' emotions provide short-term appeal.

Although frames are inherently persuasive, statistical frames are considered more persuasive than narrative frames because of the duration of the influence. Statistical frames may also be evaluated more positively, meaning they are liked more or considered more successful, than narrative frames because they are more generalizable and provide a higher quality source of information (So et al., 2017). More specifically, Allen and Preiss (1997) found that statistics encourage more learning and are more persuasive than narratives for messages related to teachers adopting new teaching techniques. Lindsey and Yun (2009) echoed this finding in their own research investigating students' attitudes towards a year-round schedule. In their work on persuasive health campaigns, Zebregs and colleagues (2014) discovered that statistical evidence provided a stronger case because it demonstrated health related outcomes in large populations. This allowed individuals to see other similar shared experiences. In contrast, narrative evidence is based on only a few cases and is representative of a smaller population. Accordingly, individuals anticipated that the experiences were not common and were not relatable. Drawing from this body of literature, I posit the following:

H1: Statistical frames produce more positive ad evaluation than narrative frames.

H2: Statistical frames produce stronger intention to donate than narrative frames.

Altruism

In addition to the frames utilized, the intention to donate to a nonprofit organization is impacted by qualities of the individual. I suggest that an individual's altruistic ideology may be particularly relevant to donation behavior in the health-oriented nonprofit context. Altruism is defined as behavior that is intentional, voluntary, and benefits others rather than personal benefit, compensation, or punishment (Manzur & Olavarrieta, 2021).

Motivation to donate to nonprofit organizations is influenced by personal identity, or how people view themselves (Aaker & Akutsu, 2009). Rose-Ackerman (1996) justified giving through intrinsic motivation, stating that donors benefit personally from giving. Such intrinsic motivation is derived from three psychological sources (Rose-Ackerman, 1996). First, individuals might obtain satisfaction from their acts of charity, rather than from other people. In other words, people are not simply satisfied by others' giving. As such, they make contributions themselves. Second, individuals may care about the satisfaction of the beneficiaries. When people make donations, they care about the person who is benefiting from the donation. Third, individuals may exude "buying-in" mentalities. This persona may generate a "feel-good" emotion after making a donation.

To further understand the motivation behind altruism, consider Maslow's Hierarchy. The most basic needs for human beings are physiological, namely the need for air, water, and food. Next, humans are concerned for safety, including personal security, health, and employment. Following from safety, individuals need love and belonging. Particularly they desire friendship, family, intimacy and connection. Esteem needs consider one's desire for status, recognition, and respect. Finally, an individual aims to achieve self-actualization, which describes an individual's desire to become the most that one can (Strickland & Vaughan, 2014). Self-actualization is key

to one's altruistic motivation behind donating. As such, donating is explained by individual's moralities and interests in transforming themselves into their best self.

An individual may be intrinsically motivated to make a charitable contribution to a nonprofit organization for different reasons; however, a colloquial explanation for donation is moral obligation. Moral obligation describes an individual's felt social responsibility (Schuyt et al., 2013). For example, Pomazal and Jaccard (1976) found that altruistic behavior is significantly related to intention to help in research on blood-donating behavior. Due to their foundation in religious organizations, nonprofit organizations appeal to morality and dictate that helping others is imperative. "Donors may want to feel that they are doing their share, or that they can give back to society for the fortune that has met them" (Vesterlund, 2006, pg. 573). As such, I argue that altruism encourages nonprofit organization donations. Formally stated:

H3: Altruism is positively associated with ad evaluation and intention to donate.

Given that narrative frames appeal to one's emotions and statistical frames appeal to one's values, I argue that an individual is more inclined to donate after reading a statistically framed message. Furthermore, I advance that statistical frames are more salient to people who have high levels of altruism. Statistical frames are longer lasting and evaluated more positively, making statistical frames also more successful and generalizable. I argue that altruism attunes people to those qualities making statistical messages more salient. I Consider the joint influence of frames and altruism on ad evaluation in my final hypotheses.

H4: Type of frame moderates the association between altruism and ad evaluation, such that the association between altruism and ad evaluation is stronger for statistical frames than narrative frames.

H5: Type of frame moderates the association between altruism and intention to donate, such that the association between altruism and intention to donate is stronger for statistical frames than narrative frames.

Methods

I tested my hypotheses in an online experiment using self-report data collected from community members. Participants accessed a URL that directed them to an online survey hosted by Qualtrics. After consenting to participation (see Appendix A), individuals reported demographic information (i.e., sex, age; See Appendix B).

The survey then presented one of two different fundraising messages, an appeal using a statistical frame (see Appendix C) or an appeal using a narrative frame (see Appendix D). Following the presentation of a fundraising message, participants completed close-ended self-report scales to evaluate the variables of interest (see Appendix B).

Participants

One hundred ninety-three participants were recruited from social media to participate in the study. The sample was composed of 57 men (29.53%) and 145 women (75.13 %). Ages ranged from 18 to 77 years old ($M = 32.78$, $SD = 15.53$). Participants were primarily college graduates ($n = 98$, 50.78%); individuals also reported completing their master's degrees ($n = 39$, 20.20%); some college but do not have a degree ($n = 28$, 14.51%); high school or received their GED ($n = 10$, 5.18%); earned their associate's degree ($n = 10$, 5.18%); received a doctorate ($n = 10$, 5.18%); have a professional certification ($n = 5$, 2.59%); and have not fully completed high school ($n = 2$, 1.04%). A majority of the sample identified as White ($n = 165$, 85.49%); individuals also identified as Latinx ($n = 10$, 5.18%), African-American ($n = 9$, 4.66%), Asian ($n = 8$, 4.15%), Multi-racial ($n = 5$, 2.59%), and American Indian or Alaska Native ($n = 5$, 2.59%).

The average annual household income for participants was primarily over \$100,000 ($n = 62$, 32.12%); individuals also reported their average annual household income as less than \$20,000 ($n = 42$, 21.76%); between \$50,000 and \$74,999 ($n = 38$, 19.69%); \$75,000 and \$99,999 ($n = 22$, 11.40%); \$35,000 and \$49,999 ($n = 19$, 9.84%); and between \$20,000 and \$34,999 ($n = 19$, 9.84%).

Measures

Evaluation of the Ad. Erlandsson, Nilsson, and Västfjäll's (2018) measure assessed favorable attitudes towards the ad. Participants responded to four items using a 7-point scale where higher numbers reflected a more positive evaluation (1 = *Does not agree at all*, 2 = *Disagrees*, 3 = *Somewhat disagrees*, 4 = *Indifferent*, 5 = *Somewhat agrees*, 6 = *Agrees*, 7 = *Agrees completely*). Items included "I think this ad will make people who did not previously donate, to start donating money" and "I think this ad will make people already donating to increase their donation amounts" (statistical frame: $M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.39$, $\alpha = .80$; narrative frame: $M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.42$, $\alpha = .85$).

Intention to Donate. Erlandsson, Nilsson, and Västfjäll's (2018) item assessed the likelihood of making a monetary donation. Participants responded to one item using a 7-point scale where higher numbers reflected a stronger intention to donate (1 = *Does not agree at all*, 2 = *Disagrees*, 3 = *Somewhat disagrees*, 4 = *Indifferent*, 5 = *Somewhat agrees*, 6 = *Agrees*, 7 = *Agrees completely*; statistical frame: $M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.59$, narrative frame: $M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.57$).

Altruism. Manzur and Olavarrieta's (2021) measure assessed the voluntary and intentional other-oriented behaviors an individual might selflessly exhibit. Participants responded to nine items using a 5-point scale where higher numbers reflected higher levels of altruism (1 = *Never*, 2 = *Rarely*, 3 = *Sometimes*, 4 = *Frequently*, 5 = *Always*). Items included "I give money to

a charity” and “I donate goods or clothes to a charity” (statistical frame: $M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.08$, $\alpha = .76$; narrative frame: $M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.06$, $\alpha = .75$).

Results

As preliminary analyses, I conducted correlations between the variables of interest (see Table 1). Consistent with H3, altruism was positively and significantly correlated with ad evaluation. In addition, intention to donate was positively and significantly correlated with ad evaluation. Finally, counter to H3, the relationship between altruism and intention to donate was not significant.

H1 predicted that statistical frames are evaluated more positively than narrative frames. Prior to conducting a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), I assessed the homogeneity of variances using Levene’s Test for ad evaluation. The results indicated that the variances for ad evaluation were not equal. Accordingly, the subsequent analysis merits caution; the F statistic may underestimate the significance and result in a false rejection of the null hypothesis. I then conducted an ANOVA. Ad evaluation was entered as the dependent variable and the frame was entered as the fixed factor. Results did not demonstrate a main effect for frame type: $F(1, 191) = .20$, $p = .89$, $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$; statistical: $M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.19$; narrative: $M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.25$. Therefore, H1 was not supported.

H2 predicted that statistical frames produce stronger intention to donate than narrative frames. Prior to conducting an ANOVA, I assessed the homogeneity of variances using Levene’s Test for intention to make a donation. The results indicated that the variances for intention to donate were not equal. Again, the subsequent analysis merits caution as the F statistic may underestimate the significance. I then conducted an ANOVA. Intention to donate was entered as the dependent variable and the frame was entered as the fixed factor. Results did not demonstrate

a main effect for frame type: $F(1, 191) = .25, p = .62$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$; statistical: $M = 3.98, SD = 1.59$; narrative: $M = 4.09, SD = 1.57$. Therefore, H2 was not supported.

H4 predicted that the association between altruism and ad evaluation is stronger for statistical frames than narrative frames. Prior to conducting a two-way ANOVA, I assessed the homogeneity of variances using Levene's Test for ad evaluation. The results indicated that the variances for ad evaluation were not equal. The subsequent analysis merits caution as the F statistic may underestimate the significance. I then conducted a two-way ANOVA. Ad evaluation was entered as the dependent variable. Altruism and frame were entered as independent variables. Results demonstrated a significant interaction effect between altruism and frame. $F(2, 190) = 5.31, p < .001$. Therefore, H4 was supported. The association, however, between altruism and ad evaluation was weaker for statistical frames ($p = .21$) than narrative frames ($p < .01$).

H5 predicted that the association between altruism and intention to donate is stronger for statistical frames than narrative frames. Prior to conducting a two-way ANOVA, I assessed the homogeneity of variances using Levene's Test for intention to donate. The results indicated that the variances for intention to donate were not equal. The subsequent analysis merits caution as the F statistic may underestimate the significance. I then conducted a two-way ANOVA. Intention to donate was entered as the dependent variable. Altruism and frame were entered as independent variables. Results failed to demonstrate a significant interaction effect between altruism and frame, $F(2, 190) = 1.16, p = .24$. Therefore, H5 was not supported.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to investigate the influence of framing and altruism on individuals' intentions to donate to a health-oriented nonprofit organization. H1 posited that

statistical frames would produce more positive ad evaluation than narrative frames. Findings demonstrated that statistical frames were not evaluated more positively than narrative frames. This finding is inconsistent with earlier empirical work that found statistical frames to be more liked and successful than narrative frames. Previous research, however, primarily investigated the utility of statistical and narrative frames in the context of health education and health decision-making. Similar to the results of this study, Zebregs and colleagues (2015) found that statistical frames and narrative frames were equivalently successful in the context of narrative versus non-narrative information in health education. Our results in combination with the results of Zebreg et al. (2015) suggest that both statistical and narrative frames are evaluated equally in a health donation-related context.

H2 posited that statistical frames would produce a stronger intention to donate than narrative frames. Findings demonstrated that neither frame was more persuasive in producing an intention to donate. Earlier work showed that statistical messages produced more change in behavioral intention. The researchers argued that the objective orientation of statistical frames compared to the subjective orientation of narrative frames is more effective (Greene & Brinn, 2003; Zhang et al., 2015). Counter to this argument, my findings suggest that statistical evidence is not more persuasive when it comes to intention to donate.

H3 posited that altruism is positively associated with ad evaluation and intention to donate. Findings demonstrated that altruism was positively correlated with ad evaluation: however, altruism was not significantly correlated with intention to donate. This is inconsistent with Pomazal and Jaccard's (1976) research which found that altruistic behavior was significantly related to intention to donate blood. Perhaps the context is important to consider. Altruism may be more relevant to donation that is physically consequential rather than financially

consequential. Further, understanding altruism as a contributing factor in intention to donate and donation behavior could benefit nonprofit organizations.

H4 posited there would be a stronger association between altruism and ad evaluation for statistical frames than narrative frames. Findings demonstrated there was a significant interaction effect between altruism and frame: however, the association between altruism and ad evaluation was weaker for statistical frames than for narrative frames. Earlier research investigated gain versus loss frames, and positive versus negative frames and found gain frames have a slight advantage to loss framed messages, and positive framed messages are effective in improving attitude while negative framed messages are effective in eliciting donations (Xu & Huang, 2020; Erlandsson, et al, 2017). Previous findings suggested the importance of statistical versus narrative frames finding that statistical framed messages are more likely to enhance message persuasiveness while narrative framed messages have greater messages effectiveness (Kim & Nan, 2019). Taken together, future research should consider the interaction between gain/loss, positive/negative, and statistical/narrative frames to more holistically understand donation based behaviors. Liu and colleagues (2019) discovered that altruism was a significant factor in frames used to persuade individuals to make an organ donation. Correspondingly, altruism should also be considered in future research, as it could be an influential element in message framing.

H5 posited there would be a stronger association between altruism and intention to donate for statistical frames than narrative frames. Findings demonstrated there was not a significant interaction effect between altruism, intention to donate, and frame. Earlier research primarily investigated altruism and ‘pro-social’ behavior without the interaction of statistical and narrative frames. Ariely, Bracha, and Meier (2009) suggested that norms, perceptions, and personal views are the link between altruism and intention to make a donation. Counter to this argument, my

findings suggest there is not a significant link between altruism, frame, and intention to donate. Taken together, future research should consider how altruism independently interacts with intention to donate and frame in the charitable giving context.

The conclusions offered are qualified by the limitations of the study and the need for future research. For example, the results are limited by the homogeneity of the sample. I see utility in future work that examines individuals who are twenty-five years or older including those who are employed or unemployed. In addition, the study relied on advertisements for a fictional nonprofit organization. Subsequent research might consider utilizing an operating nonprofit organization in the advertisements. Despite these limitations, this study adds to the literature by considering the importance of framing and altruism for the success of advertisements in the context of health-related nonprofit organizations.

References

- Aaker, J. & Akutsu, S. (2009). Why do people give? The role of identity in giving. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(3), 267-270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.05.010>
- Allen, M. & Preiss, R.W. (2009). Comparing the persuasiveness of narrative and statistical evidence using meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 14(2), 125-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099709388654>
- Anheier, H. K. (2005). *Nonprofit organizations: Theory management, policy*. Taylor & Francis Routledge.
- Arnsberger, P., Ldlum, M., Riley, M., & Stanton, M. (2008). A history of the tax-exempt sector: An SOI perspective. *Internal Revenue Service Statistics of Income Bulletin*, 27(3), 105-135. www.irs.gov
- Ariely, D., Bracha, A., & Meier, S. (2009). Doing good or doing well? Image motivation and monetary incentives in behaving prosocially. *The American Economic Review*, 99(1), 544-555. <http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/aer.99.1.544>
- Arowolo, S. O. (2017). Understanding framing theory. 10.13140/RG.2.2.25800.52482.
- Barclift, P. (2011). Understanding the charitable, philanthropic, altruistic impulse. In K. A. Agard *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook* (Vol. 2, pp. 763-772). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412979320.n85>
- Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for Altruism: Toward a Pluralism of Prosocial Motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2(2), 107-122.
- Cornell Law School, (n.d.) *Non-profit organizations*. Legal Information Institute. www.law.cornell.edu
- Einstein, M. (2017). *Advertising: What Everyone Needs to Know®*. Oxford University Press.

- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Erlandsson, A. Nilsson, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2018). Attitudes and donation behavior when reading positive and negative charity appeals. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 30(4), 444-474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2018.1452828>
- Feeley, T. H., Marshall, H. M., & Reinhart, M. A. (2006). Reactions to narrative and statistical written messages promoting organ donation. *Communication Reports*, 19(2), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934210600918758>
- Greene, K. & Brinn, L.S. (2003). Messages influencing college women's tanning bed use: Statistical versus narrative evidence format and a self-assessment to increase perceived susceptibility. *Journal of Health Communication*, 8(5), 443-461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713852118>
- Hammack, D.C., (2002). Nonprofit organizations in American history: Research opportunities and sources. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(11), 1638-1674. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002764202045011004>
- Han, B. & Fink, E. L. (2017). How do statistical and narrative evidence affect persuasion?: The role of evidentiary features. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 49(1), 39-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2012.11821779>
- Internal Revenue Service. (2021). Exemption Requirements for 501(c)(3) Organizations. www.irs.org
- Kim, J. & Nan, X. (2019). Temporal framing effect differ for narrative versus non-narrative messages: The case of promoting HPV vaccination. *Communication Research*, 46(3), 401-417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215626980>

- Kopfman, J. E., Smith, S. W., Yun, J. K. A., & Hodges, A. (2009). Affective and cognitive reactions to narrative versus statistical evidence organ donation messages. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26(3), 279-300.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889809365508>
- Lindsey, L. L. M. & Yun, K. A. (2009). Examining the persuasive effect of statistical messages: A test of mediating relationships. *Communication Studies*, 54(3), 306-321.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970309363288>
- Liu, Y., Tsai, J., Chen, Y. (2019). Beyond altruism: Framing organ donation in a 19-year review of Chinese news coverage. *Journal of Health Communication*, 24(12), 878-888.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2019.1681564>
- Mazor, K. M., Baril, J., Dugan, E., Spencer, F., Burgwinkle, P., & Gurwitz, J. H. (2007). Patient education about anticoagulant medication: Is narrative evidence or statistical evidence more effective? *Patient Education and Counseling*, 69(1-3), 145-57.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2007.08.010>
- Manzur, E. & Olavarrieta, S. (2021). The 9-SRA scale: A simplified 9-items version of the SRA scale to assess altruism. *Sustainability*, 13(13), 6999. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13136999>
- Manfredo, M. J. et al. (2017). Why social values cannot be changes for the sake of conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 31, 772-780. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12855>
- McKeever, B. (2013). From Awareness to Advocacy: Understanding Nonprofit Communication, Participation, and Support. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25(4), 307–328,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2013.806868>
- Morgan, S. & Miller, J. (2011). Communicating about gifts of life: the effect of knowledge, attitudes, and altruism, on behavior and behavioral intentions regarding organ donation.

- Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30(2), 163-178.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909880216580>
- Pomazal, R. J. & Jaccard, J. J. (1976). An informational approach to altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33(3), 317-326.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.33.3.317>
- Potter, W.J. (2019). Major theories of media effects: Analysis and evaluation by W. James Potter. *Peter Land Publishing Inc.*
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). Altruism, nonprofits, and economic theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2), 701-728. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2729219>
- Rosenthal, P. I. (1971). Specificity, verifiability, and message credibility. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57, 393-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637109383084>
- Salamon, L.M. & Anheier, H.K. (1992). *In search of the nonprofit sector II: The problem of classification*. The Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies.
- Schuyt, T., Smit, J., & Bekkers, R. (2013). Constructing a philanthropy scale: Social responsibility and philanthropy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 501. 10.2139/ssrn.2274558.
- Strickland, R.A. & Vaughan, S.K. (2014). The hierarchy of ethical values in nonprofit organizations: A framework for an ethical, self-actualized organization culture. *Public Integrity*, 10(3), 233-251. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PIN1099-9922100303>
- Tulane University. (August 15, 2020). *Why Health Nonprofits Are an Important Part of Public Health*. Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine.
Publichealth.tulane.edu
- Vesterlund, L. (2006). 24. Why Do People Give? In *The Nonprofit Sector* (pp. 568-588). New Haven: Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300153439-027>

- Williams, B., Entwistle, V., Haddow, G., and Wells, M. (2008). Promoting research participation: Why not advertise altruism? *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 66(7), 1451-1456.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.12.013>
- Xu, J. & Huang, G. (2020). The relative effectiveness of gain-framed and loss-framed messages in charity advertising: meta-analytic evidence and implications. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 25(4), e1675.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1675>
- Zebregs, S., van den Putte, B., de Graaf, A., Lammers, J., & Neijens, P. (2015). The effects of narrative versus non-narrative information in school health education about alcohol drinking for low educated adolescents. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1085).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2425-7>
- Zebregs, S., van den Putte, B., Neijens, P., & de Graaf, A. (2014). The differential impact of statistical and narrative evidence on beliefs, attitude, and intention: A meta-analysis. *Health Communication*, 30(3), 282-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2013.842528>
- Zhang, J.M, Chen, G.M., Chock, T.M., Wang, Y., Ni, L., & Schweisberger, V. (2015). A psychological study of processing HIV/AIDS public service announcements: The effects of novelty appeals, sexual appeals, narrative versus statistical evidence, and viewer's sex. *Health communication*, 31(7), 853-862. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2015.1012629>

Table 1*Correlations Between Variables of Interest*

	1.	2.	3.
1. Altruism	-		.11
2. Ad Evaluation	.19*	-	
3. Intention to Donate		.58*	-

* $p < .01$

Appendix A

Implied Informed Consent

Title of Project

Nonprofit Fundraising Messages

Principal Investigators

Dr. Lindsey S. Aloia
Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Old Main 517
aloia@uark.edu
479-575-3046

Abbey Dilatush
Graduate Student
Department of Communication
aldilatu@uark.edu

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research study is to better understand individual's reactions to fundraising messages.

Procedures to be Followed

You will be asked to complete a series of questions about your reactions to fundraising messages.

Discomforts and Risks

There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

Duration

Participation in this study will take approximately 30 minutes.

Statement of Anonymity

Your participation will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University of Arkansas policy. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

Right to Ask Questions

Please contact Dr. Lindsey S. Aloia at (479)-575-3046 or by email at aloia@uark.edu with questions, complaints, or concerns regarding your participation in this research study. For questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Ro Windwalker, the University's IRB Coordinator at (479) 575-2208 or by email at irb@uark.edu

Voluntary Participation

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Your decision to participate in this research study is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty.

Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information on this screen and consent to take part in the research.

Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age?
2. What is your sex?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other
3. What is your race?
 - a. Caucasian
 - b. African-American
 - c. Latinx or Hispanic
 - d. Asian
 - e. Native American
 - f. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - g. Multi-racial
 - h. Other
4. What is your highest degree or level of education you have completed?
 - a. Less than high school diploma
 - b. High school diploma or GED
 - c. Some college but no degree
 - d. Associated Degree
 - e. Bachelor's Degree
 - f. Master's Degree
 - g. Professional Certification
 - h. Doctorate
5. What is your average household income?
 - a. Less than \$20,000
 - b. \$20,000 - \$34,999
 - c. \$35,000 - \$49,999
 - d. \$50,000 - \$74,999
 - e. \$75,000 - \$99,999
 - f. Over \$100,000

Items to Capture Altruism

Please answer the following statements that best describe you on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always)

- 1 – Never
 - 2 – Rarely
 - 3 – Sometimes
 - 4 – Frequently
 - 5 – Always
1. I give money to a charity.
 2. I donate goods or clothes to a charity.

3. I volunteer for a charity.
4. I help carry a stranger's belongings.
5. I give change to someone I do not know.
6. I help my acquaintances move houses.
7. I let a neighbor I do not know well borrow items of some value to me.
8. I offer to help a disabled or elderly stranger across a street.
9. I offer my seat to a stranger who is standing.

Items to Capture Ad Evaluation and Intention to Donate

After reviewing the first message, please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 (does not agree at all) to 7 (agrees completely)


- 1 – Does not agree at all
- 2 – Disagrees
- 3 – Somewhat disagree
- 4 – Indifferent
- 5 – Somewhat agrees
- 6 – Agrees
- 7 – Agrees Completely
10. I think this ad will make people who did not previously donate, to start donating money.
11. I think this ad will make people already donating to increase their donation amounts.
12. I think this ad will be very efficient for increasing donations in general.
13. I would make a donation to [nonprofit].

After reviewing the second message, please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 (does not agree at all) to 7 (agrees completely)

- 1 – Does not agree at all
- 2 – Disagrees
- 3 – Somewhat disagree
- 4 – Indifferent
- 5 – Somewhat agrees
- 6 – Agrees
- 7 – Agrees Completely
14. I think this ad will make people who did not previously donate, start donating money.
15. I think this ad will make people already donating to increase their donation amounts.
16. I think this ad will be very efficient for increasing donations in general.
17. I would make a donation to [nonprofit].

Appendix C


Statistical Ad



FAYETTEVILLE CHILDREN'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL

About **10,470 children** in the United States under the age of 15 will be diagnosed with cancer in 2022.

Because of major treatment advances in recent decades, **85% of children** with cancer now survive 5 years or more. Still, survival rates can vary a great deal depending on the type of cancer.



After accidents, cancer is the second leading cause of death in children ages 1 to 14. About **1,050 children** under the age of 15 are expected to die from cancer in 2022.


Your gift means we can bring hope to cancer patients.

TO MAKE A DONATION:

www.fcrh.org
+479-495-7190

Appendix D


Narrative Ad



FAYETTEVILLE CHILDREN'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL

Jon is an old soul. Though he is introverted and quiet, he carries himself with a confidence and a strength well beyond his years and his optimism has given fortitude to his family.

It started with a stomachache and vomiting. After a visit with his local pediatrician, Jon was diagnosed with a cancerous tumor in his brain.



Jon and his family were referred to Fayetteville Children's Research Hospital, where doctors placed him on a treatment plan that included chemotherapy and a special radiation therapy. Thankfully, Jon is now cancer-free.

Your gift means we can bring hope to cancer patients like Jon.

TO MAKE A DONATION:

www.fcrh.org
+479-495-7190

Appendix E

Recruitment Post

Hello social media friends! I am currently conducting research for my Master's Thesis and I need participants to complete my survey.

This survey is designed to better understand individuals' intention to donate to a nonprofit organization. If you are currently 18 years of age or older and wish to participate in the project, click the following link: _____.

This research will expand the communication discipline's understanding of individuals' intention to donate.

Thank you for considering participating in this study.

Appendix F



To: Lindsey S Aloia
From: Douglas J AdamsJustin R Chimka, Chair
IRB Expedited Review
Date: 04/20/2022
Action: **Exemption Granted**
Action Date: 04/20/2022
Protocol #: 2203394017
Study Title: Health-Oriented Nonprofit Organizations: The Influence of Framing and Altruism on Intention to Donate

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

cc: Abbey Dilatush, Investigator