

Predictors of intentions to donate on a long-term basis among young adults

Jesse M. Mogaka

S1999338

Bachelors Communication science

Supervisor: Dr.A.D. Beldad

Hand in Date: 24-07-2020

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| PREDICTORS OF INTENTIONS TO DONATE ON A LONG-TERM BASIS AMONG YOUNG ADULTS | 1 |
| ABSTRACT | 3 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK | 6 |
| 2.1 LONG-TERM DONATIONS | 6 |
| 2.2 THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR | 6 |
| 2.2.1 <i>Attitude Towards Charitable Subscriptions</i> | 7 |
| 2.2.2 <i>Subjective Norms</i> | 7 |
| 2.2.3 <i>Perceived Behavioural Control</i> | 8 |
| 2.3 EXTENDING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR | 9 |
| 2.3.1 <i>Moral Norms</i> | 9 |
| 2.3.2 <i>Anticipated Guilt</i> | 10 |
| 2.3.3 <i>Perceived Donation Efficacy</i> | 10 |
| 2.3.4 <i>Anticipated Warm Glow</i> | 10 |
| 2.3.5 <i>Self-identity</i> | 11 |
| 2.3.6 <i>Trust in Charitable Organisations</i> | 12 |
| 2.3.7 <i>Awareness of Charitable Subscriptions</i> | 12 |
| 3 METHODS | 13 |
| 3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE | 13 |
| 3.2 SAMPLING PROCEDURE | 13 |
| 3.3 RESPONDENTS..... | 14 |
| 3.4 MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS | 14 |
| 3.5 MEASUREMENT RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY | 16 |
| 4 RESULTS | 18 |
| 4.1 CORRELATION AND MULTICOLLINEARITY..... | 18 |
| 4.2 HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS..... | 19 |
| 4.2.1 <i>Significant Positive Effects</i> | 19 |
| 4.2.2 <i>Marginally Significant Effects</i> | 20 |
| 4.2.3 <i>Insignificant Effects</i> | 20 |
| 5 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS | 21 |
| 6 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS | 22 |
| 7 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS | 23 |
| 8 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS | 24 |
| 9 REFERENCES | 25 |
| 10 APPENDICES | 29 |
| APPENDIX A: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE | 29 |
| APPENDIX B: SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE LOG..... | 42 |

Abstract

In the recent years, charitable organisations in the Netherlands have seen their number of long-term donors decrease. One of the reasons for this decrease was that charities were having difficulty with persuading young adults to donate long-term. As a result of the costliness and ineffectiveness of campaigns to recruit long-term donors, some charitable organisations have chosen reduce recruitment campaigns. However, long-term donations are important for charities because they offer opportunities for charities to improve their operations and they offer stability.

Knowledge from these studies can be useful for charities to improve fundraising attempts. However, while young adults seem to have distinct preferences regarding incidental and long-term donations, past studies tend not to make the same distinction. Thus, this study aimed to provide a more specific understanding of why young adults do or do not donate long-term.

To answer the question, this study examined the extent to which the theory of planned behaviour explains young adults' intention to donate long-term shall be examined. Thus, this study looked at the influence of the *attitude towards charitable subscriptions*, *subjective norms* and *perceived behavioural control* beliefs regarding charitable subscriptions on young adults' intention to donate long-term. Furthermore, seven additional factors were used to extend the theory of planned behaviour. These factors were *moral norms*, *anticipated guilt*, *anticipated warm glow*, *self-identity*, *perceived donation efficacy*, and *trust in charitable organisations*.

By means of a survey this study tested the extent to which 10 factors could explain young adult's intention to donate long-term. The specific target group of this study were Dutch young adults between the ages 18 and 25 years. The total number of respondents was 254 and they had an average age of 22 years. A hierarchical regression analysis was run with in the first block only the predictors of the theory of planned behaviour and in the second block all 10 predictors. The hierarchical analysis found that the predictors of the theory of planned behaviour explained 28% of the variance in intention to donate long-term. With the additional factors, 35% of the variance was explained. Thus, 8% of the variance could be accounted for by these factors.

Furthermore, the analysis suggests the following factors to be significant predictors of Dutch Young adults in the Netherlands: *attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions*, *anticipated guilt*, *moral norms*, *perceived behavioural control*, *subjective norms* and *anticipated warm glow*. These factors are suitable for forming requirements to which future communication campaigns to attract new donors must adhere. By developing communication strategies that adhere to these requirements, charitable organisations might be able to attract more long-term donors more effectively.

1 Introduction

Charitable organisations concern themselves with societal issues ranging from preserving nature to improving healthcare to providing access to clean water, food and shelter (Carrol & Kachersky, 2019). To serve the public interest they often rely on monetary donations. These donations can be categorised into incidental and long-term donations. Incidental donations include donating to door to door collectors or at a charity event without any structure from the donor. Long-term donations include paid memberships or subscriptions to a charitable organisation and facilitate structural donations over a longer period of time. While, in the recent years, charities in the Netherlands have improved fundraising campaigns that aim to elicit incidental donations, they have seen long-term donations decreasing over the years (Van Uffelen, 2019). In 2019 alone, Greenpeace lost 9,000, UNICEF lost 12,000 and Oxfam Novib lost 16,000 long-term donors (Van Uffelen, 2019). In fact, the Worldwide Fund for Nature lost 63,000 long-term donors.

Losing such donors can have quite a negative impact on the existence of charities, because long-term donations are an important part a charity's revenue and stability. Firstly, long-term donations account for a significant portion of private donations to charity that cannot be easily compensated by incidental donations. For example, despite innovating one-off fundraising events in the recent years, charities have increased incidental donations but have not been able to compensate for the loss of these structural donations (Van Uffelen, 2019). Secondly, besides accounting for a significant portion of private donations, long-term donations also increase revenue predictability (ING, 2018b). Similar to subscribers of consumption goods and services, long term donors donate to charity structurally, either on a monthly or yearly basis. This predictability makes it easier for charities to set out plans over longer periods of time. However, due to losing long-term donors, charitable organisations have become more reliant on the income from individual fundraising events. Furthermore, the predictability of revenues may reduce the costs of operations such as fundraising or acquiring equipment and supplies because it gives charitable organisation a better position to negotiate with suppliers of services and goods (ING, 2018b). Thus, charitable organisations have an important stake in attracting new long-term donors.

One of the main reasons for this decrease in long-term donors, is that charitable organisations are having a lot of difficulty in recruiting new long-term donors (Margreet Plug, as cited in Van Uffelen, 2019). They especially had trouble with convincing younger donors to donate long-term. This is not an uncommon phenomenon. Freund and Blanchard-Fields (2014) suggest that the younger people are, the less likely they are to donate money to charity. Furthermore, younger people also donate relatively less than older people. A study by the Central Bureau of Statistics in the Netherlands found that adults above the age of 55 donate above 1.2% of their expendable income to charity, while adults below the age of 35 donate 0.8% (CBS, 2015).

In the case of long-term donations, It seems like younger generations of donors are less likely to take on charitable subscriptions than older generations (Bekkers, Schuyt, & Gouwenberg, 2017). They prefer to donate incidentally rather than long-term (Van Uffelen, 2019). However, within the context of consumption goods and services, a general reluctance to adopt subscriptions seems to be lacking among young adults. In fact, among potential adopters of subscriptions to services and goods, young adults are identified as most likely to take on subscriptions. In an assessment of the opportunities and challenges concerning subscriptions of tangible goods, the bank ING (2018b) suggests that especially young Europeans between 18 and 25 years are the most likely to adopt subscriptions on tangible goods. This age group is tech-savvy and spends significantly more money than older age

groups on tangible subscriptions (ING, 2018b). This may indicate that young adults might be open to take on charitable subscriptions.

As a result of the costliness and ineffectiveness of campaigns to recruit long-term donors, some charitable organisations have chosen reduce recruitment campaigns (Van Uffelen, 2019). The WWF estimates that stopping the recruitment of donors on the street accounts for 15% of the loss in long-term donors (Van Uffelen, 2019). However, motivating young people to donate is not only important for charitable organisations right now, but also for their future existence, as studies have found that past donation behaviour has a positive influence on future donations (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Linden, 2011). Thus, it is important that campaigns to recruit long-term donors continue.

To attract new donors more effectively, it may be important to understand why potential donors might want to donate long-term. Several studies across different disciplines have been devoted to understanding why people participate in charitable giving. Therefore, there is substantial knowledge on factors that can influence the decision to give to charity. Charitable giving is often studied as helping behaviour (Carrol & Kachersky, 2019; Bekkers, & Wiepking, 2011). It can be considered as voluntarily giving something of value without wanting anything in exchange (Cambridge dictionary, n.d.). A donation can come in the form of money, goods or services and has the purpose to help a person or organisation. However, as opposed to general helping behaviour, charitable giving often has an absent beneficiary of the help (Carrol & Kachersky, 2019). Charitable organisations, non-profit organisations dedicated to social wellbeing (Carrol & Kachersky, 2019), often act as mediators between the donor and beneficiary.

Previous studies made distinctions between different types of charitable giving as they suggest that individuals hold different beliefs towards different forms of charitable giving, such as, monetary donations, volunteering, and organ donations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011, Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Choi, Kim, Chung, & Lee, 2019). However, when it comes to monetary donations, previous studies tend to make no distinctions between incidental and long-term donations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011, Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). This study aims to fill that gap and help to improve recruitment campaigns by answering the following research question: Which factors influence young adults' intention to donate long-term?

To answer the research question, a survey was conducted among young adults in the Netherlands between the ages 18 until 25. This age group was focused on because they can be seen as most likely to adopt non-charitable subscriptions (ING, 2018b).

It answers this question through the two following objectives. The first objective concerns examining the extent to which the theory of planned behaviour explains young adults' intention to donate long-term shall. This theory is often used to study charitable giving behaviour (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010; Linden, 2011). This theory suggests that, whether an individual participates in a behaviour depends on their intention (motivation) and ability to perform the behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). While their ability may depend on the resources available to an individual, their intention is based on distinct beliefs about a behaviour. The theory suggests that there are three types of beliefs which are the most salient when contemplating performing a behaviour: (Ajzen, 1991). Firstly, behavioural intentions depend on the attitude of an individual holds towards a behaviour. These attitudes are formed by attitudinal beliefs, such as whether performing a behaviour is favourable or unfavourable. Secondly, behavioural intentions depend on subjective norms. These norms entail the perceived normative beliefs that an individual's social environment holds towards engaging in a behaviour. Thirdly, behavioural intentions depend on perceived behavioural control, which is formed by beliefs regarding the ability to perform a behaviour. This study shall look at the influence of the *attitude towards charitable*

subscriptions, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control beliefs regarding charitable subscriptions on young adults intention to donate long-term.

The second objective concerns extending the theory of planned behaviour. Additional factors that have been found to influence other forms of charitable giving shall be studied in relation to donating long-term. These factors include, moral norms, anticipated guilt, anticipated warm glow, self-identity, perceived donation efficacy, and trust in charitable organisations. As behaviours and individuals vary, salient beliefs which influence behavioural intention may also vary (Ajzen, 1991). Therefore, making further distinctions between beliefs may increase the understanding of the motivating factors that influence the decision to perform a behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Consequentially, studies on charitable giving propose various factors which may influence charitable giving besides attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011).

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Long-term Donations

In the recent years, with the rise of online crowdfunding platforms, donors have become able to donate directly to a beneficiary, which can be a person or organisation. However, such platforms often only facilitate one-off donations. Charitable organisations often offer opportunities to donate on a long-term basis. As opposed to one-off donations, which are often incidental and impulsive, long-term donations are more structural and planned. Such donations can be often made on monthly but also on a yearly basis (Hartstichting, n.d.; UNICEF, n.d.; WWF, n.d.). Therefore, Long-term donations can be considered similar to subscriptions.

A general definition of a subscription is an arrangement that settles what product/service is provided, the frequency of usage/delivery, at what cost and within what timeframe (ING, 2018b). In the case of monetary donations the product/service can be seen as the goal that a charitable organisation is trying to achieve. Since charitable giving aims to benefit others beyond ones family, long-term donors might receive nothing or something small in exchange. For example the World Wide fund for Nature offers a magazine every three months (WWF, n.d.). Thus, frequency is mainly concerned with the payment of money. Regarding the frequency of donations, most charitable organisations seem to offer arrangements for monthly donations (Hartstichting, n.d.; UNICEF, n.d.; WWF, n.d.). As for costs and time frame, this can be seen as the amount of money that donors are willing to donate and for how long they are willing to donate. (Hartstichting, n.d.; UNICEF, n.d.; WWF, n.d.). Therefore, in this study, long-term donations are considered as *monthly charitable subscriptions: Arrangements that facilitate the donation of money to a charitable organisation on a monthly basis.*

2.2 Theory of Planned Behaviour

As previously mentioned, an often-used theory to predict charitable giving behaviour is the theory of planned behaviour by Ajzen (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010; Linden, 2011; Ajzen, 1991). This theory is often found to predict charitable giving behaviour in various occasions and shall therefore be used in this study to understand the intention of young adults to donate long-term. (Ajzen, 1991; Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018).

Fundamentally, the theory of behaviour suggests that behaviours are motivated by salient beliefs relevant to a behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). These beliefs, mediated through behavioural intentions, may lead to the performing of a behaviour. These intentions indicate how hard a person is willing to try to perform a certain behaviour. While people can hold many beliefs at the same time, some are more readily at hand when contemplating a behaviour. The theory identifies three types of beliefs to be the most salient concerning behaviours (Ajzen, 1991). These beliefs are categorised as attitude towards a behaviour, subjective norms about a behaviour and perceived behavioural control.

2.2.1 Attitude Towards Charitable Subscriptions

In general people want to participate in behaviours that they perceive as favourable. Attitude towards a behaviour refers to an individual's overall evaluation of how favourable performing a certain behaviour is (Ajzen, 1991). It can be defined as a general and enduring positive or negative feeling about a person object or issue (Petty & Cacioppo, as cited in Kassin, Fein, Markus, 2016; Mimouni, Chaabane, & Parguel, 2016). The importance of attitude in relation to behaviour is generally accepted and demonstrated to us daily through various interactions with marketing communication processes. Most people encounter attempts to change their attitude towards products, services, or issues daily. Examples of such attempts range from commercials and advertisements to packaging design

Research on the relation between attitudes and behaviour dates to at least 1934. A general assumption used to be that attitudes can influence behaviours directly (Fill & Turnbull, 2016; Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016). However, between 1934 and 1977 this relation between attitudes and behaviours has been contested as studies found no influence of self-reported attitudes on behaviours (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016; Terry, Hogg, & White, 1999). Rather attitudes seemed to correlate positively with behaviour intention than with the behaviour itself. This finding formed a basis for what later became the theory of planned behaviour (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016; Terry, Hogg, & White, 1999).

The theory of planned behaviour suggests that an individual with a positive attitude towards a behaviour has higher intentions to perform it (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). This effect of attitude on behavioural intention has been found in the context of varying behaviours. For example, Terry, Hogg and White (1999) found that a positive attitude regarding recycling was correlated with a higher intention to recycle, and Mittelman and Rojas Méndez (2018) found that positive attitude was correlated with higher intentions to donate. Thus, in this study it is expected that young adults' attitude towards long-term donations correlates positively with their intention to donate long-term. Therefore, the following hypothesis states

- H1: Young adults' attitude towards donating long-term has a positive effect on their intention to donate long-term.

2.2.2 Subjective Norms

When contemplating a behaviour, it is sometimes important to know how others perceive the behaviour. Subjective norms towards a behaviour are the perceived social reactions to engaging in a certain behaviour. These norms consist of two components normative beliefs and motivation to comply to a behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). Normative beliefs are beliefs about how other people in one's social environment perceive a certain behaviour. Motivation concerns whether important people in one's environment would

encourage or discourage a certain behaviour (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). A common example of the relationship between subjective norms and behaviour is peer pressure, when an individual is encouraged by his/her social environment to participate in a certain behaviour (Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). Thus, the theory of planned behaviour suggests that the more young adults perceive donating long-term to charity as a social norms, the more they would intend to donate long-term.

The effect of subjective norms on behavioural intention has also been studied in various contexts and often a positive correlation is found between subjective norms and behavioural intention. In a study concerning household recycling, Terry, Hogg and white (1999) found that participants would intend more to recycle when this behaviour is in line with their perceived subjective norms. Furthermore, Manesi, Van Lange, Van Doesum and Pollet (2019) suggest that even indirect social scrutiny by means of eyes on a poster eyes on a poster may increase individuals' intention to donate to victims of a typhoon.

However, Mittelman and Rojas Méndez (2018) suggest that the effect of subjective norms on behavioural intention might vary depending on the level of individualism within a populations culture. When comparing their effect of subjective norms in their study on why Canadians give to charity and a study on why Pakistani donate to charity, their results suggest that subjective norms had no effect in Canada, while the opposite was true in Pakistan. Furthermore, Kassin, Fein and Markus (2016) suggest that independence and autonomy are the most highly valued in the U.S.A., Australia, United Kingdom, Canada and the Netherlands, while Pakistan is one of the 6 countries where collectivism is valued the most. Based on these finding, subjective norms could have various effects.

Simultaneously, a study in Leeds, United Kingdom, found that students evaluate behaviours by other students that are typical for their university more positively than atypical behaviour (Hutchison, Jetten and Gutierrez, 2011). The researchers also found that when students were primed that their university is known for its tolerance, atypical behaviour was seen more positively but not as much as typical behaviour This suggests, that even in countries where autonomy is highly valued, among certain groups subjective norms still affect how behaviours are perceived. Therefore, the following hypothesis states:

- H2: Subjective norms have a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

2.2.3 Perceived Behavioural Control

Additionally, whether a behaviour can be achieved may also play a role in whether to engage in it. Perceived behavioural control (PBC) is defined as people's perception of the difficulty of performing a behaviour (Mittleman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). It refers to the degree to which people believe that they can perform a certain behaviour and is also known as self-efficacy (Sharma & Morwitz, 2016). For example, regarding donating long-term, a factor that could inhibit this behaviour could be that young adults find it difficult to donate long-term. Thus, if young adults perceive donating long-term to be easy, they may have more intention to donate long-term.

Various studies have found a positive correlation between PBC and the intention to donate. Several studies have found that a higher perceived behavioural control correlated with a higher intention to donate. Mittleman & Rojas Méndez (2018) found that PBC is a

significant predictor of why Canadians donate. Additionally, in a study of online fundraising effectiveness, Sargant et al (2007) suggest that website accessibility was a positive predictor for, not only the total amount of online donations, but also for the number of new donors that a website attracts. Based on these results the third hypothesis states;

- H3: Young adults' perceived behavioural control has a positive effect on their intention to donate long-term.

2.3 Extending the theory of planned behaviour

The theory of planned behaviour is a theory that aims to explain deliberate behaviours in general. It has often been argued that further categorisation of beliefs besides attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control might help to predict behavioural intention more accurately (Ajzen 1991; Van der Linden, 2011; Mittelman, & Rojas Méndez). Making further distinctions between beliefs that precede behavioural intentions may increase the understanding of motivators of a certain behaviour, since the beliefs that are salient may differ per behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). For example, when an individual is intending to vote, perceived behavioural control might be a less salient factor than when intending to take skateboarding lessons. The skateboarding lessons would require one to consider the costs of the lessons, while voting is often free. Thus, by extending the theory of planned behaviour more understanding can be gained of factors that can influence young adults' intention to donate long-term.

2.3.1 Moral Norms

Besides the existing subjective norms in the theory of planned behaviour, some researchers have argued for the inclusion of Moral norms (Smith et al, 2007). Moral norms, also known as moral obligation, refer to personal responsibility or duty to perform a given behaviour and to adhere to personal norms (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). Within the context charitable giving, personal responsibility has been found to play an important role. Several studies on the effects of moral norms on the intention to donate in general have found the factor to be a significant positive predictor (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018). Thus, moral norms differ from subjective norms because they put more emphasis on factors related to personal feelings of responsibility, rather than perceived social pressure.

Especially in a country that values individuality and autonomy, personal norms might have a significant effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term. Thus, the more young adults perceive donating long-term to charity as a personal norms, the more they intend to donate long-term. Simultaneously, if they feel less responsible to donate long-term, the less they intend to do so. A possible reason that less young adults are willing to donate could be the diffusion of responsibility. This diffusion can be caused by a bystander effect where young adults assume that they do not need to donate because someone else will do it (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016; Erlandsson, Jungstrand, Vastfjal, 2016).

Therefore, the following hypothesis states:

- H4: Moral obligation has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

2.3.2 Anticipated Guilt

As individuals feel a moral obligation to engage in a certain behaviour, they might feel guilty when they fail to perform that behaviour. Guilt can be defined as a self-directed emotional reaction to behaving immorally (Erlandsson, Jungstrand, Vastfjal, 2016). Often feelings of guilt occur after doing something bad, however these feelings can also occur before a behaviour as anticipated guilt (Cotte, Coulter, & Moore, 2005). As a result, guilt has the potential to incentivise future behaviour. Anticipated guilt results from “contemplating a potential violation of one’s standards” (p362; Cotte, Coulter & Moore, 2005). This type of guilt appeal is often used to promote healthcare products/services and charities (Cotte, Coulter & Moore, 2005).

Anticipated guilt is found to be positively correlated with donation intention in several studies (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Erlandsson, Jungstrand, Vastfjal, 2016). For example, one study compared donations of church members before they had confessions and after confessions. In this study the total amount donated was often higher before people had confessed (Harris, Benson, & Hall; as cited by Bekkers& Wiepking, 2011). By enhancing feelings of responsibility, the effect of guilt can lead to charitable giving (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). However, the opposite seems also to be true that when potential donors feel little responsibility, they also feel less guilt (Erlandsson, Jungstrand, Vastfjal, 2016). Therefore, the following hypotheses states:

- H5: Anticipated guilt when failing to donate long-term has a positive effect on young adult’s intention to donate long-term.

2.3.3 Perceived Donation Efficacy

A main reason for donating to charity is to help achieve a certain goal. Therefore, it may seem only logical that donors find it important that their donations are spent effectively towards these goals (Karlan & wood, 2016; Carrol & Kachersky, 2019). Perceived efficacy of behaviour refers to the perception that a behaviour will lead to the desired outcome (Sharma & Morwitz, 2016; Karlan & Wood, 2016). This belief is confirmed in several studies in both the United Kingdom (Sargant et al) and in the Netherlands to affect donation intention, (Bekkers) as participants seemed to have an aversion against expensive fundraising events (As cited in Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). For those participants expensive fundraising methods meant that less of the donated money is spent on achieving a charitable goal. Furthermore, Karlan and Wood (2016) found that presenting positive information about charitable effectiveness can increase the likelihood of donating. Therefore, the following hypothesis states:

- H6: Perceived donation efficacy has a positive effect on young adults’ intention to donate long-term.

2.3.4 Anticipated Warm Glow

Often charitable giving is studied as an altruistic behaviour, as donating to charity solely to help someone else without benefitting from it. However, several studies have found that donating brings people joy. Neuropsychological studies by Harbaugh, Mary, and Burghardt (2007) suggest that donating elicits neural activity in areas of the brain that are linked to reward processing (as cited by Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Furthermore, Mimouni, Chaabane and Parguel (2016) suggest that donors who report a great warm glow feeling often donate a larger size to charity. When defining warm glow, researchers often refer to

Andreoni's definition which states: warm glow is a pleasurable feeling that is produced by the act of giving by default without the consideration of the consequences of giving (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Konow, 2010; Mimouni, Chaabane & Parguel, 2016).

The effects of warm glow seem to depend on the decision-making process of an individual (Karlan & Wood, 2016). The elaboration likelihood model by Petty and Cacioppo suggests that how an individual makes decisions depends on how their ability and motivation to process information from for example an advertisement or a donation call (Fill & Turnbull, 2016). Within this model there are two routes that lead to a decision making: the central and peripheral route. When an individual has high ability and motivation, they are highly involved with the message and shall process persuasive information through the central route. In the central route the focus is on logic and the quality of arguments and is less intuitive (Fill & Turnbull, 2016). Within the context of charitable giving, examples of such arguments include information about donation efficacy. However, for donors who are motivated by warm glow, presenting such information can reduced the intention to donate (Karlan & Wood, 2016).

In the peripheral route, individuals are seen to lack the ability or motivation to process information and are less involved in a persuasive message. Processing in this route is more intuitive and relies on peripheral cues (Fill & Turnbull, 2016). For example, one might choose to buy a certain sports shoe because it is endorsed by one's favourite athlete. A study by Karlan and Wood (2016) suggests that warm glow motivated donors make their decision to donate based on peripheral cues. In fact, in their study presenting additional information on donation impact deterred some warm glow donors. Given the preference of young adults to donate incidentally rather than structurally and long-term (Bekkers, Schuyt, & Gouwenberg, 2017; Van Uffelen, 2019), warm glow might be a significant role in their intention to donate. Thus, the following hypothesis states:

- H7: Anticipated warm glow when contemplating to donate long-term has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

2.3.5 Self-identity

Self-identity refers to salient and enduring beliefs of one's self-perception (Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). According to William Swann (as cited in Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016) people are highly motivated to verify their existing self-concept in the eyes of others. Young adults often identify themselves as socially mindful. A study by Massachusetts institute of technology, showed that millennials reported to be more environmentally conscious than older generations (Coughlin, 2018). Meanwhile young adults seem to believe in corporate social responsibility's ability to solving poverty related issues and to improve life standards (Cheng, 2019). Thus, it could be expected that donating long-term is something that matches their self-identity.

Within the study of behaviour, researchers have argued that self-identity should be considered as a predictor of behavioural intention. This suggestion is based on empirical evidence that self-identity predicts behavioural intention alongside attitudes and norms (Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). Several survey studies have provided evidence of a relationship between an altruistic self-image and philanthropy (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Manesi, Van Lange, Van Doesum, & Pollet, 2019; Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). Thus, the need of an individual to live up to their self-image seems to encourage certain forms of philanthropy (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016).

Therefore, the following hypothesis states:

- H8: Social mindfulness has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

2.3.6 Trust in Charitable Organisations

Trust plays an important role in charitable giving. When donating money to charity, donors often do not have the means to control whether their donations are used as promised. Thus, there is a risk that their money is used for purposes that they do not support. Trust can be defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party without the ability to monitor or control that other party, based on the expectation that the other will perform an action important to the trustor (p.712; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). According to Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman (1995), there are three main factors of perceived trustworthiness that lead to perceived trustworthiness.

One factor is ability. This refers to the perceived skills and competencies of a party to perform certain activities. The second factor benevolence refers to the perceived willingness of a trustee to want to do good and having good intentions. The third factor integrity refers to the perception that the trustee adheres to a set of principles that are acceptable. Generally charitable organisations rely heavily on societal support to achieve their mission. Crucial for this support is that such organisations are seen as legitimate and trustworthy (Farwell, Shier, & Handy, 2019; Hyndman & McConville, 2017). While for perceived efficacy requires donors to have trust in the effectiveness of their behaviour to solve a problem, donors are also required to have trust in a charitable organisation (Hydeman & McConville, 2017). However, beforehand donors cannot know whether their donation will be used as expected. This means that one must believe that an organisation is well managed, behaves honestly and ethically, and are making a positive difference to their cause (Populus, as cited in Hyndman & McConville, 2017).

In 2017, Bekkers, Schuyt and Gouweberg reported that in trust in charitable organisations is in decline, despite their efforts to increase transparency and despite people in the Netherlands acknowledging that charitable organisations are valuable. This decline of trust in charitable organisations can be a possible cause for the decline in long term structural donors. It might be that young adults have little trust in charitable organisations. Therefore, the following hypothesis states:

- H9: Trust in charitable organisations has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate.

2.3.7 Awareness of Charitable Subscriptions

Lastly, another possible predictor of the intention to adopt a charitable subscription is awareness. Awareness refers to an individual's knowledge of the existence of long-term donations (Choi, Kim, Chung, & Lee, 2019; Fill & Turnbull, 2016). In the context of branding, awareness is operationalised as brand knowledge, familiarity or brand recognition and brand recollection (Do Paço, Gouveia Rodrigues, & Rodrigues, 2014). Within various marketing communications models, awareness is often seen as the start of a persuasion process (Fill & Turnbull, 2016; Mimouni, Chaabane, & Paraguel, 2016). The notion is that cognitive mechanisms such as awareness need to precede affective mechanisms, meaning that one needs to have some knowledge to be able to form an affection. For charitable giving, this means that potential donors are aware of the possibility to donate structurally, as well as

aware of charitable organisations that they can donate to. However, once awareness has been created, it should be maintained, or else audiences might become more distracted by competing messages and lose focus from a brand or organisation.

As for the effect of awareness on charitable giving, various studies have reported a positive association between donation awareness and charitable giving (Balwani et al; as cited in Choi, Kim, Chung, & Lee, 2019). A study on the intention of teenagers in South Korea to donate online suggests that teenagers who have a higher level of donation awareness were also more likely to donate more. Due to previous studies and the importance of awareness in communication processes, the following hypothesis states:

- H10: Awareness of long-term donation options has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

3 Methods

3.1 Research Design and procedure

The purpose of this study is to understand the factors that influence young adults' intention to donate. To answer this question, a quantitative approach was chosen. Specifically, an online standardised, self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data. This approach was chosen after doing an examination on past studies literature on behaviour and charitable giving. This showed that charitable giving and behaviour have been studied extensively and as a result many factors that explain charitable giving are quite established. However, these factors may vary across populations and types of charitable giving (Mittelman & Rojas Méndez, 2018; Choi, Kim, Chung, & Lee, 2019). Furthermore, qualitative research would be less suited to describing large populations (Babbie, 2016). These circumstances made a quantitative survey to seem more suitable for this research purpose. Because of standardisation, quantitative surveys are less time intensive when collecting and analysing data from many cases. Such surveys are more suitable to describe and explain phenomena in large populations (Babbie, 2016).

The surveys responses were collected through Qualtrics Survey Software. At the beginning of the survey, participants were explained about the topic and potential privacy risks. They were also explained that no personal information would be collected by which they can be identified, and that quitting is possible at any moment. As a result, all data was collected anonymously. Since the target population is Dutch, the survey was translated to Dutch. Before publishing the survey, a pre-test was done with five Dutch participants. From this pre-test it became clear that some words were a bit complicated, therefore these words were replaced by more common synonyms.

3.2 Sampling Procedure

The target group of this study were Dutch young adults between the ages 18 and 25 years. These age group of young adults was chosen due to their high propensity to adopt subscriptions on consumption goods and services (ING, 2018b). After having this study reviewed and approved regarding ethical issues by the University of Twente, participants were recruited by means of snowball sampling, online survey exchange platforms and the University of Twente's sampling pool program. Regarding snowball sampling, social media contacts were asked to participate and share the survey with other Dutch young adults that

they know. These contacts were not offered any incentives or compensation. However, some compensations were offered to participants that found the survey on the survey exchange platform and the university's sampling pool. Regarding online survey exchange platforms, the main platform used was surveyswap.com. Incentives were given in the form of credits, for every survey that was filled in by the researcher of this study a certain amount of credits were earned, which could then be used to credit others survey exchangers once they completed the survey of this study.

3.3 Respondents

Table 1 shows the sample composition. The total number of respondents completed the survey was 254. On average respondents in the sample were 22 years old. Within the sample the number of male and female respondents were relatively equal, but with slightly more female respondents. About 90% of the participants were students and all either finished or are studying at colleges or university level. 5.5% of the respondents' highest/current education level is community college and 5.1% has finished or is still in high school. While 68.5% does not have any religion, the most popular religions among young adults are catholic and protestant. Lastly, most of the participants reside in the provinces Overijssel, Noord-holland and Zuid-holland.

3.4 Measurement Instruments

Table 2 shows the items that were used for data collection as well as data analysis. These are the items were found to have discriminant validity by means of a factor analysis. The complete survey as depicted to participants can be found in Appendix A.

Most of these items were derived from several other studies and were adjusted to be applicable in the context of long-term donations. As mentioned before, long-term donations were defined as monthly subscriptions, since this is the most common option to donate long-term. Therefore, as can be seen in Table 2, all questions were adjusted to focus on monthly subscriptions.

Aside from the items used to measure *attitude*, which were measured with a 5-point semantic scale, all other items were measured with a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Neutral, to Agree. A 5-point scale is suggested to give better results than a 3-point scale with only agree, disagree or neutral (Robinson, 2018). The *Intention to adopt monthly charitable subscription* as well as *attitude towards charitable subscription*, *perceived behavioural control*, *moral norms* was measured with items that were derived from Mittelman and Rojas Méndez (2018).

The items for measuring *awareness* of charitable subscriptions were derived from Choi, Kim, Chung and Lee (2019). Concerning *Subjective norms* 1 item was derived from Mittelman and Rojas Méndez (2018) 1 item from Terry, Hog and white (1999) and the other 1 item from Beldad and Hegner (2018). The items of Perceived efficacy of donation were derived from Sharma and Morwitz, (2016). The Items for *Anticipated guilt* and *Anticipated warm glow* were derived from Erlandsson, Jungstrand and Vastfjal (2016). Finally, regarding *Trust in charitable organisations*, 1 item was derived from Farwell, Shier and Handy (2019). The remaining items were derived from the general model of trust (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

Table 1*Demographic information (N=254)*

| Characteristics | | Frequency | Percent % |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Average age | | M= 22 (SD=1.59) | |
| Sex | | | |
| | Male | 120 | 47 |
| | Female | 134 | 52 |
| Occupation | | | |
| | Student | 231 | 90.9 |
| | Working full-time | 16 | 6.3 |
| | Working part-time | 6 | 2.4 |
| | Jobless/Job seeking | 1 | 0.4 |
| Highest completed/ current education level | | | |
| | University | 152 | 59.8 |
| | HBO | 75 | 29.5 |
| | MBO | 14 | 5.5 |
| | VWO | 8 | 3.1 |
| | HAVO | 5 | 2.0 |
| Religion | | | |
| | No religion | 174 | 68.5 |
| | Catholic | 46 | 18.1 |
| | Protestant | 18 | 7.1 |
| | Islam | 3 | 1.2 |
| | Hindu | 1 | 0.4 |
| | Other | 12 | 4.7 |
| Province of residence | | | |
| | Overijssel | 90 | 35.4 |
| | Noord-Holland | 44 | 17.3 |
| | Zuid-Holland | 40 | 15.7 |
| | Gelderland | 22 | 8.7 |
| | Noord-Brabant | 20 | 7.9 |
| | Utrecht | 19 | 7.5 |
| | Groningen | 7 | 2.8 |
| | Flevoland | 5 | 2.0 |
| | Limburg | 4 | 1.6 |
| | Drenthe, Zeeland, Friesland | 3 | 1.2 |
| Total | | 254 | 100 |

3.5 Measurement Reliability and Validity

The data that resulted from the surveys were analysed by means of SPSS software. The analysis process started with testing the validity of the items used in the survey using Principal Component Analysis with a varimax rotation. This analysis showed the extent to which the items measured discriminant factors. The KMO and Bartlett's Test = 0.846, $p < 0.01$ suggest that a factor analysis on the collected data would be useful. After several rounds of factor analysis, all items measured a discriminant factor. To reach this point 3 items were removed from the scale that measured the *Awareness of charitable subscriptions*, 2 Items from *attitude towards charitable subscriptions* and 1 Item from *Moral norms*, resulting in the items and factor loadings depicted in Table 2.

Furthermore, Table 3 shows the eigenvalues and explained variances of the factors. Herein can be seen that all items, except for the items for moral norms, have eigenvalues above 1. This suggests that the construct of moral norms explains a little of the variance in the data. Following the factor analysis were the scale reliability analyses. As depicted in Table 2, all Cronbach's alphas are above 0.60 and can be considered statistically reliable.

Table 2

| <i>Measure Validity and Reliability Analysis</i> | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Construct | Survey items | Factor loadings | Cronbach's alpha |
| Awareness of charitable subscriptions | I can easily name several charities that offer monthly subscriptions. | 0.828 | 0.628 |
| | I am well informed about monthly donation subscriptions. | 0.832 | |
| Intention to adopt monthly charitable subscription | In the near future, I am seriously planning to donate monthly to a charitable organisation. | 0.779 | 0.920 |
| | In the near future, I am intending to adopt a monthly donation plan from a charity. | 0.907 | |
| | In the near future, it is likely that I will have a monthly donation plan. | 0.898 | |
| Attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions | My making adopting a monthly charitable subscription would be: Very unpleasant to Very pleasant | 0.809 | 0.748 |
| | Very unfavourable to Very favourable | 0.822 | |
| | Very negative to Very positive | 0.554 | |
| Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC) | I think that I am easily capable of donating monthly to charities in the near future. | 0.858 | 0.825 |
| | In the near future I can afford financially to adopt a monthly charitable subscription to charity. | 0.825 | |
| | In the near future, if I wanted to, I could take on a monthly subscription to a charitable organisation. | 0.840 | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|
| Perceived donation efficacy | | 0.825 |
| | I believe that adopting a monthly subscription to a charitable cause can make a difference | 0.745 |
| | I believe that adopting a monthly subscription on a charitable cause is effective to support a cause. | 0.784 |
| | I believe that adopting a monthly subscription for charity is useful. | 0.755 |
| | My adoption a donation plan would be of added value to support a charitable cause. | 0.823 |
| Moral Norm | | 0.657 |
| | I am someone who has a moral obligation to donate to charity. | 0.639 |
| | I am someone who believes that it is just to adopt a monthly charitable subscription. | 0.765 |
| Socially mindful self-identity | | 0.721 |
| | I am a person who is aware of how my actions would affect the welfare of others. | 0.761 |
| | I think of myself as a socially mindful person. | 0.775 |
| | I see myself as someone who cares about the welfare of others. | 0.826 |
| Subjective Norms | | 0.815 |
| | People who are important to me would recommend me to make monthly donations to charity. | 0.816 |
| | People who are important to me think that my donating monthly to a charitable cause would be desirable. | 0.784 |
| | People who are important to me expect me to adopt a charitable subscription. | 0.771 |
| Anticipated Warm Glow | | 0.873 |
| | Adopting a monthly subscription to charity shall bring me Joy. | 0.750 |
| | Adopting a monthly subscription to charity shall make me feel satisfied. | 0.846 |
| | I would feel like I did something very nice if I adopted a monthly subscription to charity. | 0.830 |
| Anticipated Guilt | | 0.918 |
| | I would feel regret if I did not adopt a monthly donation plan. | 0.798 |
| | I would feel guilty if I did not adopt a monthly donation plan. | 0.882 |
| | I would have a bad conscience if I did not adopt a donation plan. | 0.923 |
| | I would feel bad if I don't take a donation subscription. | 0.893 |
| Trust in charitable organisations | | 0.890 |
| | Thinking about charities in general, I find them trustworthy. | 0.838 |
| | Thinking about charities in general, their managers are trustworthy. | 0.768 |
| | Thinking about charities in general, they have competence to support their cause. | 0.827 |
| | Thinking about charities in general, are sincerely concerned about the welfare of society. | 0.825 |
| | I trust this charitable organization to do its best in helping its beneficiaries. | 0.755 |

Table 3*Eigenvalues and percentage of explained variance*

| Construct | Eigenvalue | Percentage of Variance |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1 Trust in charitable organisations | 8,196 | 23,417 |
| 2 Anticipated guilt | 3,981 | 11,374 |
| 3 Perceived donation efficacy | 2,859 | 8,167 |
| 4 Intention to subscribe | 2,394 | 6,839 |
| 5 Anticipated warm glow | 1,962 | 5,605 |
| 6 Perceived behavioural control | 1,763 | 5,036 |
| 7 Subjective norms | 1,394 | 3,982 |
| 8 Self-Identity | 1,190 | 3,401 |
| 9 Attitude | 1,149 | 3,282 |
| 10 Awareness | 1,076 | 3,075 |
| 11 Moral norms | ,793 | 2,265 |

4 Results

4.1 Correlation and Multicollinearity

A Pearson correlation analysis was done to test whether the independent variables correlated with the dependent variable (See Table 4). This analysis shows that all predictors have a significant correlation with the dependent variable, except for *self-identity*. Therefore, this variable deemed unfit for further analysis.

Furthermore, the independent variables were also tested for multicollinearity. Table 5 shows that the variables have tolerance levels above 0.5. This means that most of the variance can only be explained by a specific variable. Furthermore, IBM (n.d.) suggests that when variables have VIF scores below 2, then there are little problems with multicollinearity. When the variables have VIF scores above 2 then there are problems with multicollinearity. Table 5 also shows that all VIF scores are below 2 and that little multicollinearity can be expected between the predicting variables.

Table 4*Correlations*

| | Mean | SD | Intention | Attitude | awareness | Donation Efficacy | Anticipated Guilt | Moral norm | PBC | Self-identity | Subjective norms | Trust | Warm glow |
|-------------------|------|------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------|---------------|------------------|-------|-----------|
| Intention | 2.26 | 1.15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attitude | 3.34 | .86 | .39** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Awareness | 3.14 | 1.04 | .16* | .12 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Donation Efficacy | 3.71 | .93 | .23** | .48** | .20** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Guilt | 2.22 | 1.03 | .26** | .10 | .03 | .11 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Moral norm | 2.92 | .99 | .43** | .39** | .13* | .34** | .33** | 1 | | | | | |
| PBC | 3.57 | 1.09 | .22** | .08 | .10 | .13* | -.21** | .01 | 1 | | | | |
| Self-identity | 4.00 | .70 | .03 | .09 | .17** | .19** | .06 | .25** | .01 | 1 | | | |
| Subjective norms | 2.03 | .89 | .42** | .32** | .11 | .16* | .34** | .50** | -.03 | .017 | 1 | | |
| Trust | 3.20 | .84 | .14* | .32** | .17** | .43** | .10 | .32** | .14* | .21** | .25** | 1 | |
| Warm glow | 3.45 | 1.02 | .36** | .48** | .15* | .53** | .20** | .35** | .02 | .15* | .30** | .26** | 1 |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

To test the research hypotheses and determine the effect of the independent variables that extended the theory of planned behaviour, a hierarchical regression analysis was run with the “intention to adopt a monthly charitable subscription” as the independent variable. In the first block, the basic predictors of the theory of planned behaviour were entered. These three predictors were attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control and resulted in an adjusted R^2 value of .28 ($F_{3, 250} = 34.22$, $p < .001$). This indicates that 28% of the variance in young adults’ intention to adopt charitable subscriptions was explained by these three predictors.

In the second block, the variables, moral norms, anticipated guilt, perceived donation efficacy, anticipated warm glow, self-identity, trust in charitable organisations and awareness of charitable subscriptions were added besides the variables of the first block. The addition of these 7 variables resulted in a higher adjusted R^2 value of .35 ($F_{6, 244} = 16.36$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, this indicates that 7% of the variance in young adults intention can be explained by these 7 variables.

4.2.1 Significant Positive Effects

The effects and significance of each predictor are also depicted in Table 5. In this table can be seen that attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions, anticipated guilt, moral norms, perceived behavioural control, subjective norms and anticipated warm glow have coefficients that are greater than 0 and thus a positive effect on the intention to donate. Furthermore, the null hypothesis of these effects can be rejected, since all these predictors have $p < 0.01$, except for Anticipated warm glow, which has a $p < 0.05$. Therefore, the following hypotheses are supported:

- H1: Young adults' attitude towards donating long-term has a positive effect on their intention to donate long-term.
- H2: Subjective norms have a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.
- H3: Young adults' perceived behavioural control has a positive effect on their intention to donate long-term.
- H4: Moral obligation has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.
- H5: Anticipated guilt when failing to donate long-term has a positive effect on young adult's intention to donate long-term.
- H7: Anticipated warm glow when contemplating to donate long-term has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

4.2.2 Marginally Significant Effects

Trust in charitable organisation is the only predictor that seems to have a marginally significant effect ($p < 0.10$) on the intention to adopt a monthly charitable subscription. Therefore, the null-hypothesis of this variable cannot be rejected. Furthermore, the effect of this predicting variable is negative since it has a coefficient. Thus, the following hypothesis is rejected:

- H9: Trust in charitable organisations has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate.

4.2.3 Insignificant Effects

As mentioned before, *socially mindful self-identity* was removed from further analyses due to having no significant correlation with the *intention to adopt a charitable subscription* and the following hypothesis was rejected:

- H8: Social mindfulness has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

The variables awareness of monthly charitable subscription and perceived efficacy of monthly charitable seem to have insignificant effects on the intention to adopt a monthly charitable subscription since $p > 0.10$. Therefore, the null hypotheses of the effects of these predictors cannot be rejected. As a result, the following hypotheses are rejected:

- H10: Awareness of long-term donation options has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.
- H6: Perceived donation efficacy has a positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term.

Table 5*Regression Coefficients*

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | p | Collinearity Statistics | |
|---|--------|---------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Tolerance | VIF |
| Intercept | -.600 | .314 | -1.907 | ,058 | | |
| Attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions | .357 | .075 | 4.731 | ,000 | ,888 | 1,127 |
| Subjective Norms | .431 | .073 | 5.949 | ,000 | ,892 | 1,121 |
| Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC) | .222 | .056 | 3.953 | ,000 | ,990 | 1,010 |
| Intercept | -1.198 | .372 | -3.217 | ,001 | | |
| Attitude towards monthly charitable subscriptions | .266 | .084 | 3.157 | ,002 | ,640 | 1,562 |
| Awareness of charitable subscriptions | .067 | .058 | 1.166 | ,245 | ,940 | 1,064 |
| Perceived donation efficacy | -.081 | .083 | -0.968 | ,334 | ,566 | 1,768 |
| Anticipated Guilt | .168 | .063 | 2.667 | ,008 | ,795 | 1,258 |
| Moral Norm | .230 | .074 | 3.098 | ,002 | ,621 | 1,610 |
| Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC) | .270 | .055 | 4.860 | ,000 | ,915 | 1,093 |
| Subjective Norms | .244 | .079 | 3.065 | ,002 | ,669 | 1,494 |
| Trust in charitable organisations | -.144 | .079 | -1.814 | ,071 | ,755 | 1,324 |
| Anticipated Warm Glow | .179 | .073 | 2.461 | ,015 | ,615 | 1,626 |

5 Discussion of Results

In the recent years, charitable organisations in the Netherlands have seen their number of long-term donors decrease. One of the reasons for this decrease was that charities were having difficulty with persuading young adults to donate long-term. They seem to prefer incidental donations over long-term donations. Because campaigns to attract younger long-term donors were deemed too costly in comparison to their efficiency, some charitable organisations seemed to have given up hope in attracting new long-term donors.

However, long-term donations are important for charities because they offer opportunities for charities to improve their operations and they offer stability. Due to the importance of charitable giving, many studies have been devoted to understanding why people donate. Knowledge from these studies can be useful for charities to improve fundraising attempts. However, while young adults seem to have distinct preferences regarding incidental and long-term donations, past studies tend not to make the same distinction. Thus, this study aimed to provide a more specific understanding of why young adults do or do not donate long-term.

To answer the question, this study examined the extent to which the theory of planned behaviour explains young adults' intention to donate long-term shall be examined. Thus, this study looked at the influence of the *attitude towards charitable subscriptions*, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control beliefs regarding charitable subscriptions on young

adults' intention to donate long-term. Furthermore, seven additional factors that have been found to influence other forms of charitable giving were used to extend the theory of planned behaviour. These factors were moral norms, anticipated guilt, anticipated warm glow, self-identity, perceived donation efficacy, and trust in charitable organisations.

Besides testing the effects of these 10 variables on young adults' intention to donate long-term, this study also tested the extent to which the additional variables may improve the predictive value of theory of planned behaviour. Thus, a hierarchical regression analysis was run with in the first block only the predictors of the theory of planned behaviour and in the second block all 10 predictors. The hierarchical analysis found that the predictors of the theory of planned behaviour explained 28% of the variance in intention to donate long-term. With the additional factors, 35% of the variance was explained. Thus, 7% of the variance could be accounted for by these factors.

Regarding the effect of individual factors, as expected, the three proposed predictors of the theory of planned behaviour were found to have a significant positive effect on young adult's intention to donate long-term. From the variables used to extend the theory of planned behaviour, only moral norms, anticipated guilt and anticipated warm glow were found to have a significant positive effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term. Trust in charitable organisations was found to have a marginally significant negative effect on the intention to donate long-term. It seems not to be a salient factor when thinking about donating long-term. However, when prompted to think about the trustworthiness, young adults who have more intention to donate long-term might be more critical towards the trust worthiness of organisations. This might explain why a marginally significant negative correlation is found between organisational trust and donating long-term.

Regarding perceived donation efficacy, despite perceiving donating long-term as an efficacious behaviour this did not seem to affect young adults' intention to donate long-term. This is in line with previous findings by Bekkers, Schuyt and Gouwenberg (2017) that despite a decline in generosity over the years, Dutch citizens still see charitable organisations as valuable. However, it seems to be an insignificant factor regarding charitable giving intention. A reason for the lack of effect of perceived efficacy could be due to young adults' being warm-glow motivated donors. In their study on perceived efficacy, Karlan and Wood (2016) found that presenting information on donation efficacy to warm glow donors could have a negative effect. Since, in this study, warm glow was found to have a significant effect, it could be the case that young adults are high motivated by emotions and intuition in the decision to donate long-term.

Lastly, also self-identity was found to have an insignificant effect on young adults' intention to donate long-term. On average participants report to identify themselves as somewhat highly socially mindful. However, contrary to the hypothesis, this self-perception of being socially mindful seemed to have no effect on their intention to donate long-term. In previous studies it has been argued that often people overestimate their self-image, meaning that they see themselves as more socially mindful, than they are (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Therefore, the effect can turn out to be insignificant.

6 Practical Implications

This study aimed to understand which factor play a role in young adult's intention to donate long-term. The factors that have been found to significantly predict young adults' intention to donate are suitable to form requirements to which future communication campaigns to attract new donors must adhere. For example, the finding regarding attitude suggests that it is important for potential donors to perceive the act of donating long-term as favourable or positive. Furthermore, social encouragement and approval are also important for long-term donating to happen among young adults. This indicates that besides direct request to donate

long-term, developing social approval and encouragement to donate within young adults' social environment might also attract new long-term donors. Thus, besides donation requests, charities may benefit from communication aimed to improve the way long-term donations are perceived.

The finding regarding perceived behavioural control suggests that it is important that donating long-term seems do-able. To improve the perceived ability to donate long-term among young adults, charitable organisations could, for example, develop different types of subscriptions. For example, regarding music streaming subscriptions, users can often turn subscriptions on and off with only hours notice. This reduces the worry of not being able to afford the subscription.

The findings regarding moral norms and anticipated guilt suggest that future campaigns should aim to raise moral obligation in young adults to donate long-term. Since, these factors are significant predictors, this might indicate that young adults feel less responsibility to donate long-term. Lack of responsibility can be caused by a bystander effect (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016; Erlandsson, Jungstrand, Vastfjal, 2016). Therefore, while most Dutch people find donating to charitable organisations valuable, charitable organisations are recommended to make clear which responsibilities young adults have regarding charitable giving. By specifying which role young adults have, the bystander effect can be avoided (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2016).

Lastly, the findings regarding Anticipated warm glow suggest that donating long-term should be perceived to result in a pleasant feeling, in order for young adults to participate in the behaviour. Furthermore, the significant effect on anticipated warm glow and the insignificant effects of perceived donation efficacy indicate that young adults are warm-glow donors (Karlan & Wood, 2016). This means that donors have low involvement with communicative efforts of charitable organisations and interact with their messages through peripheral cues (Karlan & Wood, 2016; Fill & Turnbull). As a result, their decision to donate is based on an intuitive process. This finding regarding anticipated warm glow suggests that future campaigns to attract young long-term donors should be able to be processed intuitively and require little ability or motivation to process the message. Requiring such donors to be more involved with a message by for example offering more information on donation efficacy seems to have a negative effect on their intention to donate (Karlan & Wood, 2016). Therefore, charitable organisations are recommended to make adopting a charitable subscription a more intuitive process that requires little processing of information.

7 Theoretical Implications

The study can be seen as confirmative. It tested several predictors of behavioural intention. It suggests that predictors of behavioural intention within the theory of planned behaviour are significant predictors when it comes to the intention to donate long-term among young adults: *attitude towards behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control*. These results further support the theory of planned behaviour as significant predictors of behavioural intention. Additionally, it suggests that *anticipated guilt, moral norms and anticipated warm glow*, can be used to improve the predictive value of the theory of planned behaviour.

Furthermore, this study added to existing knowledge about charitable giving by bringing a focus beyond explaining general donation behaviour to a specific focus on long-term structural donation behaviour. Next to that, a specific focus was put on a specific population group. For example, this focus helps to add more information to the effects of subjective norms in different cultures and population. This factor is suggested to have various effects depending on how autonomy is valued within a population (Mittelman and Rojas Méndez, 2018; Kassin,

Fein, & Markus, 2016). While the effect of subjective norms was expected to have no effect on behaviour in a country that values individuality, an effect was found.

8 Limitations and Future Recommendations

This study set out to find predictors of the intention to donate long-term. In this study a standardised survey was used to measure the variables. This measure is suitable for collecting and analysing data from a large sample size. However, it is not very flexible. One of the risks associated with standardisation is that “by designing questions that is at least minimally appropriate to all respondents, you may miss what is most appropriate to many respondents” (p. 280; Babbie, 2016). The results indicate that this might have been the case. The model used in this study explains 36.7% of the variance in intention to donate long-term. This leaves about 63% of the variance unaccounted for. Thus, there might be many other factors that can explain why young adults have low intentions to donate long-term. Therefore, future studies should also try to find other predictors.

Additionally, after factor analysis the number of items used to measure awareness and moral norms were reduced. Therefore, too few items might have been used to measure moral norms and awareness, meaning that the scales might not have been able to capture the complexity of these variables (Robinson, 2018). Furthermore, future research is needed to re-examine the effect of organisational trust on charitable giving intention. While previous studies have suggested a positive effect of trust on charitable giving, in this study a negative effect of organisational trust was found, also this effect was only marginally significant.

Other, limitations of this study concern its sample size and composition. There were less than an optimum number of participants were recruited for the study. The study had 254 participants, while for a population of 1.7 million (CBS, 2020) a sample size of 385 would have been more representative (Survey Monkey, n.d.). Furthermore, the composition of education level in this study is not representative of Dutch young adults. Education level is important because it has been found to influence charitable giving. For example, in this sample about 60% were studying or have completed university. This contrast national statistics which suggest that university students make around 20% of the young adults in the Netherlands (CBS, 2020).

Lastly, while several factors have been found to significantly affect young adult’s intention to donate longterm, to make long-term donations more appealing for young adults, future studies will need to explain how these predictors influence young adult’s intention. For example, perceived behavioural control was found to be a significant predictor. Therefore, a question for future research could be how charitable organisations can make it easier for young adults to adopt a charitable subscription.

9 References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t
- Babbie, E. R. (2016). *The practice of social research*. South-Western.
- Beldad, A., & Hegner, S. (2018). Determinants of Fair Trade Product Purchase Intention of Dutch Consumers According to the Extended Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 41(3), 191-210. doi:10.1007/s10603-018-9384-1
- Bekkers, René., Schuyt, T., & Gouwenberg, B. (2017). *Geven in Nederland 2017: huishoudens, nalatenschappen, fondsen, bedrijven, goede doelenloterijen en vrijwilligers*. Amsterdam: Lenthe.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2010). A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924–973. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>
- Carroll, R., & Kachersky, L. (2019). Service fundraising and the role of perceived donation efficacy in individual charitable giving. *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.02.051>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). DONATE: meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/donate>
- CBS. (2015). *Nederland steeds ruimhartiger voor goede doel*. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2015/51/nederland-steeds-ruimhartiger-voor-goede-doel>
- CBS. (2020). Leerlingen, deelnemers en studenten; onderwijssoort, woonregio. <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/71450ned/table?dl=2260A>.
- Chaabane, A. M., & Parguel, B. (2016). The double-edge effect of retailers' cause-related marketing. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 44(6), 607–626. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijrdm-08-2015-0126>
- Cheng, M. (2019, June 19). 8 Characteristics of Millennials That Support Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/margueritacheng/2019/06/19/8-characteristics-of-millennials-that-support-sustainable-development-goals-sdgs/>
- Choi, S., Kim, H., Chung, M., & Lee, S. Y. (2018). 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>
- Cotte, J., Coulter, R. A., & Moore, M. (2005). Enhancing or disrupting guilt: the role of ad credibility and perceived manipulative intent. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(3), 361–368. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0148-2963\(03\)00102-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0148-2963(03)00102-4)
- Coughlin, J. (2018, May 7). Greener Than You: Boomers, Gen X & Millennials Score Themselves on The Environment. Retrieved from

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/josephcoughlin/2018/05/05/greener-than-you-boomers-gen-x-millennials-score-themselves-on-the-environment/>

Erlandsson, A., Jungstrand, A. Å., & Västfjäll, D. (2016). Anticipated Guilt for Not Helping and Anticipated Warm Glow for Helping Are Differently Impacted by Personal Responsibility to Help. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01475>

Farwell, M. M., Shier, M. L., & Handy, F. (2018). Explaining Trust in Canadian Charities: The Influence of Public Perceptions of Accountability, Transparency, Familiarity and Institutional Trust. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(4), 768–782. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-00046-8> Fill, C., & Turnbull, S. (2016). *Marketing communications: discovery, creation and conversations*. Pearson Education Limited.

Freund, A. M., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (2014). Age-related differences in altruism across adulthood: Making personal financial gain versus contributing to the public good. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(4), 1125–1136. doi:10.1037/a0034491

Hartstichting. (n.d.). Oplossingen voor een sterk hart. Retrieved from <https://www.hartstichting.nl/>

Hyndman, N., & Mcconville, D. (2018). Trust and accountability in UK charities: Exploring the virtuous circle. *The British Accounting Review*, 50(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2017.09.004>

Hutchison, P., Jetten, J., & Gutierrez, R. (2011, June 21). Deviant but desirable: Group variability and evaluation of atypical group members. Retrieved July 24, 2020, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022103111001727>

ING. (2018a, April 4). Europeanen willen vaker een abonnement op goederen. Retrieved from <https://www.ing.nl/zakelijk/kennis-over-de-economie/uw-sector/zakelijke-dienstverlening/nederlanders-lopen-niet-warm-voor-abonnementen-op-fysieke-producten.html>

ING. (2018b). *Now that we subscribe to music, are tools and toiletries next?* . ING Economics Department. Retrieved from https://www.ing.nl/media/ING_EBZ_opportunities-and-challenges-for-tangible-goods-subscriptions_tcm162-143372.pdf

Karlan, D., & Wood, D. H. (2017). The effect of effectiveness: Donor response to aid effectiveness in a direct mail fundraising experiment. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 66, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.05.005>

Kassin, S. M., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2017). *Social psychology*. Cengage Learning.

Konow, J. (2010). Mixed feelings: Theories of and evidence on giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 94(3-4), 279–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2009.11.008>

Linden, S. V. D. (2011). Charitable Intent: A Moral or Social Construct? A Revised Theory of Planned Behavior Model. *Current Psychology*, 30(4), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-011-9122-1>

Manesi, Z., Lange, P. A. V., Doesum, N. J. V., & Pollet, T. V. (2019). What are the most powerful predictors of charitable giving to victims of typhoon Haiyan: Prosocial traits, socio-demographic variables, or eye cues? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *146*, 217–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.024>

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>

Mittelman, R., & Rojas-Méndez, J. (2018). Why Canadians give to charity: an extended theory of planned behaviour model. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, *15*(2), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-018-0197-3>

Paço, A. D., Rodrigues, R. G., & Rodrigues, L. (2014). Branding in NGOs – its Influence on the Intention to Donate. *Economics & Sociology*, *7*(3), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789x.2014/7-3/1>

Rise, J., Sheeran, P., & Hukkelberg, S. (2010). The Role of Self-identity in the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(5), 1085–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00611.x>

Robinson, M. A. (2017). Using multi-item psychometric scales for research and practice in human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, *57*(3), 739–750. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21852>

Sharma, E., & Morwitz, V. G. (2016). Saving the masses: The impact of perceived efficacy on charitable giving to single vs. multiple beneficiaries. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *135*, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.06.001>

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>

Survey Monkey. (n.d.). Sample Size Calculator: Understanding Sample Sizes. Retrieved June 10, 2020, from https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/?ut_source=help_center

Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(3), 225–244. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466699164149>

Unicef. (n.d.). Steun ons en help mee - Voor ieder kind. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.nl/>

Van Uffelen, X. (2019) Alles voor het goede doel: weg met de collectebus, leve de challenge. *Volkscrant*. Retrieved from <https://www.volkscrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/alles-voor-het-goede-doel-weg-met-de-collectebus-leve-de-challenge~b4977926/>

Verberk, M., Kunkel, D., & Crijnen, C. (2019). *Abonnementen 2019*. Nationaal Instituut voor Budgetvoorlichtingen. Retrieved from <https://www.nibud.nl/wp-content/uploads/Rapport-Abonnementen-2019-.pdf>

WWF. (n.d.). Word donateur van WWF: Steun de natuur: doe je ook mee? Retrieved from https://www.wwf.nl/kom-in-actie/met-een-donatie/word-donateur?utm_source=googlepaid&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=aocdon&utm_content=WWF&gclid=Cj0KCQjw_ez2BRCyARIsAJfg-ksP0Dn2ErfxG0atNjkHEy9_GPOOTBNi7uzpaaMuRyfs0-i_h4R_YUaAsA9EALw_wcB

10 Appendices

Appendix A: online questionnaire

"Voor €3 per maand kunt u [...] steunen": Percepties en meningen over abonnementen op goede doelen

Start of Block: Block 1

Q1

Beste deelnemer

Bent u bekend met de zin: *Voor slecht €3 per maand kunt u steunen*" en bent u tussen de 18 en 25 jaar oud?

Dan nodig ik u graag uit om uw mening te delen over *maandelijkse abonnementen op goede doelen*.

De enquête duurt ongeveer 5 minuten. Het bestaat uit verschillende stellingen over goede doelen en maandabonnementen. De resultaten van deze enquête zullen worden gebruikt om te begrijpen welke percepties en meningen over goede doelen abonnementen populair zijn onder jongvolwassenen.

Uw deelname aan deze studie is **geheel anoniem en vrijwillig** en u kunt zich **op elk moment terugtrekken**.

Alvast bedankt voor uw medewerking!

Jesse Mogaka,
Student Communicatie Wetenschappen
Universiteit Twente.

Voor meer informatie: J.m.mogaka@student.utwente.nl

Q2 Privacy Persoonlijke Gegevens Het doel van dit onderzoek is om te begrijpen welke percepties en meningen over goede doelen abonnementen populair zijn onder jongvolwassenen. Wij geloven dat er **geen bekende risico's** verbonden zijn aan dit onderzoek; echter, zoals bij elke online gerelateerde activiteit is het risico van een inbreuk altijd mogelijk. Naar beste vermogen blijven uw antwoorden in deze studie vertrouwelijk. Wij doen er alles aan uw privacy zo goed mogelijk te beschermen. **Er wordt op geen enkele wijze vertrouwelijke informatie of persoonsgegevens van of over u naar buiten gebracht**, waardoor iemand u zal kunnen herkennen. Voordat onze onderzoeksgegevens naar buiten gebracht worden, worden uw gegevens zoveel mogelijk geanonimiseerd. De verzamelde gegevens zullen niet gebruikt worden voor doeleinden buiten het eerder aangegeven doel en worden na het onderzoek verwijderd. **Door op "Akkoord" te klikken geeft u aan 18 jaar of ouder te zijn. Akkoord te gaan dat u persoonlijke gegevens**

verwerkt worden zoals hierboven beschreven. Vrijwillig mee te werken aan dit onderzoek.

-

Akkoord (1)

End of Block: Block 1

Start of Block: Block 3

Q13 Geslacht

Man (1)

Vrouw (2)

Anders (3)

Q14 Leeftijd

18 (1)

19 (2)

20 (3)

21 (4)

22 (5)

23 (6)

24 (7)

25 (8)

Q15 Primaire Bezigheid

- Student (1)
 - Werkloos/ Werk zoekende (2)
 - Werkende (Part-time) (3)
 - Werkende (full-time) (4)
-

Q16 Huidige onderwijsniveau of anders hoogst afgeronde niveau

- Universiteit (1)
 - HBO (2)
 - MBO (3)
 - VWO (4)
 - HAVO (5)
 - VMBO (6)
-

Q17 Woonplaats

- Drenthe (1)
 - Flevoland (2)
 - Friesland (3)
 - Gelderland (4)
 - Groningen (5)
 - Limburg (6)
 - Noord-Brabant (7)
 - Noord-Holland (8)
 - Overijssel (9)
 - Utrecht (10)
 - Zeeland (11)
 - Zuid-Holland (12)
-

Q18 **Religie**

- Katholiek (1)
- Protestants (2)
- Islamitisch (3)
- Joods (4)
- Hindoeïstisch (5)
- Boeddhistisch (6)
- Geen religie (7)
- Anders (8)

End of Block: Block 3

Start of Block: Block 6

Q46

Even Vooraf

Voor deze enquête is **uw mening** het belangrijkste. Er zijn geen foute antwoorden! Geef het antwoord dat het beste u mening weergeeft. Probeer de enquête vlot door te nemen (in ongeveer 5 of 7 minuten)

Q44

Twee Belangrijk Begrippen Maandabonnement op goede doelen: Een
 abonnement waarmee maandelijks *een vooraf bepaald bedrag of bedrag naar keuze* gedoneerd wordt
 aan een goed doel. Goede doelen een organisatie dat zich inzet
 voor een zaak van algemeen belang bijvoorbeeld: *gezondheid,*
welzijn en cultuur, internationale hulp, natuur en milieu.

End of Block: Block 6

Start of Block: Block 2


Q5

Ik vind dat ik:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>goed bewust ben</i> van het bestaan van abonnementen op goede doelen. (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>gemakkelijk goede doelen kan opnoemen</i> die een maandabonnement aanbieden (5) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>goed geïnformeerd ben over</i> maandabonnements voor goede doelen. (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>regelmatig advertenties tegen kom</i> over maandabonnements op goede doelen. (13) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>vaak</i> een abonnement op een goed doel <i>ben aangeboden</i> . (15) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q40

Ik vind dat ik:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>nauwelijks doneer</i> aan goede doelen. (9) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>veel ervaring heb met</i> maandabonnements op goede doelen. (10) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>vrij recent</i> geld gedoneerd heb aan een goed doel. (11) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Weinig obstakels heb</i> die mij ervan weerhouden om een maandabonnement op een goed doel te nemen (12) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>goed in staat ben</i> om een maandabonnement op een goed doel <i>te nemen</i> . (14) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

End of Block: Block 2
Start of Block: Block 7


Q6 In de nabije toekomst:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>neem ik waarschijnlijk</i> een maandabonnement op een goed doel. (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>heb ik de intentie om</i> een maandabonnement op een goed doel te nemen. (5) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>kan ik me financieel veroorloven</i> om een maandabonnement op een goed doel te nemen. (9) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q39 In de nabije toekomst:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Kan ik zonder moeite</i> een maandabonnement op een goed doel nemen. (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Kan ik, als ik wil,</i> een maandabonnement op een goed doel nemen. (7) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Ben ik zeker van plan om</i> een maandabonnement op een goed doel te nemen. (9) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

End of Block: Block 7

Start of Block: Block 7


Q7 Het nemen van een maand abonnement:

| | eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>kan het verschil maken</i> voor een goed doel. (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>is nuttig</i> . (2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>is een effectieve manier</i> om een goed doel te ondersteunen. (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>is van toegevoegde waarde</i> voor een goed doel (7) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>is in lijn met mijn principes.</i> (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |


Q9 Het NEMEN van een maandabonnement op een goed doel zal me:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Een tevreden gevoel geven.</i> (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Plezier geven.</i> (2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>een goed gevoel geven.</i> (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q10 Het WEIGEREN van een maandabonnement op een goed doel zal me:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>een schuldgevoel geven.</i> (2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>een slecht gevoel geven.</i> (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Een slecht geweten geven.</i> (4) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Spijt geven.</i> (7) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q46

Het nemen van een maandelijks abonnement op een goed doel vind ik:

| | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 5 (5) | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Negatief (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Positief (5) |
| Onaangenaam (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Aangenaam (5) |
| Onattent (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Attent (5) |
| Ongunstig (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Gunstig (5) |
| Zinloos (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Zinvol (5) |

End of Block: Block 7

Start of Block: Block 8



Q11 Ik ben iemand die:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>bewust is</i> van hoe mijn gedrag het welzijn van anderen beïnvloeden. (2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Geeft om</i> het welzijn van anderen. (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Persoonlijk <i>een morele plicht heeft</i> om te doneren. (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Maatschappelijk verantwoord is.</i> (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| gelooft dat het <i>rechtvaardig</i> is om een maandabonnement te nemen op een goed doel. (7) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q12 Mensen die voor mij belangrijk zijn:

| | Eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | Oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>zouden het wenselijk vinden</i> als ik maandelijks zou doneren aan een goed doel. (2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>raden mij aan</i> om een maandelijks abonnement te nemen op een goed doel. (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Zouden het afkeuren</i> als ik een maandabonnement nam op een goed doel (4) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Verwachten van mij</i> dat ik een maandelijks abonnement op een goed doel neem (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q8 Over het algemeen vind ik dat Goede doelen:

| | eens (5) | Enigszins eens (4) | Neutraal (3) | Enigszins oneens (2) | oneens (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>erg bekwaamd zijn</i> in wat ze doen. (3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>betrouwbare bestuursleden hebben.</i> (4) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>oprecht geven om</i> de welzijn van de maatschappij. (5) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>hun best doen</i> om hun doelgroep te helpen. (6) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>betrouwbaar zijn.</i> (7) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

End of Block: Block 8**Start of Block: Block 7**

Q46 Laatste vraag: is er iet wat je wilt delen over het nemen van zulke abonnementen of goede doelen in het algemeen?

Q47

Vergeet niet om de enquête op te sturen

Bedankt voor u deelname! Made this survey and need respondents? Click this link to receive credits for SurveySwap.io, the largest free survey exchange community -->
<https://surveyswap.io/sr/I7QSOaAd7Bds7Xla>

End of Block: Block 7

Appendix B: Systematic literature log.

Central Research question: Which factors influence the intention to donate long-term.

| Date | Source | Search terms and strategies | How many hits (how many relevant) | Related terms/authors | Notes |
|------------|--------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 16-06-2020 | Scopus | TITLE-ABS-KEY (ajzen AND theory AND of AND planned AND behaviour) | 871 (first 6 interesting) | Ajzen, Theory of planned behaviour. Key theories regarding charitable giving behaviour | Was looking for a recommended article and found it. |
| 30-04-2020 | Scopus | TITLE-ABS-KEY ("donation intention" awareness) | 13 (1 interesting) | Awareness, charitable giving | Used a lot of settings to reduce it to 3 |
| 30-04-2020 | Scopus | "brand awareness" intention AND to AND donate | 2 (1 interesting) | Do Paço | Used a lot of settings to reduce it to 3 |
| 01-05-2020 | Scopus | TITLE-ABS-KEY (guilt AND monetary AND donations) | 3 (1 interesting) | Guilt, advertising | Used a lot of settings to reduce it to 3 |
| 30-04-2020 | scopus | TITLE-ABS-KEY ("purchase intention" awareness) | 428 (0) | Intention, awareness | Too broad |
| 30-04-2020 | Scopus | (TITLE-ABS-KEY (donation AND behaviour AND young AND adults)) AND (why) | 133 (0) | Predictors of donation behaviour | Results are more about blood donation |

