

What Makes Association Members Donate More? Factors Influencing Members' Donation Amount in Membership-Based Professional Associations

Jeyoung Oh¹ · Eyun-Jung Ki² 

Published online: 5 November 2018

© International Society for Third-Sector Research and The Johns Hopkins University 2018

Abstract As charitable donations account for a significant amount of the revenue of professional associations, such associations can benefit greatly from a better understanding of the factors that influence the amount of money that members donate. Using data collected from six professional associations, this study examines the factors affecting association members' donation amounts. A survey of 2156 members was conducted to investigate the potential factors. The results of hierarchical regression analysis showed that after controlling for sociodemographic factors, face-to-face solicitation, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, membership length, and recommendation intention significantly influence the donation amount among members. This study offers more comprehensive explanations for the factors that influence members' donation amounts and provides potential strategies to maximize donations from members.

Keywords Donation · Solicitation type · Donation motivation · Membership length · Recommendation intention · Professional associations

Introduction

Professional associations have different missions and serve different stakeholders, including members, the profession, the field, or the public (Tschirhart 2006); however, they share the same goal: to advance the community as they serve diverse groups and various areas, including social and political fields. The primary sources of revenue for such associations are membership fees and dues and the programs or services that they provide (Bosso 2003; Gazley and Dignam 2010). Still, other funding sources for professional associations are significant. According to Bowman (2017), after membership dues and programs and service revenue, gifts and donations from individuals were the third biggest revenue source for membership associations, accounting for 15% of the total revenue. Yet, only a few studies have examined factors that influence the members' donation amount to their professional associations (e.g., Beard 2015; Ki and Oh 2018). For example, Ki and Oh (2018) examined how length of and satisfaction with membership influence members' donation amount. They found that factors such as gender and length of membership highly correlated with the amount of charitable giving of nonprofit professional association members. Beard (2015) suggested that organizational identification is positively related with the amount members donate to their organizations.

Scholars have examined the factors that motivate individuals to donate to nonprofit associations (e.g., Sargeant et al. 2006; Van Slyke and Brooks 2005). The amount donated by individuals to the nonprofit sector in the United States is about \$300 billion a year (Giving USA 2017). Nevertheless, only a few nonprofit organizations receive the majority of the money. In that regard, one of the primary goals of nonprofit organizations is to find a way to

✉ Eyun-Jung Ki
ki@apr.ua.edu

Jeyoung Oh
joh11@crimson.ua.edu

¹ College of Communication and Information Sciences, University of Alabama, Reese Phifer Hall 438, Tuscaloosa, AL 35401, USA

² Department of Advertising and Public Relations, University of Alabama, Capital Hall 2621, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA

increase the amount of the donations they receive (West 2004). As a subset of nonprofit organizations (Tschirhart and Gazley 2014), membership associations share similarities with other types of nonprofit organizations. For example, similar to nonprofit organizations that play a significant role in facilitating democratic processes and public advocacy (Leroux and Goerdel 2009), membership associations represent the opinions of their constituent members and influence their members to engage more in civic participation. Burkum (2009) indicates that members of professional associations such as the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education attend public hearings and roundtable sessions of the state board of education and provide comments on policy formation. Membership in professional associations may also enhance members' civic virtues and political efficacy level and make them more responsible citizens (Klingner 2008; Verba et al. 1995). However, they should be studied separately because they not only serve social groups and the public good like other types of nonprofit organizations, but also strive to benefit the members or the professions they serve (Tschirhart and Gazley 2014). For example, unlike other types of nonprofit organizations, member-based professional associations represent an occupation or an industry (Nesbit and Gazley 2012) to help educate individuals or solve problems in the industry (Freidson 1994). A key difference lies in the source of funding to operate the organizations. Because their major revenue source is from membership dues (Bowman 2017), studies on member-based nonprofit associations have focused more on the factors that can expand membership (e.g., Ki and Wang 2016). Nevertheless, charitable giving from individuals, especially members of nonprofit associations, is a significant contributor to these organizations' revenue (Bosso 2003; Wang and Ashcraft 2014), and there is a gap in the literature on what makes association members donate more.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the factors that influence members' monetary donation amounts to nonprofit member-based professional associations. Using a survey of 2156 members of six professional associations, this study examines members' preferred solicitation types, motivations for donation, membership length, intention to recommend the association, and barriers to donation to understand their impacts on the donation amount among nonprofit professional association members. This study can enhance the understanding of the factors that influence members to donate more to their associations.

Literature Review

Professional Associations

Professional associations are defined as “identification and organizing bodies for fields of professional practice” (Hager 2014, p. 40). A professional association provides a voluntary membership to individuals based on their professional qualifications (Rusaw 1995). As member-based nonprofit organizations, professional associations play a significant role in enhancing the community and society as they advocate for the public interest beyond their own members' interests (Tschirhart and Gazley 2014). As a way to support the mission of associations, members can be involved in two major forms of charities: volunteering and monetary donations (Lee and Chang 2007). Volunteering consists of providing an individual's time to serve goals the organization wants to achieve, whereas donation refers to any monetary giving to organizations. Volunteering is important in maintaining organizations, but monetary donation is sometimes considered more essential in terms of operating the organizations (Hsu et al. 2007).

A handful of studies have examined predictors of donation amount, such as race (Conley 2000), empathy (Dickert et al. 2011), and membership length (Ki and Oh 2018); however, these studies have not examined other factors that influence the amount of the donation by professional association members. Previous literature has indicated that outside factors such as intensity of approaches (Diamantopoulos et al. 1993) and individual differences including demographic and psychological characteristics can lead to an individual's decision to engage in monetary donation behavior (Schlegelmilch et al. 1997). Furthermore, the motivations they have as a member may influence the size of their donations to associations (Hager 2014; Ki and Wang 2016). Thus, this study will examine members' preferred solicitation types, motivations for donation, membership length, recommendation intention, and barriers to donation to examine their influences on the amount of donation among professional association members.

Preferred Solicitation Types

Solicitation refers to any method of asking for charitable giving (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011) and plays a significant role in encouraging individuals to engage in donation. According to Bryant et al. (2003), about 85% of the 1996 Independent Sector survey participants indicated that they donated because they were asked to donate. Other studies also found that the mere act of asking for a donation increases individuals' tendency to engage in

charitable giving (Schlegelmilch et al. 1997). Even though there could be differences in the level of effectiveness, soliciting in any way will garner more support for the association. Similarly, actively soliciting donations was more effective than merely presenting an opportunity for a donation (Lindskold et al. 1977).

Scholars have also explored whether particular methods of asking for donations bring better results. For example, some organizations create messages that trigger emotional reactions by making the audience confront the suffering of others (e.g., Small and Loewenstein 2003). Indeed, the manner of asking for a donation is an essential factor in influencing an individual's charitable giving (Liu and Aaker 2008).

The type of solicitation matters, as medium theory¹ posits that different means of delivering the same message may bring different results (McLuhan 2008). In this vein, studies have compared face-to-face solicitation to solicitation through any kinds of media (e.g., newsletter, email, television, or telephone). Because different media have dissimilar levels of influence on aspects like attention to message and content credibility (e.g., Banning and Sweetser 2007; Dahlén 2005), understanding the influences of different ways to solicit monetary donations is important. Comparison between interpersonal communication and mediated communication has been conducted since the 1970s (e.g., Walther 1992; Williams 1977). According to Rice and Love (1987), mediated communications are less personal and emotional compared to interpersonal communication. Although previous studies have found that both face-to-face communication and media communication enhance donation among individuals (e.g., Bordia 1997; Brockner et al. 1984), the influences of preference for solicitation communication types have not been empirically tested in the context of increasing the amount of donation among professional association members. Thus, we posit:

H1a Face-to-face request is positively related to the amount donated for a membership association.

H1b Mediated request is positively related to the amount donated for a membership association.

Motivations

Motivation for engaging in a behavior can be divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic (Deci 1971). Intrinsic motivation is “the inherent tendency to seek out novelty

and challenges, to extend and exercise one's capacities, to explore, and to learn” (Ryan and Deci 2000b, p. 70). Individuals engage in charitable giving to support organizations that reflect their inner values (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011) and often provide generosity without expecting any separable outcomes or rewards (Deci and Ryan 1987).

Extrinsic motivation refers to “doing something because it leads to a separable outcome” (Ryan and Deci 2000a, p. 55). Rather than focusing on the behavior, those who are motivated by extrinsic motivations focus on the outcomes that the behavior brings (Vallerand and Blssonnette 1992). Some of the benefits members can experience for charitable giving include increased self-worth, positive feelings, enhanced personal reputation, and satisfaction for oneself (e.g., Andreoni 1989; Schiff 1990). Based on the previous literature, this study posits:

H2a Intrinsic motivation of an association member is positively related to the amount of donation.

H2b Extrinsic motivation of an association member is positively related to the amount of donation.

Membership Length

Examining the length of membership in the context of member-based professional associations is important because the number of members is an important resource for organizations' revenue (Paswan and Troy 2004). Previous literature indicated that length of the membership can be an indicator of supportive behaviors of members toward their associations. For example, supporting an industry in general was one of the prime motivations of individuals who retain their organization memberships (Hendon 1979). This indicates that members expect that an industry or field will grow if they support it monetarily. According to Bhattacharya et al. (1995), those who retain their membership longer experience a sense of identification with the organization or a feeling of prestige from their membership. Studies from various fields have found that identifying oneself with an affiliated association is a strong indicator of supportive behavior toward the organization (e.g., Hong and Yang 2011). Therefore, this study posits:

H3 Membership length of an association member is positively related to the amount of donation.

Intention to Recommend

Individuals recommend an organization when they are satisfied with their experiences with the organization's services or products. Previous studies have documented that interpersonal recommend is considered to be a more reliable source than messages from marketers (Carl 2016)

¹ McLuhan (2008) suggested that each communication channel differs not only in terms of the message content, but also in the way it influences an individual's thought process. He differentiates media based on the required cognitive processes for each channel.

and that positive recommendations can provide benefits to an organization such as enhanced product sales (File and Prince 1992; Herr et al. 1991). The more an individual hears about something, the more s/he will be influenced by it (Bansal and Voyer 2000). People with high satisfaction are more willing to promote organizations by sharing their positive experiences with others than those who have not had the experience (Leisen and Prosser 2004). Moreover, individuals who have a high intention to recommend others about an organization's services or products have a higher likelihood of repeatedly engaging in behavioral support for the organization (Kuo et al. 2013). Based on the previous literature, this study posits:

H4 An association member's intention to recommend an organization is positively related to the amount of donation.

Barriers to Donation

Studies regarding charitable giving explore the factors that motivate individuals to donate. However, studies examining the barriers to donation are relatively limited, especially in the literature on nonprofit membership associations. The literature suggests that lack of solicitation and lack of money are the main barriers to donations (James 2008). However, these barriers have primarily been studied in the context of bequest giving. For example, Wiepking et al. (2012) tested potential barriers from the literature to understand if they predict individuals' charitable bequest giving behavior. The results of their study indicated that those with feelings of financial insecurity and with higher perceived difficulty in making a bequest are less likely to leave a charitable bequest. In addition, Sargeant et al. (2004) suggested that lack of solicitation is a major barrier of bequest giving behavior. In the field of health communication, scholars reviewed barriers to organ donation and found that they include lack of sufficient information about donation (Edwards et al. 2007; Siminoff and Traino 2009) and personal or religious conflicts (Edwards et al. 2007). Lack of knowledge and attitude toward donation seem to be the major barriers for individuals to engage in giving. However, to our best knowledge, no researchers have yet looked at the barriers that prevent members of professional associations from donating more. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H5a Solicitation barriers are negatively related to the amount donated for a membership association.

H5b Motivation barriers are negatively related to the amount donated for a membership association.

Method

This study focuses on the relationships between preferred solicitation types, motivations for donation, membership length, intention to recommend, barriers to donation, and the amount of donation to associations by members. To achieve the purposes of this study, survey data collected by the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE) were used. The six partnering associations of the ASAE that provided data include: the American Academy of Neurology, the American College of Healthcare Executives, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Society of Association Executives, the Association for Operations Management, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. These organizations participated in developing the survey questionnaire and then distributed it directly to their selected members. The population of this study was composed of existing members of these six membership organizations. Sample sizes were selected in proportion to the membership of the associations. Almost 42,000 randomly selected members from the six associations received a survey link. A total of 5004 returned the questionnaire, yielding a 12% response rate. After removing 2848 respondents because they were incomplete or inappropriate, a total of 2156 respondents were examined in the study.

Measures

Dependent Variable

Amount of Donation This variable was measured with a question: "Approximately how much have you donated, in U.S. dollars, in the past 12 months?" There were five choices: (1) less than \$100, (2) \$100 or more but less than \$500, (3) \$500 or more but less than \$1000, (4) \$1000 or more but less than \$5000, and (5) \$5000 or more ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.30$). This variable was used as a continuous variable.

Independent Variables

To create each independent variable, items under the variable were summed up and averaged.

Face-to-Face and Mediated Solicitation To examine the solicitation types association members prefer, two variables were measured using a three-point scale ranging from "I do not like this approach" to "I prefer this approach." The operationalized definition of face-to-face solicitation is any kind of a request for a donation in person. Three items inquired whether participants have been asked to donate

through face-to-face solicitation: “being asked personally by someone you know”, “being asked personally by a leader in the organization”, and “being asked to give through a special event” ($CR = .81$; $AVE = .60$). Mediated solicitation is the act of asking for a donation using any kind of medium. This variable was measured with three items: “being asked through appeals by postal mail”, “seeing a check-off box on a membership renewal or other form”, and “learning of a need through any media such as newsletter” ($CR = .79$; $AVE = .57$).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations Motivations were also factor-analyzed into two groups: (1) intrinsic motivation and (2) extrinsic motivation. The items asked how important various reasons were in the participants’ decisions about giving money to the association. Respondents can choose from 1 = not at all important to 5 = very important. Adopted from Ryan and Deci (2000a), intrinsic motivations indicate “donation motives which are inherently interesting or enjoyable” (p. 55). Intrinsic motivations were measured with three items, including “to address social problems”, “to support a cause that is important to me”, and “I have been fortunate and want to give back” ($CR = .76$; $AVE = .47$). Donation motives that include expectation of outcomes by engaging in the donation are defined as extrinsic motivations (Ryan and Deci 2000a). Four items, including “to build my reputation”, “to support my religious beliefs”, “to honor someone important to me”, and “giving is an expected part of my profession or position” were used to measure extrinsic motivations ($CR = .90$; $AVE = .74$).

Membership Length This study defined length of membership as the length of time an individual has been a member of an association. Based on Ki and Oh (2018), the number of the years retaining a membership of an organization was asked to measure this variable.

Intention to Recommend This variable is defined as members’ intention to recommend that others join their association. The question asked to measure members’ intention to recommend the associations was: “How likely is it that you would recommend membership in [name of the association] to a friend or colleague?” This question was measured on an 11-point scale ranging from 1 = not at all to 11 = extremely likely.

Barriers Based on a previous study on barriers to charitable donation (Wiepking et al. 2012), this study used seven items measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Two types of barriers to charitable giving were determined based on

factor analysis: (1) solicitation barriers and (2) motivation barriers. The measure of solicitation barriers includes three items: “I haven’t been asked to give”, “I don’t know about a giving program of [name of the association]”, or “I haven’t been asked to give in ways that I prefer” ($CR = .90$; $AVE = .74$). Motivation barriers consist of four items: “I give enough through dues and other purchases—I don’t need to give more”, “I don’t want to give to [name of the association]”, “I am concerned that if I give once I will be asked again and again”, and “I don’t have enough of a connection to the organization to give or to give any more” ($CR = .81$; $AVE = .52$).

Control Variables

Sociodemographic Variables Studies regarding membership associations looked at the influence of individuals’ current position, education level, gender, marital status, children, religion, region, and income (e.g., Kou et al. 2014; Wang and Ashcraft 2014). These variables were measured, and their influences were controlled in the analysis.

Results

Sample Demographics

A total of 2156 responses were analyzed in the study. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the variables.

A majority of the participants were between mid-level and senior level but were not chief executive officers. The respondents’ average education levels were between bachelor’s and master’s degrees. Most of the respondents were married males with no children, living in the United States. Table 2 presents the measurements of all control variables.

Correlation Analysis

As shown in Table 3, most of the variables used in the study significantly correlate with other variables.

Statistical Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to test the construct validity and reliability based on the recommendations of other scholars (e.g., Said et al. 2011; Wilkins et al. 2016; Yap and Khong 2006). The CFA measurement model included all the independent variables. The model has a good fit (see Table 4). Each construct has composite reliabilities larger than .60, which indicates that

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

	All respondents (<i>N</i> = 2156) <i>M</i> (SD)/percentage
Control variables	
Position	2.62 (0.98)
Education level	4.80 (1.13)
Gender—male	73.1%
Marital status—married	79.1%
Children—no	64.2%
Religion—no	14.3%
Region—U.S.	82.2%
Income	4.02 (1.30)
Independent variables	
Preferred Solicitation type	
Face-to-Face	1.99 (.53)
Mediated	1.90 (.43)
Motivation	
Intrinsic	3.85 (.81)
Extrinsic	2.44 (.87)
Membership Length	16.16 (13.47)
Intention to Recommend	8.97 (2.15)
Barriers	
Solicitation	3.07 (1.15)
Motivation	3.19 (0.95)

the constructs are represented fairly by the measurement items (Bagozzi and Yi 1988).

Hierarchical regression is used for the multivariate analysis (see Table 5) due to its ability to partition the variance of each variable and explanatory power (e.g., Ferrari 2002; Richey et al. 2008). First, the study controlled sociodemographic factors by entering them in Step 1 (see detailed information about sociodemographic factors in

Table 2). Types of solicitation (Stage 2), motivations (Stage 3), membership length (Step 4), recommendation intention (Step 5), and barriers (Step 6) were entered at each step to see the influence of each variable.

After controlling for sociodemographic factors, there were significant *R*-square changes in the amount of donation due to solicitation type, motivations, membership length, and recommendation intentions. The results of the full model show that the mere act of face-to-face solicitation significantly increases the amount of donation among respondents ($\beta = .065, p < .001$). Therefore, H1a was supported and H1b was rejected. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation significantly explained the respondents' amount of monetary contribution ($\beta = .116, p < .001$ for intrinsic; $\beta = .120, p < .001$ for extrinsic). Thus, both H2a and H2b were supported. H3 was supported, as membership length significantly correlates with the amount of donation ($\beta = .185, p < .001$). H4 was rejected, as members' intention to recommend that others join the organization negatively affected their amount of donation ($\beta = -.046, p < .001$). To answer H5a and H5b, both solicitation and motivation barriers were included in the analysis. Neither had a significant influence on the respondents' amount of charitable giving.

Discussion

Even when they are not a major financial resource for membership associations, charitable donations are becoming more important as other resources, such as government funding, are shrinking (Bosso 2003). Scholars have studied the factors affecting the charitable giving of professional association members (e.g., Wang and Ashcraft 2014), but there are still gaps to be filled. Because of the unique characteristics of professional associations, members of

Table 2 Measurements of control variables

Variables	Measurements
Position	The respondent's position. 1: <i>entry-level</i> ; 2: <i>mid-level</i> ; 3: <i>senior level but not chief executive position</i> ; 4: <i>chief executive position</i>
Education	The respondent's highest education level. 1: <i>high school or less</i> ; 2: <i>some college</i> ; 3: <i>associate degree</i> ; 4: <i>bachelor's degree</i> ; 5: <i>master's degree</i> ; 6: <i>Ph.D. or equivalent</i>
Gender	1: female; 0: male
Marital status	1: married; 0: otherwise
Children	1: the respondent has children under 18 years old; 0: otherwise
Religion	1: the respondent belongs to a religion 0: does not belong
Region	1: the respondent is in the United States; 0: otherwise
Income	The respondent's approximate total household income. 1: <i>less than \$25,000</i> ; 2: <i>\$25,000 to \$50,000</i> ; 3: <i>\$50,000 to \$100,000</i> ; 4: <i>\$100,000 to \$150,000</i> ; 5: <i>\$150,000 to \$200,000</i> ; 6: <i>\$200,000 or more</i>

Table 3 Correlation matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Face-to-face solicitation	–							
Mediated solicitation	– .011	–						
Intrinsic motivation	.180**	.160**	–					
Extrinsic motivation	.210**	– .026	.318**	–				
Membership length	– .122**	– .003	– .044*	.034	–			
Recommend	.115**	.110**	.147**	.121**	.098**	–		
Solicitation barrier	.121**	– .030*	.050**	.042**	– .244**	– .046**	–	
Motivation barrier	– .107**	– .121**	– .061**	– .026	– .087**	– .225**	.318**	–

** $p < .05$ **Table 4** Model fit index and criteria

Model fit criterion	Fit statistics
Chi square > .05	192.06 ($p < .001$, $df = 107$)
Goodness-of-fit index (GFI) > .90	.991
Root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) < .05	.019
Normed fit index (NFI) > .90	.973
Incremental fit index (IFI) > .90	.988

Table 5 Hierarchical regression coefficients (beta) for predicting responses to donation amount

Predictors	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
Position	.112***	.112***	.101***	.067***	.070***	.070***
Education	.076***	.083***	.082***	.061***	.061**	.061**
Gender (female = 1)	– .103***	– .106***	– .127***	– .080***	– .079***	– .081***
Marital status (married = 1)	.046*	.047*	.048*	.031	.030	.030
Children (yes = 1)	– .031	– .034	– .026	.016	.014	.014
Religion	.173***	.168***	.126***	.120***	.120***	.119***
Region (U.S. = 1)	.184***	.182***	.166***	.154***	.151***	.149***
Income	.345***	.345***	.333***	.300***	.302***	.301***
Face-to-face solicitation		.064***	.026	.043*	.049**	.053**
Mediated solicitation		– .015	– .024	– .030	– .025	– .023
Intrinsic motivation			.105***	.109***	.114***	.116***
Extrinsic motivation			.130***	.118***	.120***	.120***
Membership length				.184***	.188***	.187***
Recommendation intention					– .056**	– .051**
Solicitation barrier						– .015
Motivation barrier						.028
R^2	.291***	.296***	.326***	.351***	.354***	.355***
R^2 change		.004**	.031***	.024***	.003**	.001

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

these associations may have different reasons for charitable giving than individuals who do not have any affiliation. This study explored factors such as members' preferred solicitation types, motivations to donate, length of membership, intention to recommend, and barriers to donation

to understand the effects of these variables on the amount association members decide to give to their organizations.

The results of this study suggest that members' preferred solicitation type influences the amount of donation among members. As expected, in-person solicitation was far more

effective to increase the amount of charitable giving. This result aligns with those of previous studies on the face-to-face method of asking for a donation (e.g., Brockner et al. 1984). This can be explained by the fact that individuals are pressured by the presence of an individual asking for help in front of them. Asking for a donation using other media such as newsletters and renewal forms did not increase members' tendency to donate more. Members may respond to a mediated solicitation by donating, but the amount of donation may depend more on factors other than members' preferred solicitation types. Medium theory suggests that different types of medium bring out different behaviors from the message receiver (McLuhan 2008). Studies based on this theory have shown that face-to-face communication is more likely to bring positive reactions (Rice and Love 1987). Similarly, the results of this study show that members who prefer interpersonal solicitation are more likely to donate more to their associations. This result contributes to the literature by empirically demonstrating the influences of both interpersonal and mediated communication on soliciting monetary donations to professional association members.

Intrinsic motivation positively influences the amount of donation members decide to give to the associations. Motivations to make the world or community a better place were related with the donation amount individuals provide to nonprofit associations, aligning with previous studies (Ki and Oh 2018; Verhaert and Van den Poel 2011). Even though the nature of a professional association is to benefit members by providing them with tangible outcomes, feeling better about themselves internally does matter to the members. The results of the study do not align with previous literature on the effect of extrinsic motivations on donation amount (Wang and Ashcraft 2014). This study found that external motivations such as rewards or peer pressure for donations play significant roles in increasing donation amount. Because the results of a donation made from extrinsic motivation are more immediate and often tangible, people who value extrinsic motivation are more likely to donate more in order to increase their positive outcomes.

The findings about the influence of membership length aligned with previous studies (e.g., Ki and Oh 2018; Wang and Ashcraft 2014). The results of the current study indicate that the longer members stay in an association, the more likely they will donate more money to the association. Members who stay in an organization may value the mission of the organization and believe that the organization is benefiting them or the industry they are in. Retaining membership also indicates they may have higher levels of organizational identification and satisfaction (Bhattacharya et al. 1995; Paswan and Troy 2004) that are related with the supportive behavior toward an organization (Hong and

Yang 2011; Ki and Hon 2007). The length of membership statistically predicts the amount of charitable giving by members.

Contrary to what was expected, members' recommendation intention negatively influences their donation amount. The result does not align with previous literature that examined the influence of employee recommendation on donation behavior and found a positive correlation (Snipes and Oswald 2010). Even though the intention to recommend the association has been found to benefit the organization by increasing revenue or individuals' supportive behaviors toward the organization (e.g., Gremler et al. 2001; Reichheld and Sasser 1990), this was not applicable in the context of measuring the amount of donation to member-based professional nonprofit associations. This result can be explained by the concept of social loafing (Ringelmann 1913), which is the tendency of an individual who is part of a larger group that strives to achieve a common goal to put less effort toward the goal. When they recommend that a colleague join the organization, members may feel like their obligation to engage in more supportive action toward the association has been fulfilled, and they do not need to act on other supportive behaviors such as donating more to the associations.

Barriers to donating bigger amounts have not been studied much in terms of charitable giving. The results of this study indicated that whether a member recommends the organization or not, the hardship of donation does not really matter when it comes to the decision regarding the amount of charitable giving. Whether they promote their associations or not, all the respondents initially engaged in associations to support the values they cherish. This may show that the traditional barriers to donating do not play a significant role in decreasing donation amount by members of associations.

The results of this study suggest new findings about donations to membership associations as they provide factors that have not been studied much. Practically, by knowing the importance of each variable, membership associations can craft strategic plans for their members as potential donors. They can hold more events that executives of organizations can attend and where they can solicit for donations. In addition, executives can put more effort into building more personal connections and relationships with organization members to increase potential donation amount by members. In light of the fact that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations would positively influence donation amounts, associations can provide better communications to their members. For example, organizations can reward members who donate more than a certain amount to give them separable outcomes and can focus more on the impact the donation can have on the organization in terms of outcomes. Members' intrinsic

motivations should also be considered. Associations should also provide benefits to retain the membership of existing members to maximize the amount of donations they can receive.

Limitations and Future Research

Although the findings of this study contribute to the current literature, it is important to highlight some of its limitations. First, online surveys can have selection bias similar to mail surveys (Hickman et al. 2005), meaning that those who completed the survey are more involved than those who did not. Another limitation is the unmeasured variables that might be related to donation amount, such as ethnicity or satisfaction with the organization (e.g., Conley 2000; Ki and Oh 2018). Future researchers should consider including variables other than those tested in this study to draw a clearer and more sophisticated picture of the factors related to donation amounts in the association membership context. Moreover, this study used ranges for the donation amount rather than exact dollar amounts. Future researchers need to consider a way to gather an exact amount of donation in order to draw more accurate picture.

Regardless of the limitations, the findings of this study contribute to the understanding of the factors that influence professional association members' decisions about their donation amounts. As the importance of charitable giving among membership associations will continuously increase (Bosso 2003), better understanding of the factors that influence the amount of donation is essential among professional associations that seek to receive more charitable giving. The current findings open new aspects of the membership association philanthropy literature in that they show the role of members' preferred solicitation type, motivations, and membership length.

References

- Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with impure altruism: Applications to charity and Ricardian equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(6), 1447–1458.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74–94.
- Banning, S. A., & Sweetser, K. D. (2007). How much do they think it affects them and whom do they believe? Comparing the third-person effect and credibility of blogs and traditional media. *Communication Quarterly*, 55(4), 451–466.
- Bansal, H. S., & Voyer, P. A. (2000). Word-of-mouth processes within a services purchase decision context. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(2), 166–177.
- Beard, J. G. (2015). *The identification theory: A quantitative study of women's charitable giving motivation*. Doctoral dissertation, Capella University.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924–973.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., Rao, H., & Glynn, M. A. (1995). Understanding the bond of identification: An investigation of its correlates among art museum members. *The Journal of Marketing*, 59, 46–57.
- Bordia, P. (1997). Face-to-face versus computer-mediated communication: A synthesis of the experimental literature. *The Journal of Business Communication* (1973), 34(1), 99–118.
- Bosso, C. J. (2003). Rethinking the concept of membership in nature advocacy organizations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(3), 397–411.
- Bowman, H. W. (2017). Toward a theory of membership association finance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(4), 772–793.
- Brockner, J., Guzzi, B., Kane, J., Levine, E., & Shaplen, K. (1984). Organizational fundraising: Further evidence on the effect of legitimizing small donations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(1), 611–614.
- Bryant, W. K., Jeon-Slaughter, H., Kang, H., & Tax, A. (2003). Participation in philanthropic activities: Donating money and time. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 26(1), 43–73.
- Burkum, K. R. (2009). The role of state higher education governance structures in state-level higher education lobbying. Ph.D. Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.
- Carl, W. J. (2016). What's all the buzz about? *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(4), 601–634.
- Conley, D. (2000). The racial wealth gap: Origins and implications for philanthropy in the African American community. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(4), 530–540.
- Dahlén, M. (2005). The medium as a contextual cue: Effects of creative media choice. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(3), 89–98.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), 105.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1024–1037.
- Diamantopoulos, A., Schlegelmilch, B., & Love, A. (1993). Giving to charity: Determinants of cash donations through prompted giving. In R. Varadarajan & B. Jaworski (Eds.), *Marketing theory and application* (Vol. 4, pp. 133–142). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Dickert, S., Sagara, N., & Slovic, P. (2011). Affective motivations to help others: A two-stage model of donation decisions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 24(4), 361–376.
- Edwards, T. M., Essman, C., & Thornton, J. D. (2007). Assessing racial and ethnic differences in medical student knowledge, attitudes and behaviors regarding organ donation. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 99(2), 131.
- Ferrari, A. M. (2002). The impact of culture upon child rearing practices and definitions of maltreatment. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 26(8), 793–813.
- File, K. M., & Prince, R. A. (1992). Positive word-of-mouth: Customer satisfaction and buyer behaviour. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 10(1), 25–29.
- Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: Theory, prophecy, and policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gazley, B., & Dignam, M. (2010). *The decision to give: What motivates individuals to support professional associations*. Washington: ASAE & The Center for Association Leadership.
- Giving USA. (2017). *Giving USA 2017: Total charitable donations rise to new high of \$390.05 billion*. Retrieved from <https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2017-total-charitable-donations-rise-to-new-high-of-390-05-billion> Accessed June 2017.

- Gremler, D. D., Gwinner, K. P., & Brown, S. W. (2001). Generating positive word-of-mouth communication through customer-employee relationships. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 12(1), 44–59.
- Hager, M. A. (2014). Engagement motivations in professional associations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2_suppl), 39S–60S.
- Hendon, W. S. (1979). *Analyzing an art museum*. New York: Praeger.
- Herr, P. M., Kardes, F. R., & Kim, J. (1991). Effects of word-of-mouth and product-attribute information on persuasion: An accessibility-diagnostics perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 454–462.
- Hickman, T. M., Lawrence, K. E., & Ward, J. C. (2005). A social identities perspective on the effects of corporate sport sponsorship on employees. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(3), 148–157.
- Hong, S. Y., & Yang, S. U. (2011). Public engagement in supportive communication behaviors toward an organization: Effects of relational satisfaction and organizational reputation in public relations management. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 23(2), 191–217.
- Hsu, M. H., Ju, T. L., Yen, C. H., & Chang, C. M. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65(2), 153–169.
- James, R. N. (2008). Health, wealth, and charitable estate planning. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 1026–1043.
- Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. (2007). Testing the linkages among the organization–public relationship and attitude and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19(1), 1–23.
- Ki, E.-J., & Oh, J. (2018). The determinants of the donation amount in nonprofit membership association. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 58, e1609.
- Ki, E.-J., & Wang, Y. (2016). Membership benefits matter. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 27(2), 199–217.
- Klingner, D. E. (2008). Toward a new ASPA: Building global governance capacity through networked professional associations. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 11(3), 354.
- Kou, X., Hayat, A. D., Mesch, D. J., & Osili, U. O. (2014). The global dynamics of gender and philanthropy in membership associations: A study of charitable giving by Lions Clubs international members. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2_suppl), 18S–38S.
- Kuo, Y. F., Hu, T. L., & Yang, S. C. (2013). Effects of inertia and satisfaction in female online shoppers on repeat-purchase intention: The moderating roles of word-of-mouth and alternative attraction. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 23(3), 168–187.
- Lee, Y. K., & Chang, C. T. (2007). Who gives what to charity? Characteristics affecting donation behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 35(9), 1173–1180.
- Leisen, B., & Prosser, E. (2004). Customers' perception of expensiveness and its impact on loyalty behaviors. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 25(3), 35–52.
- Leroux, K., & Goerdel, H. T. (2009). Political advocacy by nonprofit organizations: A strategic management explanation. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 32(4), 514–536.
- Lindskold, S., Forte, R. A., Haake, C. S., & Schmidt, E. K. (1977). The effects of directness of face-to-face requests and sex of solicitor on streetcorner donations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 101(1), 45–51.
- Liu, W., & Aaker, J. (2008). The happiness of giving: The time-ask effect. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 543–557.
- McLuhan, M. (2008). The medium is the message. *Communication Theory*, 18, 390–402.
- Nesbit, R., & Gazley, B. (2012). Patterns of volunteer activity in professional associations and societies. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(3), 558–583.
- Paswan, A. K., & Troy, L. C. (2004). Non-profit organization and membership motivation: An exploration in the museum industry. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 1–15.
- Reichheld, F. F., & Sasser, J. W. (1990). Zero defections: Quality comes to services. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5), 105–111.
- Rice, R. E., & Love, G. (1987). Electronic emotion: Socioemotional content in a computer-mediated communication network. *Communication Research*, 14(1), 85–108.
- Richey, R. G., Jr., Tokman, M., & Skinner, L. R. (2008). Exploring collaborative technology utilization in retailer–supplier performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(8), 842–849.
- Ringelmann, M. (1913). Research on animate sources of power: The work of man. *Annales de l'Institut National Agronomique*, 12(2), 1–40.
- Rusaw, A. C. (1995). Learning by association: Professional associations as learning agents. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 215–226.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.
- Said, H., Badru, B. B., & Shahid, M. (2011). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for testing validity and reliability instrument in the study of education. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12), 1098–1103.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J. B., & West, D. C. (2006). Perceptual determinants of nonprofit giving behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(2), 155–165.
- Sargeant, A., Warwick, M., & Hilton, T. (2004). *Successful bequest fundraising: key lessons from research*. Paper presented at Annual Conference, Association of Fundraising Professionals, Seattle.
- Schiff, J. A. (1990). *Charitable giving and government policy: An economic analysis* (Vol. 102). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1997). Responses to different charity appeals: The impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(8), 548–560.
- Siminoff, L. A., & Traino, H. M. (2009). Improving donation outcomes: Hospital development and the rapid assessment of hospital procurement barriers in donation. *Progress in Transplantation*, 19(2), 180–187.
- Small, D. A., & Loewenstein, G. (2003). Helping a victim or helping the victim: Altruism and identifiability. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 26(1), 5–16.
- Snipes, R. L., & Oswald, S. L. (2010). Charitable giving to not-for-profit organizations: Factors affecting donations to non-profit organizations. *Innovative Marketing*, 6(1), 73–80.
- Tschirhart, M. (2006). Nonprofit membership associations. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 523–541). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tschirhart, M., & Gazley, B. (2014). Advancing scholarship on membership associations: New research and next steps. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2S), 3S–17S.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Blissonette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational styles as predictors of behavior: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality*, 60(3), 599–620.

- Van Slyke, D. M., & Brooks, A. C. (2005). Why do people give? New evidence and strategies for nonprofit managers. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 35(3), 199–222.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Verhaert, G. A., & Van den Poel, D. (2011). Empathy as added value in predicting donation behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1288–1295.
- Walther, J. B. (1992). Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relational perspective. *Communication Research*, 19(1), 52–90.
- Wang, L., & Ashcraft, R. F. (2014). Organizational commitment and involvement: Explaining the decision to give to associations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2_suppl), 61S–83S.
- West, L. A. (2004). Non-profits face funding pressures. *Journal of Accountancy*, 198(3), 16.
- Wiepking, P., Scaife, W., & McDonald, K. (2012). Motives and barriers to bequest giving. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(1), 56–66.
- Wilkins, S., Butt, M. M., Kratochvil, D., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2016). The effects of social identification and organizational identification on student commitment, achievement and satisfaction in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(12), 2232–2252.
- Williams, E. (1977). Experimental comparisons of face-to-face and mediated communication: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(5), 963.
- Yap, B. W., & Khong, K. W. (2006). Examining the effects of customer service management (CSM) on perceived business performance via structural equation modelling. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 22(5–6), 587–605.