



## Abstracts

**Peter Ayton, City University London**

### **The efficacy of broadcast charitable appeals: Tangible impact of Donations**

Do factors that influence donation decisions in the lab also affect real monetary donations? To answer this question we analysed 358 charitable appeals on BBC Radio 4 – the main UK talk radio station. For each appeal, we coded several factors that have been known to affect giving in the lab. Among them we coded whether a single victim was identified; whether a donation amount was suggested; whether a specific tangible impact was indicated and whether the presenter was a celebrity. Our results revealed that just two factors were significant predictors of giving: mention of tangible impact of plausible individual donations and the presenter's gender. We discuss these findings in relation to past research and their implications for the design of charitable appeals.

**Erica Best, No Kid Hungry**

### **Improving acquisition; the power of one person**

Showing supporters the difference they can make makes all the difference in their giving. Using DonorVoice's PreTest Tool we were able to test thousands of different ways of showing the impact a donation could have in both a fast and effective way. Results seemed to confirm the Identifiable Victim effect – help towards one person in need is greater than towards statistical victims. Next, we tested this approach in-market where we observed an increase in both response rate and average gift.

**Hengchen Dai, University of California Los Angeles**

### **Prosocial Goal Pursuit in Crowdfunding: Evidence from Kickstarter**

In reward-based crowdfunding, creators of entrepreneurial projects solicit capital from potential consumers to reach a funding goal and offer future products/services in return. Extending prior research that assumes that economic considerations (e.g., project quality, campaign success likelihood) drive backers' decisions, we provide the cleanest field evidence so far that consumers also have prosocial motives to help creators reach their funding goals. This effect is amplified when the nature of a project tends to evoke consumers' prosocial motivation and when a project's creator is a single person. Finally, you'll hear how goal proximity could affect donation rates and donation amounts to a specific project.



**Ayelet Gneezy, University of California San Diego**  
**How good are our best practices?**

Similar to other industries, fundraisers and nonprofits have a set of principles that have earned a status similar to that of the holy grail. Having used them for so long, we rarely stop to question their effectiveness. Think, for example, about the belief that long letters offering detailed accounts of a life changed are effective than short ones or about the (appealing) argument that the more time we keep a campaign alive, the more donors will have the opportunity to express their support. Or even about the ostensibly common-sense principle arguing that increasing the number of ways to give (e.g., wire transfer, check, Paypal, vimeo) would increase the number of donors. This talk will offer new insights and perspectives suggesting it is time questioning our beliefs and assumptions.

**Kiki Koutmeridou, DonorVoice**  
**Creating leads using identity insights and a couple of reply form nudges**

In almost all cases the answer to the question “how do we get people to give/do more?” is “you need to know why they would”. For far too long our sector has talked about “relationship”, “donor centricity” without knowing the underlying motivation of the people they’re contacting. All we’ve been measuring and managing so far is what they are (demographic data) or what they did (behavior data). But neither tells us anything about why they supported us (or why they’d ever do it again). In the first part of this talk, we’ll explore how you could use your supporters’ identity – the part of self being expressed in their support of you – to increase online engagement and generate new leads. In the last part of the talk you’ll see how you could improve your reply form’s performance with the help of a few nudges.

**Larissa Peters, Catholic Relief Services, 10:50 EST / 15:50 UK**  
**Getting repeat donations; emotion & impact at work**

Getting the first gift is hard enough. Getting the second, third or Nth is so much harder. It’s a perennial problem that has beset us all with seemingly no good answer on how best it can be solved. So, in collaboration with DonorVoice, we ran a series of behavioural science tests using our email communications and Facebook ads. In this talk, you’ll hear how triggering your supporters’ empathy, or sense of impact could increase conversions by 58% and 20% respectively.

**David Reinstein, University of Exeter**  
**Could you increase giving with information on charity effectiveness and impact?**

Helping behavior is strongly driven by emotional reactions to individual suffering (empathy). It has been suggested that presenting analytical impact information may disrupt empathic giving, as it shifts potential donors towards a more deliberative mode. In six studies, we explored the effect of measures of charity efficiency/effectiveness and that of empathy-inducing images. Our results suggest that analytical information about impact and cost-effectiveness does not strongly disrupt empathic giving, and may enhance it. Furthermore, the ‘right’ empathic images can drive effective giving.



**Derek Roberts, Crisis**

**Getting supporters to stay in touch with you**

Making a donation often means you get a number of solicitations from that organisation in a number of channels. Not anymore. At least, not in Europe. Under new regulations – the infamous GDPR – charities need to secure the donors’ consent before they can contact them in certain channels. How can charities ensure supporters stay in touch? To find the answer to that question, we embarked on some insights work with DonorVoice, the outcome of which we put to the test in-market. The result? An 8.4% greater chance of supporters giving their consent.

**Enrico Rubaltelli, University of Padova, 10:10 EST / 15:10 UK**

**How to systematically increase people’s likelihood to give; the perception of the cost/benefit tradeoff of a fundraising campaign**

When donors are asked to make a donation, they assess the tradeoff between the resources they are forgoing (cost) and the impact they could have (benefit). If the cost is perceived to be too high, or the benefit too low, they might decide not to give. On the contrary, they will be more likely to give if the cost is *perceived to be* low and/or the benefit high. In this talk you’ll hear about two interventions which could increase the likelihood of a donation by maximizing a donors’ perception of (low) cost for themselves or (high) benefit for the recipients. The first intervention is successful at decreasing the perception of cost by breaking a larger donation amount into instalments. The second intervention, the so-called attraction effect, changes the perception of the benefit with the addition of an alternative impact option, which is similar but inferior to the original one. Both interventions are based on reliable psychological processes thus allowing us to influence donations in a reliable and predictable way.

**Rami Sarakbi, Canadian Red Cross, 9:40 EST / 14:40 UK**

**Improving retention; how to stop losing all those monthly donors**

It’s pretty disheartening to spend a lot of money recruiting monthly donors, knowing full well you’ll lose many of them in the first few days, weeks, and months. But what if you could **know**, at point of sign up, who was most at risk of leaving, know why and take insight-based action to prevent it? That’s what we’ve been doing at CRC. Using DonorVoice’s Feedback Platform we could now identify, within the first week, precisely which supporters were at risk of cancelling in the next 3 to 6 months. Knowing this so early on gave us the opportunity to try and prevent it. Using a behavioral science-based telephone script, we called half of our at-risk supporters with the purpose of “saving” them. The result? A 16% reduction in attrition in the test group.