

VIRAL MARKETING IN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR: CRAFTING MESSAGES
THAT CREATE AWARENESS AND CALL AN AUDIENCE TO ACTION

By

Hannah Diane Parker

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of Mississippi in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College.

Oxford

May 2015

Approved by:

Advisor: Dr. Hugh Sloan

Reader: Dr. Kathleen Wachter

Reader: Dr. Tony Ammeter

© 2015

Hannah Parker

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

HANNAH DIANE PARKER: Viral Marketing in the Nonprofit Sector: Crafting Messages that Create Awareness and Call an Audience to Action

(Under the direction of Dr. Hugh Sloan)

The nonprofit (NPO) sector has seen immense growth in recent years. With this growth has come an increased need for any particular nonprofit to compete and differentiate itself from the vast number of other nonprofits also looking for clients, volunteers, and donors. Unfortunately, nonprofits often lack the resources needed to develop and execute a successful marketing campaign. The emergence of controlled viral marketing offers a number of possibilities for these NPOs looking to spread awareness and increase involvement. The purpose of this research was to explore common themes among previous viral marketing campaigns and identify factors that are likely to lead to virality. Both qualitative and quantitative research was conducted in the form of content analyses and a survey collected via convenience sample to 132 participants. The results of the analyses indicated that several factors are at work when nonprofit marketing material goes viral. The primary factor identified was the level of emotion that the content stimulated amongst viewers. Other factors included the credibility of the source, social relevance to the viewer, and the ease of distribution. NPOs would stand with much to gain if they began to work toward developing compelling online content with the potential to go viral.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. LIST OF TABLES.....	v
II. INTRODUCTION.....	1
III. LITERATURE REVIEW	
A. MARKETING IN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR	
i. Origins.....	3
ii. Challenges.....	4
iii. Implementation.....	7
B. HISTORY OF VIRAL MARKETING	9
C. NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	19
IV. METHODOLOGY	
A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	24
B. MEASURES	
i. Qualitative.....	25
ii. Quantitative.....	25
V. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS.....	33
VI. RESULTS	
A. CONTENT ANALYSIS.....	34
B. SURVEY ANALYSIS.....	39
VII. DISCUSSION.....	46
VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	54
IX. REFERENCES.....	55
X. APPENDICES	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	59
B. TABLES AND FIGURES.....	69

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1	Change in Behavioral Intention after Viewing Advertisement	41
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics	69
Table 3	Berger’s Six STEPPS, Applied	70
Table 4	Mills’s SPIN Framework, Applied	71
Table 5	Correlations	72
Table 6	Paired T-Test.....	74
Table 7	ANOVA – Behavioral Intention Before & After.....	74
Table 8	Factor Analysis Pattern Matrix	75
Table 9	Regression – Model Summary.....	77
Table 10	Regression Coefficients	78
Table 11	Residual Statistics	79
Figure 1	Regression Line.....	80

II. INTRODUCTION

While professionals in the field of medicine exhaust time and energy fighting to stop the spread of viral infections, professionals in the field of marketing instead use viral content as a tool to catapult a company into widespread firm and brand awareness. The dynamism of today's business world has led to viral content often being considered the pinnacle of marketing success.

Nonprofit organizations (NPOs), in particular, have much to gain from the possibilities of viral marketing. Given the NPO sector's limited funding to spend on marketing and other operational activities, crafting captivating online content that individuals choose to share with others can often do more for brand awareness than an expensive traditional marketing campaign.

Unfortunately, the phenomenon of viral marketing is often seen as more of a dream than an actual strategy. Web 3.0 and the new consumer culture are so complex that creating a formula for viral content is a difficult task. However, with a plethora of previous viral content to use as a guideline and a reference, the goal of this research is to add to the current body of literature regarding what makes content go viral. In particular, what makes nonprofit content go viral? How can nonprofit organizations take advantage of this new form of marketing?

To explore the impact that a captivating viral marketing campaign can have on a nonprofit organization, two approaches will be used. First, a literature search and second, the exploration of research questions developed from the literature review.

The review of literature will explore: first, the history of traditional marketing in the nonprofit sector- including its origin, its challenges, and its implementation; second, the history of viral marketing, particularly in the nonprofit sector; and third, evidence for the need for further viral marketing research as it pertains to NPOs.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. MARKETING IN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

i. Origins

In the twenty-first century, jobs have grown at a faster rate in the nonprofit sector than in the for-profit sector; nonprofit employees make up nearly 11 percent of the total workforce (Pope et al., 2009). Nonprofits contribute billions of dollars yearly to the economy in the form of products and services. A significant growth in the number of nonprofit organizations over the last three decades has created intense competition for the limited amount of donations and grants available (Pope et al., 2009). Consequently, nonprofit executives had no choice but to develop a greater interest in marketing techniques.

Marketing has been the last of all the classic business functions to arrive in the nonprofit sector. The idea of converging the two practices of marketing and nonprofits developed in the late 1960s thanks to a series of articles written by Kotler, Levy, and Zaltman (Kotler & Andreasen, 1991). The goal of these studies was to determine whether or not traditional product marketing was transferable to marketing services such as NPOs. The researchers believed that marketing would offer nonprofits the chance to survive and grow in accordance with their mission. That being said, the literature on marketing and the examination of new ways to apply marketing to NPOs is critical to the success of nonprofits looking to increase brand awareness and drive donations.

Kotler and Levy's early attempts to broaden marketing's focus was not met with unanimous agreement (Andreasan, 2012). Many believed in the late 1960s – and may still believe today – that marketing is a commercial activity. Scholars described the Kotler-Levy research as “anarchy in marketing terminology” (Andreasan, 2012, p. 37). Kotler, especially, exerted great effort to integrate social marketing into practitioners' terminology. Unfortunately, other scholars such as Lazer and Kelly defined social marketing as the social impacts that for-profit marketing had (Andreasan, 2012). Today, many confuse social marketing with social network marketing. There is limited agreement on how marketing practitioners should approach nonprofits.

ii. Challenges

One major hindrance for the successful implementation of marketing within the nonprofit sector was the belief that marketing was unnecessary. According to Kotler and Andreasan, critics argued that “good health does not need to be sold, hospitals don't need to be marketed, lawful behavior is simply a social requirement, and one shouldn't have to advertise to drivers to get them not to speed” (Kotler & Andreasan, 1991, p. 23). A more lasting opinion among the public, unfortunately, is that marketing is at its core seen as evil. This view presents itself in three opinions: that marketing wastes the public's money; that marketing is intrusive; and that marketing is manipulative (Kotler & Andreasan, 1991).

The goal of traditional marketing efforts has always been to improve a firm's bottom line. Since NPOs are not necessarily seeking profits, implementing a marketing strategy was originally seen as ill-equipped for the nonprofit sector. One main reason for

an argued lack of fit is that nonprofits must appeal to three different target markets: clients/ customers, volunteers, and donors (Pope et al., 2009). This creates a complex situation for marketers trying to develop a nonprofit strategy. They must first acknowledge the different ways that these target markets respond to the marketing mix. Second, they must communicate the often nonmonetary benefits that consumers receive from donating or volunteering. Ultimately, nonprofit marketers must craft messages that appeal to their clients, their volunteers, and their donors simultaneously.

Because many funds are restricted, nonprofits must also achieve marketing objectives through the solicitation of funding specifically for that purpose (Pope et al., 2009). Many citizens monitor not only the administrative costs but also the marketing expenditures of nonprofit organizations to ensure that it does not become a significant percent of the total money being raised. The development and execution of a compelling marketing mix is crucial for organizations in the nonprofit sector; however, marketers in the field often feel that they must do so with their hands tied behind their backs.

“Why is it so hard to sell brotherhood like soap?” (Kotler & Andreasan, 1991, p. 28). Michael Rothschild raised this question in an article discussing why marketing management must be different in the nonprofit sector compared to the for-profit sector. Most significantly, it is much more difficult to obtain secondary data about consumer characteristics, behaviors, and preferences for nonprofit marketers compared to what is readily available (at a cost) to those in the for-profit sector. When conducting market research on nonprofit topics, respondents are naturally inclined to respond in a self-serving or socially desirable way. Such responses dilute the accuracy of results. It is much more difficult for nonprofit marketers to tailor their product offering to suit their

target market's needs. For instance, there is only one method for the American Red Cross to obtain blood from donors. It should be noted, however, that NPOs can adapt other aspects of the service, such as the physical location in which the Red Cross administers blood drives.

It is also much harder to portray the intangible benefits of donating to or volunteering for a nonprofit. Transactions made in the nonprofit sector can be much more complex and difficult to express than transactions that occur in the commercial sector. Nonprofits offer consumers the chance to spend their money, but they often offer nothing in return (with the exception of tax deductions). Nonprofits can also propose actions to be taken (e.g. to stop smoking), but they offer no products and expect no payment in return. Influencing intangible exchanges requires marketers to learn different perspectives and use different techniques than they are traditionally used to, but must implement anyway.

Overall, calling consumers to action in a nonprofit setting can be much more difficult since most of these organizations are imposing costs on their audiences without offering any direct benefits to these people. Instead, the audiences' costs are often for the benefit of some distant third party. All of these challenges make it absolutely crucial for any nonprofit looking to drive brand awareness and donation rates to develop a captivating marketing strategy that will call their audience to action. One way NPOs can do this is by incorporating social media and the emerging concept of Web 3.0 into their marketing strategies.

iii. Implementation

In the last decade, strides have been made within the nonprofit sector to create a larger online presence. Web 3.0 has presented these organizations with vast opportunities to extend reach and drive donations. Overwhelmingly, nonprofits surveyed by the Case Foundation reported that their most important communication tools were their websites and email (Sharma, 2014). Ninety-seven percent of respondents were on Facebook, but saw the social media site as less crucial because it less directly brought in donations. Half of the NPO respondents cited having one or less staffers in charge of social media efforts. A lack of manpower is the biggest challenge facing nonprofits who are trying to extend their reach through social media. Moreover, 74 percent of respondents claimed to use their social networking pages as megaphones rather than avenues for communication. They use Facebook and Twitter to announce events and share information, but they do little to get constituents included in the conversation (Sharma, 2014).

According to Constant Contact (2012), 64 percent of NPOs claim that attracting new supporters is keeping them up at night. Of those surveyed, 59 percent said they struggled with learning how to connect to and engage supporters. Fifty-seven percent also cited getting funding as a major issue. On a managerial level, 34 percent of nonprofits are seeking a more effective marketing strategy; 22 percent want to learn how to make their marketing dollars go further. Unfortunately, 20 percent lack the skillset required to measure a marketing campaign's impact (Constant Contact, 2012).

Nonprofits are increasingly turning to the Web to raise funds, increase awareness, and improve relationships. However, many are focusing solely on one-way online communication instead of trying to develop relationships (Pope et al., 2009). A

significant lack of expertise and financial resources hinder nonprofits from using the Internet to their full advantage. Running an effective viral campaign requires management to recognize the strategy's inherent uncertainties, while at the same time realizing its own ability to maximize chances of success (Liu-Thompkins, 2012). To aid these organizations in viral marketing efforts, much more research is needed to examine the most optimal decisions one can make when designing a viral marketing campaign.

Of great importance in developing a successful strategy is for management and lower-level employees to be on board. In a research project conducted by Pope, Isely, and Isamoa-Tutu (2009), nonprofit employees expressed their most paramount grievances. Almost universally, these individuals identified money, time, and resources as the main limitations to their marketing efforts. Over 60 percent of those surveyed said that marketing was important to their organization, but they were often unclear about what marketing actually meant. Generally, respondents tied marketing to fundraising and not to communications with clients or volunteers. Nearly 85 percent stated they did not have one specific target market for their marketing efforts. Executives typically focused efforts on friends, board members, individuals who had donated previously, or purchased lists from PR firms (Pope et al., 2009).

Moreover, NPOs rarely use websites to their fullest potential. In the survey conducted by Pope et al. (2009), respondents expressed a desire for online donation capabilities. Only eight respondents had actually implemented a process for doing so, though. A lack of human capital to manage a site was the most common reason for not having a functioning website (Pope et al., 2009).

Based on their research, Pope et al. (2009) asserted that nonprofit's target marketing strategy must be straight forward, easy to implement, and easy to measure. Given the wide variety of individuals that this sector must attract to achieve its many missions, creating such a novel strategy is not an easy task. First and foremost, NPOs must recognize marketing as an operational requirement, and develop a marketing plan to reach each of their target markets (clients, volunteers, and donors). It is also important that NPOs (particularly small, local ones) take advantage of the many resources available online. There is no reason why any nonprofit should not be present online- having a website at the very least. NPOs need to reevaluate the importance of their marketing efforts and thus place it higher on their list of priorities. Because NPOs struggle with “a general lack of understanding of the true functions of marketing, difficulties in branding, and an inability to reach out to all of their target markets”, viral marketing could be a useful strategy (Pope et al., 2009, p. 198).

B. HISTORY OF VIRAL MARKETING

The phrase ‘viral marketing’ was first introduced in 1996 by the firm Draper Fisher Jurveston; it was used to describe Hotmail’s use of advertisements on the bottom of emails to promote the company’s web services (Mills, 2009). It refers to content that spreads through social media like a virus. For the purposes of this research, the definition of viral marketing will be that as defined by Mills (2012, p. 163): “the strategic release or seeding of branded content into the socially networked online consumer ecosystem, followed by the potentially multiplicative spread of the content through the ecosystem as

hosts (consumers) receive the content and are motivated to share the branded content with other consumers.”

The distribution of this viral content is both self-propelled and widely received. At its onset, marketing managers had little idea what kind of impact viral marketing could have on future strategies. In a marketing campaign that has gone viral, the information spreads at an exponential rate; it is not bound to geographic locations and can reach an international level in minutes. These viral messages influence public opinion about products and brands (Botha, 2013). Despite its potential success, most campaigns intended to go viral do not. Little empirical research has been conducted to identify reasons that some viral videos spread and others do not. Given these insights, the first research question was developed: What themes can NPOs identify in order to develop successful viral marketing campaigns?

Directly related to viral marketing is the concept of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM). While a key characteristic of eWOM is that its origins are external to the company at hand, organizations can still facilitate eWOM through their actions. Once eWOM occurs, its consequences can be categorized as either affective, cognitive, or behavioral (Lang & Hyde, 2013). An affective response to eWOM involves heightened emotions such as enthusiasm, confidence, and optimism. Cognitive responses result in greater brand awareness and better brand recognition/ consideration. Finally, behavioral intentions lead consumers to product trial, brand switching, and (ideally) brand adoption. Electronic word-of-mouth proves to be an integral aspect in the diffusion of information to consumers (Lang & Hyde, 2013). The affective, cognitive, and behavioral possibilities connected to eWOM has led to the development of the second research question: How

can an NPO's viral marketing campaign change consumers' minds about a brand/ call consumers to action?

"Marketing is being reborn as a consumer-centered craft." (Daniasa et al., 2010, p. 279). At the core of viral marketing is transmitting messages through the internet via peers (Daniasa, 2010). Successful viral marketing, moreover, builds an emotional connection between organizations and consumers (clients, donors, and volunteers).

Driving results through the use of social networking sites is an important component of any company's marketing strategy today. Social media applications such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube offer a variety of ways to spread the word. Social networking sites are well-suited for NPOs attempting to create viral effects. These platforms enhance the possibility for visualizing an otherwise intangible service at relatively little expense to the organization at hand (Hausmann, 2012). Short videos and online clips can often materialize the intangible and emotionally stimulate consumers before making their decisions on whether to seek a service, donate, volunteer, or support a cause. The rise of viral marketing has allowed stakeholders to partake in the conversation, both with the organization and with each other. Marketers should leverage the power of these networks of consumers to promote their services.

The greatest advantage to viral marketing is its relatively low cost compared to other types of marketing campaigns. Its biggest risk, however, is the lack of control. Viral marketing can lower the cost of promoting a brand and drastically increase the speed of adoption. Brands that are most susceptible to viral marketing tend to be unique and highly visible (Daniasa, 2010). For viral marketing to work, the message needs to be uniquely powerful.

Unfortunately, not all viral marketing campaigns gain traction. What elements differentiate campaigns that go viral from those that do not? What makes a product, idea, or behavior diffuse through an entire population? Since viral content is so dynamic and there is no “one right way” to design a viral message, this paper will look at two separate perspectives present in current literature. Jonah Berger’s approach is one way to look at what makes online content go viral. He identifies six key “STEPPS” that make content go viral: social currency, triggers, emotion, public, practical value, and stories. Adam Mills (2012) proposes an alternative (yet complementary) framework. Mills identifies four key drivers of viral marketing success: spreadability, propagativity, integration, and nexus. (Mills, 2012).

Berger’s Six STEPPS

In *Contagious: Why Things Catch On*, professor Jonah Berger explains what makes content contagious, “content” meaning stories and information, and “contagious” meaning likely to spread via social influence/ eWOM (Berger, 2012). From Livestrong wristbands to nonfat Greek yogurt, it’s an easy task to find examples of products and movements that have caught on. However, it’s much harder to actually get a movement to catch on.

Every hour, there are over 100 million conversations and over 16,000 words shared about brands (Berger, 2012). Word of mouth is responsible for between 20 to 50 percent of all purchasing decisions (Berger, 2012). Moreover, word of mouth is much more persuasive and credible than regular advertisements. A friend’s candid, objective recommendation of a brand is much more believable than an advertisement coming directly from the company itself.

Thus, positive word of mouth proves to be a mode of transmission that comes at little cost to the company. The challenge is getting people to talk. Once they are talking, though, the advertising and the targeting are being done by loyal brand enthusiasts. Obviously, the key question so far is “how do we get people to talk?” Through his decade-long research on the subject, Jonah Berger has identified six principles that are often at work in successful “contagious” online content (Berger, 2012). Berger looked at hundreds of viral messages, products, and ideas. From YouTube videos, to political messages, to popular baby names, Berger formulates six key STEPPS that cause things to be shared: social currency, triggers, emotion, public, practical value, and stories

1. Social Currency

People want to seem sharp and up-to-date, so crafting messages that allow them to achieve these desired impressions is key. Organizations must capitalize on “self-sharing”. Humans inherently have a desire to share their opinions and experiences. In fact, more than 40 percent of what people talk about regards their own personal experiences (Berger, 2012). Word of mouth, in effect, is an excellent tool for individuals to make a good impression. It acts as a form of currency through which they achieve desired impressions among their peers. Organizations need to mint their own social currency; they must give consumers a way to look good while simultaneously promoting the organization’s ideas. NPO marketers must find ways to make their idea seem extraordinary or novel so that when people share it, they too are perceived as extraordinary or novel.

2. Triggers

While social currency starts the conversation, triggers keep people talking about a brand. Each day, the average American partakes in sixteen or more conversations where

they mention a brand, organization, or product (Berger, 2012). Such word-of-mouth is so basic and commonplace that most individuals do not realize they are doing it. The best way to get your brand into the conversation is to develop triggers for it. Triggers are environmental cues or reminders that relate to a particular concept or idea (Berger, 2012).

For example, in 1997 the candy company Mars saw a huge uptick in sales of the Mars bar. The company had not changed its marketing efforts, was not spending extra on advertising, and had not run any pricing promotions. Despite a lack of internal effort to increase sales of the candy bar, it was happening thanks to a certain trigger: the planet Mars. At the same time, NASA's pathfinder mission was collecting samples from Mars. All news outlets were featuring the story, and the Mars candy bar unintentionally reaped the benefits. The everyday environment of your target market can greatly influence behavior. For NPOs attempting to craft viral content, it is important to be tuned in to today's popular culture, and to attempt to integrate that into their messages.

3. Emotion

Contagious messages typically evoke an emotion. When a person feels passionately about an idea, they are much more likely to share it with others. Positive and negative emotions certainly effect what people talk about and share. According to conventional wisdom, negative content should be more viral. However, Berger's research indicates that people are more prone to sharing positive things and to avoid sharing negative things. Thus, topics that were largely sad in context were much less likely to be shared. Counterintuitively, other negative emotions were likely to be shared. Messages that evoked feelings such as anger or anxiety were much more likely to be shared. This

indicates that something other than positivity versus negativity dictates what is shared. Berger believes this phenomenon to be physiological arousal (Berger, 2012).

Physiological arousal is a “state of activation and readiness for action” (Berger, 2012, p. 108). Messages high in arousal make the heart beat faster. In essence, they call individuals to action. Messages low in arousal have the opposite effect; they stifle action. For instance, an idea that leads to contentment deactivates any call to action. When people are content- or, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied- they feel less prone to share messages. Thus, marketers must carefully evaluate their message’s level of arousal if they intend to call an audience to action.

Henke (2013) reinforces this idea by saying that the intensity of the viewer’s experience is more important than which particular emotion the message evokes. Engagement is conceptualized as “flow”, which refers to the state in which people are so involved in the message that nothing else matters. Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi first introduced this concept of “flow” in 1990. According to Csikszentmihalyi, individuals experiencing flow lose self-consciousness and the concept of time (Cameron, 1991). Often in these states of flow, the body and mind are experiencing some type of challenging situation and are thus stretched to their limits. In her research, Henke (2013) found that participants who experienced “flow” were much more likely to pass along a message and express brand interest. The more intense the experience, the more likely positive comments and positive attitudes toward the brand are generated (Henke, 2013).

4. Public

Humans have a tendency to imitate. It is hard to imitate something that you cannot see, so marketers must make sure that the product or idea at hand is made public. Public visibility is therefore a key driver in making brands catch on.

“Social proof” is a term coined by psychologists to explain how people resolve uncertainty (Berger, 2012). Individuals naturally look to others when they are uncertain of what to do. They assume that if other people are following a certain brand, it must be a good idea. By this logic, designing products or services that advertise themselves is a very powerful strategy, especially for organizations such as nonprofits that may not have the resources to expend on an advertising campaign.

Sometimes, however, this strategy can backfire. This is especially important to note for nonprofits and advocate groups. The “Just Say No” campaign, for example, was designed with the intention of teaching kids how to handle peer pressure and avoid drug use (Berger, 2012). Research was conducted to determine whether the campaign was effective. As it turns out, the public service announcements seemed to increase drug use rather than decrease it. Kids saw the ads and saw that a lot of their peers were using marijuana. The more they came to believe their peers were using the drug, the more they wanted to use it themselves. In this case, making the private public actually had the opposite effect than what the campaign intended. Therefore, preventing a behavior actually requires making others’ behaviors less observable (Berger, 2012).

5. Practical Value

People want content that is useful. Accordingly, marketers must highlight the value offered in their content and package it in such a way that makes it easy to pass along. Whereas social currency is about the individual who sends the information, practical value is often about the receiver. Sharing online content is an easy way to help others out and show we care about them. Whether it be a result of altruism or another way to attain social currency, if a brand gives consumers messages with practical value they will often pass that message along.

6. Stories

Some stories have been passed along for thousands of years. From the story of the Trojan Horse to that of the Three Little Pigs, these tales offer an entertaining way to deliver an underlying message or moral. The Trojan Horse teaches us to beware our enemies, even when they come bearing gifts. The Three Little Pigs teach us that hard work and diligence pay off in the long run. What makes these morals so much easier to remember when they are wrapped within the context of a story? People think in terms of narratives rather than information. Stories act as vessels, and the information is naturally packaged inside (Berger, 2012).

Marketers (and NPOs in particular) must build their own Trojan horses; they must create a story that carries their ideas in a manner that people will want to tell (Berger, 2012). While it is possible to craft a compelling story that gets people talking, it is important to make sure that the story gets consumers talking about what actually matters: the brand. If marketers are not careful, they may forget to weave their brands into the story. As a marketer, one must make his story so funny or so entertaining that people

cannot help but share it. More importantly, though, a marketer must make sure that the content connects back to his brand.

Mills's SPIN Framework

In Mills's SPIN Framework, viral content must have four qualities to facilitate its spread: spreadability, propagativity, integration, and nexus. While Berger focuses on message content, Mills emphasizes the importance of facilitating the message's physical dispersion. Spreadability refers to a message's innate ability to spread across social networks. Mills suggests two factors that relate to a campaign's spreadability: likeability and sharability. If a message appeals to a consumer (likeability) and the consumer feels that his/her peers will feel the same (sharability), it is seen to be spreadable (Mills, 2012). Mills's first component encapsulates much of Berger's six STEPP framework.

Propagativity, as defined by Mills (2012), directly relates to the level of ease with which a viewer can redistribute the content. When selecting the media through which to share content, marketers should consider four things: the ease/ speed of propagation; the network and size type; the richness of the content; and the proximity of the content. Thus, marketers should choose media that allows users to quickly and easily share content to a large audience.

Next, content must be integrated across several online and offline media platforms (Mills, 2012). While it is important that content be shared across a wide range of social media sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.), it is also beneficial to consider content that will likely be shared across traditional media outlets as well (newspapers, magazines, etc). Messages that are not only "share worthy" but also "news worthy" have the potential to reach an even larger audience.

Lastly, nexus refers to reinforcing a campaign by releasing sequential units of viral content (Mills, 2012). The original viral message will leave viewers eager for more, and any organization can capitalize on that by launching equally viral content later on. If a nonprofit organization is able to deliver viral content once, it is successful. However, if it can find a way to do so consistently, it has the potential to raise brand awareness tenfold.

Berger's and Mills's concepts of virality are each separately powerful. When applied together, however, NPOs could gain even more traction with their online content. While Berger's six STEPPS focus on the message's content, Mills emphasizes tools for dispersion. NPOs that successfully integrate the two frameworks could potentially craft messages that are both conceptually stirring and easy to spread.

C. NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The old rules of marketing claim that managers must pull out their wallets to gain an audience. These old rules do not apply anymore, however, thanks to Web 3.0. Communicating to a small but powerful group of fans online and enlisting their support can ensure that one's message will spread. The trick is to be different and create content that is relevant to your brand. The old rules result in weeks of waiting for your message to generate awareness. The new rules can make your brand famous overnight. The most exciting element of the Web and viral marketing is that if a message takes off, a brand can become a household name overnight. Even more excitingly, this happens for free. Having people tell your story drives others to action. Nonprofit organizations have an incredible opportunity to publish great online content that people will actually want to

share (Scott, 2008). “If you can boil your message down to just its syrupy goodness, you can achieve life – the irresistible force of millions of customers selling your product for you” (Scott, 2008, p. 12).

Through a content analysis of YouTube’s 100 most viewed nonprofit videos, Waters and Jones (2011) identified that NPOs primarily use their YouTube videos to inform and educate. Their research emphasizes the impact that video content has on persuading the viewers. As opposed to images, videos are a much more powerful way of creating a strong mental impression of a company in consumers’ minds (Water & Jones, 2011). Videos are verbal, vocal, and visual, so the audience experiences multiple communication fronts. These three elements combined were found to have the strongest effect on an individual’s ability to remember a message.

YouTube is the fourth most viewed website in the United States (Waters & Jones, 2011). Nonprofits should capitalize on this phenomenon to reinforce awareness of their services, programs, and fundraising efforts. Because images of the brand are largely shaped through conversations, sharing videos on sites like YouTube facilitates these conversations and enhances awareness. In the past, nonprofit organizations have used video sharing sites to publish informative content including but not limited to documentaries, success stories, and fundraising initiatives (Waters & Jones, 2011). YouTube also allows the organization to track the conversation and shape the messages that are being portrayed. Whether NPOs are using web videos to engage constituents or to relay messages, research indicates that using YouTube in campaigns has increased exponentially as the viral marketing phenomenon has surfaced (Waters & Jones, 2011).

Nonprofits in the past, however, have done a poor job of moving their online audience to offline action. The NPO needs to engage its audience and explicitly state what the desired action is. Videos frequently go viral, but if there is no imminent call to action the effort is worthless. At the bare minimum, the video should request viewers to contact the organization for more information.

In Waters & Jones' content analysis study (2011), an overwhelming amount of nonprofit videos were filled with content intending to educate viewers on the mission of the NPO. The second most common purpose was to entertain. A chi-square cross-tabulation also showed differences in message purpose according to the type of nonprofit organization involved. Human services and health organizations frequently had informational videos, and arts and culture organizations were much more likely to use entertaining content.

Nonprofits were also similar in their lack of engagement. Three-fourths of the videos did not perform well in responding to comments and questions on the built-in comment feature. Even more unfortunately, only four videos explicitly asked viewers to connect with the NPO on its social media accounts. Organizations were much more likely to direct them to their website, although NPO websites are often minimally interactive and of little use to prospective donors. Another element measured was whether these organizations used their videos as a call to action. Thirty-seven percent of videos asked viewers to share the content with others; 15 percent asked for feedback; 11 percent provided information on volunteering; only 9 percent acknowledged donating (Waters & Jones, 2011).

Through inductive analysis, Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) grouped NPOs' social media content into three categories: information, community, and action. Informative messages simply spread information about the nonprofit. Community messages tapped into how the organizations could create networks and communities through content. The final function called the audiences to action; messages with this intent aimed to get viewers to do something for the organization such as donate or volunteer (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012).

As applied to Berger's STEPPS and Mills's SPIN framework, content created that falls into the community and/or action categories may possess several qualities that lead to message virality. Because of their tendency to create networks and relate to a community at large, communal messages often have social currency, are public, and provide practical value to viewers. Content that falls into the action category also creates social currency and public value. If an NPO is able to create a message that calls an audience to action (for example through volunteering), social currency could serve as a sort of intangible value. In exchange for their participation, volunteers could gain respect through their altruism. Finally, when these messages are dispersed through social media and local news outlets, they pass Mills's tests of propagativity and integration.

Despite the STEPPS and SPIN frameworks' predictions that informational content lead to poor results, NPOs rely heavily on informational content when creating video content. Only eight of the organizations studied were primarily "community builders" and only three were "promoters and mobilizers" (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p. 348). Their research found that only 15.6 percent of messages sent had the primary function of calling followers to action. Instead, many nonprofits were using Twitter as a

megaphone to disperse information and acknowledge community engagement (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012).

By relying on informational communication, nonprofits are not using social media sites to their full potential. These portals should be used to create interactive, dialogic content that gets consumers talking about a brand and inspires them to action. According to Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), information is the core activity used to attract followers; community-focused messages engage these followers, and action-oriented messages mobilize followers to action. Though this study was done on Twitter, the researchers believe it to be generalizable to all types of social media. Facebook is often identified as the medium of choice for individuals to pass along viral messages (Botha & Reyneke, 2013).

To conclude the review of literature, viral marketing has largely been seen as a “hit or miss” strategy largely dependent on luck. However, nonprofits can and *should* treat it as a strategic process with immense potential (Liu-Thompkins, 2012). The review of literature suggests that a significant knowledge gap remains regarding how nonprofits can craft marketing campaigns with a real potential to go viral. Frameworks like those of Berger and Mills make great strides toward demystifying the art of viral marketing. However, no research has been conducted to assess the previous research’s applicability to NPOs. So, what themes can be identified among NPOs’ online video campaigns that go viral? Moreover, how can these successful viral campaigns lead to offline action?

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to explore previously executed nonprofit viral marketing campaigns in order to ascertain what qualities increase brand awareness and potentially increase donations, clients, and volunteer bases. The primary objective was to determine how nonprofit organizations can use viral marketing to raise awareness/interest and drive donations. As previously proposed, the following research questions were formed based on the previous literature review:

- What themes can NPOs identify in order to develop successful viral marketing campaigns?
- How can a NPO's viral marketing campaign change consumers' minds about a brand and thus call them to action?

In order to gain further insights into the particular qualities that make nonprofit content go viral, this research involves both qualitative and quantitative methods. First, a content analysis of four separate nonprofit viral marketing campaigns was conducted. Next, with Berger's Six STEPPS and Mills's SPIN Framework in mind, a Qualtrics survey was designed and distributed to measure a sample of the population's overall feelings toward a nonprofit organization and its attempt at a viral marketing campaign.

B. MEASURES

i. Qualitative

The researcher looked at two nonprofit videos that had successfully gone viral (each with over 1,000,000 views) and two that had not (each with less than 15,000 views). Videos were shared through corporate YouTube pages. The nonprofit organizations involved in the analysis were Invisible Children, Water is Life, Boys and Girls Club of America, and United Way. Each nonprofit had a presence on YouTube and their videos were posted with a clear intent to go viral/ gain traction. The researcher watched and judged the campaigns in terms of quality, content, and overall message. Berger's Six STEPPS and Mills's SPIN Framework were then used to judge the effectiveness of each video at creating content that had a potential to go viral, thus attempting to answer the first research question: What themes can NPOs identify in order to develop successful viral marketing campaigns?

The ads were compared on all of the two frameworks' dimensions (Berger: Social Currency, Triggers, Emotion, Public, Practical Value, and Stories; and Mills: Spreadability, Propagativity, Integration, and Nexus). Then, the videos were ranked according to performance. These rankings were compared to each video's number of views to gauge the accuracy of the frameworks in predicting viral content.

ii. Quantitative

Next, the researcher conducted a quantitative analysis of a sample of the population's overall attitudes toward nonprofit organizations and the effectiveness of one NPO's online marketing campaign in particular. Data was collected through a Qualtrics

survey. The survey was designed to collect quantitative data on subjects' attitudes toward an NPO's attempted viral ad campaign.

Survey Development

The survey consists of twelve different sections, one nonprofit video, one open-ended question, and two demographic questions. The scales were chosen from the *Handbook of Marketing Scales* (1999, 2011) and the *Marketing Scales Handbook* (2005) and slightly adapted where needed to better suit the study. Overall, the scales measure respondents' social desirability bias, attitudes toward nonprofits, and behavioral intentions/ judgments of one nonprofit organization's video campaign. The attributes judged on these scales have significant implications for judging an ad's content and overall effectiveness.

The nonprofit organization examined in the survey is Wish of a Lifetime. Wish of a Lifetime, a nonprofit organization in Denver, Colorado whose mission is to "foster respect and appreciation for senior citizens by granting life enriching wishes", was chosen because it is a nonprofit lacking significant brand awareness and it could greatly benefit from the exposure that ensues with viral marketing (Wish of a Lifetime, 2015). The organization grants wishes for individuals sixty-five and older in one of four categories: commemorating service, fulfilling lifelong dreams, reconnecting loved ones, and renewing and celebrating passions. To date, Wish of a Lifetime has granted over 1,000 wishes- ranging from a wish to go skydiving to a wish to visit a long-lost relative.

Wish of a Lifetime has released several videos on social media, but none have gained much traction or reached viral status. In order to benefit Wish of a Lifetime and other small nonprofits like it, the researcher created and distributed a survey that

measures respondents' overall attitudes toward the organization and one video campaign in particular. To date, the video under observation, titled "Start Seeing Seniors", has 23,900 views. Through understanding how consumers perceive the organization's previous attempts to go viral, a clearer picture can be painted as to how to craft a message more likely to go viral in the future. The overall aim of the survey is to identify elements that either intensify or abate chances at virality. An annotated version of the survey can be seen in its entirety in Appendix A; annotations represent each question's mean and standard deviation. Additionally, a statistical synopsis of the summated concepts addressed in the survey can be seen in Table 2, Appendix B.

Survey Construct

1. SOCIAL DESIRABILITY BIAS (SDR) (Robinson et al, 2013, p 43)

Response bias is an inherent risk in surveys. Social desirability bias is an issue present in instances where respondents may feel they need to make a good impression. For example, respondents may intentionally score lower on items that clearly assess undesirable behaviors (selfishness) and intentionally score higher on items that assess desirable behavior (altruism). Because altruism is at the heart of nonprofit organizations and an individual's intent to donate, the first scale attempts to examine and account for social desirability bias.

This scale, Responding Desirably on Attitudes and Opinions (RD-16), is used to measure social desirability bias and is comprised of 16 items/ 8 pairs. The pairs come from tests of dejection, social estrangement, social opportunism, trust, social contentment, anomie, expediency, and self-determination. The respondent must agree or disagree with each item. Scores can range from 0 to 16; higher scores indicate the

individual is trying to respond desirably. Respondents' SDR scores will be tested for correlation with behavioral intention scores to account for any bias that may result from this tendency.

2. ATTITUDES INFLUENCING MONETARY DONATIONS TO CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS (Bearden et al, 2011, p 165)

In terms of donation behavior, two determinants are attitudes toward helping others and attitudes toward charitable organizations. Attitudes toward helping others are the enduring evaluations of individuals in regard to helping other individuals. Moreover, attitudes toward charitable organizations are the enduring evaluations in regard to those charities (nonprofit organizations) that help these individuals.

This scale consists of nine items. The first four represent attitudes toward helping others and the last five represent attitudes toward charitable organizations. One item on the latter requires reverse coding. A Likert scale was used; items were scored between 1 and 7 where 1 means strongly disagree and 7 means strongly agree. These scales were utilized to determine the effect these preconceived opinions toward NPOs in general may have on responses.

3. BEHAVIORAL INTENTION – WISH OF A LIFETIME, PRE-VIDEO VIEWING (Bruner et al, 2005, p 106)

Before asking respondents to state their intentions, the researcher gave an overview of Wish of a Lifetime's mission. Next, a semantic differential scale was used to measure the expressed inclination of respondents to engage in three different behaviors regarding Wish of a Lifetime: visiting its webpage, volunteering, and donating. The scale

was originally designed for purchase behavior, but the items are general enough to relate to other types of behavior as well. The researcher wanted to test respondents' intended involvement without the influence of the video.

4. VIDEO

www.vimeo.com/74885374

Next, respondents were asked to view a short video created by Wish of a Lifetime. The video was embedded into the survey, and respondents simply had to press play. It is three minutes and twenty-three seconds in length.

In regard to content, the video is in black and white and shows senior citizens holding sheets of paper with various statements written on them. The first woman holds a paper asking "What do you see when you look at me?" Other seniors then appear, holding sheets with adjectives such as old, weak, dependent, and incapable. "Maybe you don't notice me", one woman expresses. Other individuals then explain that their families do not visit them, their friends have passed away, and they live on fixed income. "But did you know?" another senior asks.

Then (with an upbeat change in music), senior citizens explain how they helped win a World War, how they mentor at-risk children, and how they volunteered to save the country. These men and women are soldiers and volunteers who have sacrificed it all in the midst of wars and the Great Depression. They have contributed to the morale of following generations, and they feel they have courage, wisdom, independence, and value. The video ends with the statement: "Making dreams come true... One wish at a

time”. Wish of a Lifetime then provides their website and the video fades to black. The video suggests no call to action.

After respondents view the video, they are asked to state in one word how they feel about the video they just watched.

5. EMOTIONAL QUOTIENT SCALE AND REACTION PROFILE (Bearden et al, 1999, p 282)

Next, respondents are surveyed to measure ad recall. An important dimension of ad recall, especially for nonprofit videos intended to go viral, is emotional appeal. Two scales were used that assess emotional reaction to the video. The first is the Emotional Quotient scale; it measures an overall emotional reaction toward the video. The next scale, the Reaction Profile, assesses three specific reactions: attractiveness, meaningfulness, and vitality. These scales were originally designed to test emotional reactions to print ads, but were deemed suitable for video content as well.

The Emotional Quotient scale is made up of 12 Likert statements; half are favorably worded and the other half are unfavorably worded. An individual’s score can range from 0 to 100. Scores are derived by adding up the number of agreements with favorable items and the number of disagreements with unfavorable items. The researcher then divides by 12 and multiplies by 100, giving a score between 0 and 100.

Most importantly, respondents’ EQ scores give insight into how successfully the video integrated some of Berger and Mills’s components: social currency, emotion, and spreadability in particular.

The Reaction Profile has 25 items and is a semantic differential scale. Twelve items measure attractiveness, 9 measure meaningfulness, and 5 measure vitality. Items

are scored on an 8 point scale. Scores can then be summed in each dimension and averaged by the number of items within each dimension to form scores.

The Reaction Profile also does a good job representing several factors discussed by Berger and Mills including practical value, stories, and spreadability.

6. VIEWER JUDGEMENT OF ADS: THE PERSUASIVE DISCLOSURE INVENTORY (Bearden et al, 1999, p 289)

The next scale was used to measure viewers' judgments of the Wish of a Lifetime video. The scale was originally created to model the persuasive discourse perspective. This perspective is based on the Aristotelian theory of rhetoric, which looks at ethos, pathos, and logos. Ethos refers to persuasive appeals that focus on the source (Wish of a Lifetime). Pathos is the appeal to the audience's emotions, and logos is the logical appeal of the advertisement. These ethos, pathos, and logos questions successfully encapsulate Berger's six STEPPS, especially social currency, emotion, and practical value.

The scale is comprised of 17 bipolar adjective sets using an eight-point format. There are five ethos items, five logos items, and seven pathos items. The three different factors are summed up; ethos and logos can have a score between five and 40 and pathos can have a score between five and 56.

7. BEHAVIORAL INTENTION – WISH OF A LIFETIME, POST VIDEO VIEWING (Bruner et al, 2005, p 106)

Respondents are then asked to report their behavioral intentions again after seeing the video. The same semantic differential scale was used to measure the expressed inclination of respondents to engage in four behaviors regarding Wish of a Lifetime: sharing the video, visiting its webpage, volunteering, and donating. This will provide

important insights into whether Wish of a Lifetime's video effectively changed respondents' minds about the brand and their intentions. Percent changes in behavioral intention will be calculated, alongside Paired T-Tests to determine statistical significance.

8. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION – AGE AND GENDER

Finally, respondents are asked to report their age and gender. These demographics will be used to identify whether age and gender have any relationship with feelings toward nonprofit advertisements and behavioral intention.

V. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Initially, the researcher conducted a pretest to examine the validity of the study and clarify content and wording. The sample comprised 50 undergraduate students who were recruited from an undergraduate business course. After analyzing the data from the pre-test, minor changes were made to the structure of the survey including length and order of questions. These changes were made in order to get a clearer and more accurate picture of the respondents' feelings. It was important to collect the sample's age and gender in order to identify segments more or less likely to respond favorably.

This was a convenience sample conducted at the University of Mississippi. Thus, the study observes attitudes within the context of undergraduate business students and cannot be generalized to any larger population. College students were believed to be a good population with which to study attitudes and behavioral intention, since they are in large part very present on social media and entering a point in their lives where they will have the resources to donate to and volunteer for NPOs.

261 people were recruited from the University of Mississippi Business School to complete the survey. A recruitment email and the link to the survey were sent out to students in three different business courses. Students were offered ten points extra credit in reward for completing the survey. Participation was completely voluntary, and 131 people actually completed the survey. Of those who completed the survey, the average age was 22. 40.7 percent were male and 59.3 percent were female.

VI. RESULTS

A. CONTENT ANALYSIS

To better understand the characteristics and organizational impacts of nonprofit viral marketing campaigns, the following section will include content analyses of four viral videos: two nonprofit campaigns that went viral and two campaigns that failed to go viral. We will define “going viral” as garnering over one million views.

In Tables 3 and 4 (Appendix B), the researcher takes the four videos discussed and incorporates them with both Jonah Berger’s 6 STEPSS framework and Mills’ SPIN Framework. Conclusively in both frameworks, performance on each element directly relates to video viewership. KONY 2012 ranked highest in both frameworks and also garnered the most views. Moreover, “What is United Way?” performed the poorest in both frameworks and had the lowest viewership. This suggests that both Berger and Mills’s research have devised accurate approaches to analyzing virality.

1. Invisible Children – KONY 2012 – over 100,000,000 views (Invisible Children, 2012)

Invisible Children’s “Kony2012” documentary-style video garnered 70 million views in its first five days online (Wilson, 2012). The thirty minute documentary sets out to make Joseph Kony and the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) a household name in order to secure his arrest (Brigham & Noland, 2014). Before Invisible Children’s advocacy campaign, the West knew very little about the LRA in Africa. Jason Russell, leader of

Invisible Children, created Kony 2012 to raise awareness, educate, infuriate, and inspire its audience to take action. Invisible Children launched the video on its own personal website and on YouTube. Quickly, stars including Oprah and Justin Bieber were sharing Kony 2012. The message subsequently appeared on news stations such as NBC and CNN (Bal et al., 2013). The most jaw-dropping aspect of Kony 2012's ultimate virality was its content. The video was political in nature and nearly thirty minutes in length. Most viral content is the opposite- entertaining and brief.

One thing that made Kony 2012 so successful was the appeal of its message. In general, people care about and respond to atrocities such as child slavery. Moreover, people want their peers to know that they care about these atrocities. Kony 2012 was spreadable because its message, in essence, was that by sharing the video and increasing the awareness of Kony, one could make a difference in the world.

Invisible Children's campaign was also extremely easy to pass along. Individuals simply had to share the link via YouTube onto other modes of social media such as Facebook and Twitter. The video's primary purpose was to be passed along, and social media was the perfect avenue to do so. Kony 2012 also quickly integrated through both social and traditional media platforms. The video was not only widespread on Facebook, but it was also highlighted by news outlets including CNN and the *New York Times*. Lastly, Kony 2012 had great nexus. Invisible Children followed up on Kony 2012 with two more videos: *Move* and *Beyond Famous*. Both videos successfully reinforced Kony 2012's original message (Bal et al., 2013). KONY 2012 started as a video, but it became a movement overnight.

2. Water is Life – First World Problems Anthem – over 6,000,000 views (Water is Life, 2012)

In 2012, a United States marketing firm, DDB, crafted a campaign for the nonprofit Water is Life (Water is Life, 2012). According to its webpage, Water is Life is an organization whose mission is to provide clean water, sanitation and hygiene programs. The video is one minute in length and features Haitians reading actual tweets with the hashtag “#firstworldproblems”. One young boy, sitting on a mound of dirt, reads aloud: “I hate when my leather seats aren’t heated” (Water is Life, 2012). A young girl, standing in front of a group of children washing their clothes in a river, states: “When I leave my clothes in the washer so long they start to smell” (Water is Life, 2012). The campaign attempts to shed light on the irony and ignorance of #firstworldproblems.

First World Problems Anthem is unique in that it takes an already popular trend and points out an inherent flaw: these are not real problems. Given its strong emotional appeal and reference to popular culture, First World Problems Anthem was very spreadable. Individuals who shared this video would likely do so to seem aware of and active in the #firstworldproblems trend and also in-the-know with issues present in third world countries. Like Kony 2012, the video was posted on YouTube allowing it to be easily spread. The video caught media attention from outlets such as Huffington Post and The Guardian. Water is Life executed great nexus with its #firstworldproblems campaign. The organization published eight follow up videos on its YouTube page. One directly addresses a tweet from a man named Jordan with the hashtag “#firstworldproblems”:

“There really isn’t anything worse than leaving your headphones at home.
#firstworldproblems” (Water is Life, 2012). The video then transitions to a Haitian

village and a young boy sitting on dirty steps. The boy says, “Dear Jordan, my name is Sadrock. If I was there, I’d get them for you” (Water is Life, 2012). The organizations then calls viewers to action, asking them to donate to real problems.

3. United Way – What is United Way? – 12,000 views (United Way, 2014)

United Way is a well-known and well-established nonprofit organization whose aim is to develop systems of volunteers willing to help people in their own community. In 2014, United Way posted a video on their YouTube channel titled “What is United Way?” (United Way, 2014). The video is extremely informative in nature, explaining its origins, successes, and announces itself as the “World’s Largest Nonprofit Organization.” The video expresses the organization’s mission and strategic initiatives. It ends thanking its volunteers and asking viewers to join the movement.

The video is solely text; it involves no live action. The video lacks much emotional appeal or social currency, making it very unlikely that viewers find any reason to share it. The video was posted on YouTube and on the United Way website. Seeing that most media outlets already know what United Way is, there was little reason for the video to gain traction in traditional marketing mediums. Lastly, the organization provides no follow-up videos further describing United Way’s cause or perhaps showing United Way in action.

4. Boys and Girls Club of America – Great Futures Campaign – 13,000 views (Boys and Girls Club, 2014)

The Boys and Girls Club of America launched a Public Service Announcement with the message that “every afternoon is a chance to change America’s future” (Boys and

Girls Club, 2014). The video shows children leaving school at 3 p.m. and explains that one-third of these children have nowhere to go afterward. It shows children wondering around in alleys and on train tracks. It then shows children at a local Boys and Girls Club. At the end of the video, the narrator explains, “great futures start here” (Boys and Girls Club, 2014).

With only 13,000 views in its six months online, this video failed to go viral. Although it is more live action than United Way’s video, it still lacks any strong or urgent emotional appeal. Not much is taken away from this video that viewers could not have already deduced from their prior knowledge about the Boys and Girls Club of America.

Applying Frameworks – Tables 3 and 4

According to Berger’s Six STEPPS framework, KONY 2012 and First World Problems Anthem both had all or a majority of the elements necessary to make content go viral. This is proven when looking at the number of views each video received. United Way and the Boys and Girls Club, on the other hand, performed much worse on each dimension and one could argue that their low viewerships are a direct result.

It is important to note that in Table 3, Appendix B, none of the videos studied contained much practical value. This could perhaps be because nonprofits inherently offer little practical value to the viewer/donor himself. The information sets out to inspire individuals to help others, rather than to help themselves. If a nonprofit could somehow develop a way to incorporate practical value into its campaign, it could further increase its chances to reach millions.

The results of applying Mills's SPIN Framework to each video agrees with Berger's six STEPPS. Kony 2012, again, performed the best and United Way received the lowest score. It should be noted that Mills's Framework deals more with message transmission and Berger's STEPPS deal with message content. Integrating the two frameworks together could be very helpful for nonprofit organizations looking to create viral campaigns.

B. SURVEY ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

Appendix A includes the survey with annotated means and standard deviations. Table 2, Appendix B summarizes the mean scores for each variable studied in the survey. The following discussion briefly analyzes each individual result.

Social Desirability Bias

The mean score for respondents' Social Desirability Bias was 13.16 on a 16 point scale. The standard deviation was 2.180. This suggests that the sample's responses may be somewhat reflective of their needs to make a good impression. As seen in Table 5, Appendix B, SDR was tested for correlation with respondents' reported behavioral intention after viewing the ad. The test indicated a very low correlation between the two variables (.057). Therefore, SDR bias seemed to have little effect on the sample's subsequent responses.

Attitudes toward Helping Others and Attitudes toward Charitable Organizations

The mean score (on a 6 point scale) for attitudes toward helping others and

attitudes toward charitable organizations was 4.94 and 4.64, respectively. The standard deviations were .7878 and .6778, respectively. This implies that the sample under observation did not hold an overwhelming negative connotation nor an overwhelming positive bias toward NPOs. The sample's responses to these two scales suggest that it was a relatively objective group to study attitudes and changes in behavioral intention.

Wish of a Lifetime Probabilities

Before viewing the video, the mean scores and standard deviations for each behavioral intention are as follows (respectively, on a 7 point scale):

- Probability of visiting webpage- 4.57; 1.37
- Probability of volunteering- 4.64; 1.46
- Probability of donating- 4.67; 1.48

After viewing the video, respondents were asked to rate the same probabilities. Additionally, respondents were asked to rate the probability that they would share the video with others. The following means and standard deviations were reported:

- Probability of visiting web page- 4.94; 1.49
- Probability of volunteering- 4.97; 1.65
- Probability of donating- 4.94; 1.49
- Probability of sharing the video: 4.79; 1.53

Thus, watching Wish of a Lifetime's promotional video resulted in the following percent changes in behavioral intention:

Table 1

Change in Behavioral Intention after Viewing Advertisement

	Before	After	% Change
Webpage	4.57	4.94	8.10%
Volunteering	4.64	4.97	7.11%
Donating	4.67	4.94	5.78%
Sharing		4.79	
Overall	4.62	4.91	6.29%

By averaging each respondent's reported probabilities for each different behavior before and after being exposed to the video, the overall average behavioral intention increased by 6.29%. In order to determine whether this change in behavioral intention was statistically significant, both a T-Test and ANOVA were conducted. These results can be seen in Tables 6 and 7, Appendix B. The Paired T-Test showed that in the context of this sample, the change in probabilities (before and after viewing the video) of visiting the webpage, volunteering, and donating were all statistically significantly higher. The average probability of visiting Wish of a Lifetime's webpage increased with the most significance, followed by volunteering and then donating. It could be argued that the reason for this is due to the increase in level of engagement with each subsequent behavior. Visiting the nonprofit's webpage has relatively little involvement, whereas volunteering or donating require a much higher level of commitment. Finally, in order to strengthen the argument that the change in behavioral intention was statistically significant, a one-way ANOVA between overall behavioral intention before and after was analyzed. This test also supports a significant difference between reported probabilities,

with a p-value of 0.000072. In summary, the respondents' reported behavioral intentions were indeed positively influenced by the video they watched.

Emotional Quotient

The first scale used to assess respondents' feelings toward the ad was the EQ Scale. The mean score (on a scale of 1 to 100) was 74.06. As seen in Table 5, Appendix B, respondents' EQ Scores were significantly correlated to their reported behavioral intentions after viewing the ad (.574). Thus, significant weight should be placed on the elements in the Emotional Quotient scale as predictors of change in behavioral intention after viewing an advertisement. High scores on the EQ Scale are closely related to a high score on behavioral probabilities surveyed.

Reaction Profile

Next, respondents were asked to assess the video using the reaction profile scale. This was scored on an 8 point scale. Low scores reflect positive adjectives (beautiful, pleasant, gentle), and higher scores reflect negative alternatives (ugly, unpleasant, harsh). This scale has three different dimensions: attractiveness, meaningfulness, and vitality. The mean score for each dimension, respectively, was 3.25, 2.49, and 3.35. Wish of a Lifetime's video performed best on the meaningfulness dimension (2.49) and worst on the vitality dimension (3.25). The average overall Reaction Profile score was 3.03. This scale was also significantly correlated to reported behavioral intention (-.486), as seen in Table 5, Appendix B. Lower scores signified a higher reported behavioral intention.

Persuasive Discourse Inventory

The PDI is a 17-item 8 point scale. Contrary to the Reaction Profile, low scores represent negative adjectives and high scores represent positive adjectives. The inventory assesses attitudes on three dimensions: ethos, logos, and pathos. Scores range from 1 to 100. The mean score for ethos, logos, and pathos (respectively) were: 81.23, 76.43, and 77.03. The average score overall was 78.23. The PDI was also significantly correlated to behavioral intention (.561).

Factor Analysis

Next, a factor analysis was conducted to reduce the number of variables applicable for a regression. The intent was to identify sets of adjectives that respondents had similar feelings toward. The analysis found correlations among variables in the Reaction Profile and the Persuasive Discourse Inventory. Initially, six components were identified. Only one variable was left in the sixth component after considering cross-loading, so it was eliminated from further analysis. Table 8, Appendix B, shows these components in detail. The researcher named each component by taking its variables into account and finding a common theme among them. The final five components are as follows: reliability of source, memorability of the ad, visual impact of the ad, perceived comfort of the ad, and emotional stimulation.

The first component was identified as “Reliability of Source”, because it comprised variables including “Dependable”, “Reliable”, and “Credible”. The second component was labeled “Memorability” and included variables such as “Easy to understand”, “Honest”, and “Easy to Remember”. The third component, “Visual Impact” pertained to variables including “Colorful”, “Lively”, and “Fresh”. “Perceived Comfort

of Ad” was the fourth component and was dominated by variables like “Pleasant”, “Gentle”, and “Comforting”. The fifth and final component was “Emotional Stimulation”; statements such as “Touches me emotionally”, “Effects my feelings”, and “Is moving” characterized this component.

Regression Analysis

Finally, a regression analysis was conducted. The dependent variable was the respondent’s behavioral intention after viewing the ad. Independent variables were: Emotional Quotient score, reliability of source, memorability of the ad, visual impact of the ad, perceived comfort of the ad, emotional stimulation, and gender. The regression took the five factors identified largely into account, as well as the respondent’s gender. Also, the respondent’s Emotional Quotient score statistically proved to be a strong indicator of behavioral intention so it was included.

The intent of this regression analysis was to explore how much variance in a respondent’s behavioral intention could be explained by the variables studied in the survey. Within the bounds of the sample, the results supported the researcher’s hypothesis that viral ad campaigns can have an effect on an individual’s perception of a brand. The adjusted R Square (seen in Table 9) was .510. This is indicative of the fact that 51% of the variance in behavioral intention after viewing the ad can be explained by the seven variables tested in the model. Table 9, Appendix B, shows the reported Betas and p-values. The following equation was derived:

$$Y_{it} = (.043)EQScore + (.222)Reliability + (.217)Memorability + (-.314)VisualImpact + (.319)Comfort + (.349)EmotionalStimulation + (.164)Gender + 1.686$$

It is important to note however, that each variable in the model was scored on a different point scale. Consequentially, the standardized Betas should be discussed. As seen in Table 10, Appendix B, Emotional Quotient Score and Emotional Stimulation had the largest standardized Betas (.471 and .266, respectively). Emotions prove to be a strong indicator of a call to action. This indicates that these two variables had the largest effect on reported behavioral intention. In descending order, the standardized betas for the other four variables were as follows: Impact (-.237), Comfort (.238), Reliability of Source (.169), Memorability (.155), and Gender (.062). Table 11, Appendix B shows the regression's residual statistics. The regression line in Figure 1, Appendix B resulted from the analysis. With a 95% confidence interval, the regression (Table 10, Appendix B) indicates that Memorability, Reliability, and Gender were not statistically significant.

VII. Discussion

Today's consumer culture- largely characterized by a fast-paced lifestyle and a strong reliance on social media- is defined by immense advertising clutter. Every day, brands (both for-profit and not-for-profit) are throwing themselves at individuals and groups in an attempt to persuade them to take action. Sometimes, these attempts come with a large cost to the marketer. Advertisers line interstates with expensive billboard campaigns; they take up one-third of many television programs with their commercials. Other times, these attempts come at little expense to the marketer. In these cases, brands manage to seamlessly weave their message into online conversations.

The truth is, consumers today are busy. They often claim they have "no time" to volunteer for or donate to a charity. Consumers already have a long list of things they *need* to do and *need* to buy, so why would they bother taking the time to sift through NPO messages- which will in large part provide them with no tangible benefits? However, despite how busy consumers claim to be, they still make time for social media. Consumers value their time online connecting with others, and whether intended or not, this time online results in the formation of strong opinions and intentions toward brands. Companies that can manage to grab hold of the online consumer's attention for even a brief second have the ability to make a strong, lasting impression.

Even still, how do NPOs compete with large corporations for a consumer's attention online? At best, many NPOs (especially small, local ones) have one or two employees devoted to marketing and development. At worst, no employee in the company has even taken a course on basic marketing principles. How can these small

nonprofits with little marketing experience push through the clutter and gain traction online? NPOs may feel like they have the odds stacked against them, but this research should serve as a case in point that nonprofits, even smaller ones, can and should attempt to take advantage of viral marketing.

Considering Berger's six STEPPS, Mills's Spin Framework, and the primary research conducted during this study, nonprofits may actually stand at an advantage when it comes to crafting content with the potential to go viral. As shown, the strongest and most prevailing common thread between the frameworks and nonprofit campaigns discussed is the level of emotion in the message. In order for consumers to consider sharing a message they see online, they must feel emotionally connected to it. Nonprofits are in a great position to take advantage of this. These organizations inherently have a passionate message to share. Nonprofits at their core came to existence for a greater good; their messages naturally evoke emotion. The trick is to use online content to materialize the intangible value that comes from being involved with a nonprofit in any way (donating, volunteering, etc.). Moreover, a nonprofit must do this in a way that is both unique to its organization and powerful in a way that consumers cannot ignore. Nonprofits need to craft viral content that leaves viewers feeling like they have *no choice* but to take action.

Aided by the review of literature and the results of both qualitative and quantitative analyses, several insights have been developed regarding how NPOs can craft original online content that possesses certain qualities making it more likely to go viral. Second, important guidelines are outlined for creating messages that not only go viral but also call viewers to action.

What themes can NPOs identify in order to develop successful viral marketing campaigns?

The aim of this research is to help smaller, local nonprofits with less resources successfully do what larger, more global brands have been able to do in the past. By incorporating four common themes among previous viral videos and making them relevant to its own brand, smaller nonprofits have the opportunity to have their message heard by millions.

1. Emotional Stimulation

The quantitative research conducted indicated emotional stimulation as a strong indicator of whether or not the video was well-received. Respondents' EQ score significantly correlated with behavioral intention. The factor analysis also identified emotional stimulation as a significant determinant of intended behavior. In looking at four previous viral campaigns, the qualitative research also showed that messages with high levels of emotion were more likely to go viral. The Boys and Girls Club as well as United Way failed to emotionally connect to viewers. In effect, they failed to go viral.

When crafting future video content, NPOs should devote immense energy into developing a real emotional connection with their audiences. Instead of using content as a megaphone to express an organization's mission, content needs to connect to viewers on an emotional level to have any chance of going viral. In turn, these emotions developed will leave viewers feeling like they have no choice but to share the video, donate, or volunteer. From laughter to anxiety, strong emotions increase the likelihood of video sharing.

In the case of local nonprofits, emotional stimulation can be achieved through connectivity. Often with these smaller NPOs, the audience is somehow tied to the mission. The issue is happening in viewers' backyards, heightening emotional stimulation since it is often so closely related to their day-to-day activities.

2. Credibility

Another common thread among many successful nonprofit video campaigns is the credibility of the source. This has less to do with the video's message and more to do with the organization itself. In order to have a chance at reaching viral status, a nonprofit needs to establish credibility among the audience. This can be done by being transparent in all aspects of operations. Establishing credibility as a nonprofit requires a history of success in fulfilling its mission, respectable leaders in charge of the organization, and a transparent webpage that backs these claims up.

Local nonprofits can gain credibility by making an effort to be visible in their community. Whether by showing up to community events, making announcements at church services, or coordinating events with local schools, NPOs must make themselves visible and necessary in the eyes of their communities in order to be viewed as credible. If your organization is not present in the community, why should the community feel a need to be present in fulfilling your organization's mission?

3. Social Relevance

Yet another theme among viral videos in the nonprofit sector is whether or not it is relevant to the viewer and his network. Berger identifies this as social currency and practical value; Mills defines this as spreadability. Whatever the name, it is apparent that

a message needs to be socially relevant in order to be shared. If an individual does not feel that a message pertains to him/ his friends, he has little reason to share it.

A nonprofit should create content that asserts itself as relevant to society. Develop a message that comes across as important and necessary to anyone who views it. One way to do this is to tie it into popular culture. For local nonprofits, considering current events in the community can help increase social relevance. Again, being present and involved is really key.

4. Ease of Distribution

Finally, a message needs to be easy to distribute in order for it to go viral. Social media makes this the easy part; thanks to Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, and many more sites, viewers can share your message with the click of a button. Beyond the scope of social media, nonprofits should consider how easy to share/relevant news outlets will consider the content. Before finalizing a video, nonprofits should ask themselves: is my content so original/ socially relevant that even newspapers and magazines would want to distribute it? Smaller, more locally-focused nonprofits have a greater advantage when it comes to connecting with news outlets. Local news stations are often easily accessible (via phone call or email) and looking for stories relevant to their communities.

How can a NPO's viral marketing campaign change consumers' minds about a brand and thus call them to action?

Even if an NPO's campaign succeeds in going viral, it has little practical value if it does not call consumers to action. Viral videos may increase awareness, but awareness without any measureable results will do little good for an organization's mission. Content

needs to have significant affective and cognitive results; this will make the message more likely to lead to behavior. This can be seen as a chain effect, each aspect is necessary and builds up to the next. A message needs to resonate affectively and cognitively before leading to behavioral action. For example, content that is simply informational may induce cognitive responses, but without any level of heightened emotion leading to affective responses, viewers are unlikely to express much behavioral intention.

The research previously mentioned by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) identified three different types of nonprofit video content: information, community, or action. I propose that rather than exclusively belonging to one of these types, a nonprofit campaign should possess the qualities of all three categories. A nonprofit needs to create a message that informs the audience of its mission, demonstrates that participation or donation will benefit a community or network at large, and expresses a dire need for action.

Paramount to successfully calling consumers to action is developing measurable goals. Having a video campaign reach over a million views is not a real goal, since it does not on its own signal an increase in donations or a larger volunteer base. Instead, a nonprofit can set a more tangible and measureable objective such as ten percent of those views turning into donations. With this as a goal, 1,000,000 views should result in a \$100,000 increase in donations. This could be very possible if the organization encourages micro-giving. Thus, if ten percent of the 1,000,000 viewers each give one dollar, the \$100,000 objective is met. A key here is to express this intention in the video.

Conversely, the organization could decide that they want one percent of the number of views as new volunteers. 1,000,000 views should thus garner 1,000 new volunteers. Objectives such as these will help the nonprofit determine if their messages

are actually accomplishing anything. If an objective is not met, it may be time for the organization to reevaluate its viral marketing campaign and try again.

Within the setting of local nonprofits, serving a particular community can result in a more easily accessible body of volunteers and potential donors. For example, local NPOs can and should work with local schools. These young students often have time to volunteer; this time spent volunteering could also turn them into future donors. Many high schools and colleges often require students to volunteer, so by helping your organization they are also fulfilling a need for themselves. The key is to have a compelling message that resonates with this audience and makes them want to volunteer to your NPO in particular.

In order to achieve these objectives, the organization needs to be clear about what it wants viewers to do. An emotionally stimulating, personally relevant video has the power to lead to action, but if there is no call to action mentioned many viewers will not know what to do. One example of being clear about intentions is to provide a direct link to a donation page, or a phone number to contact about volunteering. This also means that a nonprofit's platforms (its website, YouTube channel, Facebook page, etc.) need to be seamlessly connected. NPOs need to help facilitate the process of donating, and one way to do this is to leave little question about where individuals need to go to donate. Following these steps should help move an online audience to offline action in the form of donating and/or volunteering. Viewers appreciate honesty and cannot help your organization if you do not ask for help and provide a way to make it happen.

In conclusion, viral marketing is a relatively new phenomenon. Like any new phenomenon, it may seem daunting or even impossible to the uninformed marketer.

However, nonprofit organizations stand with much to gain from viral marketing. They also possess a lot of the qualities necessary for content to go viral. Hopefully this body of work has made the idea of crafting messages with the potential to both go viral and lead to action seem more tangible than before.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Certain aspects of the research methodology limited the implications of the results. One major limitation is the bias that often comes with a convenience sample. Moreover, given that the research can only be applied to the attitudes and intentions of university students, the study does not get a full picture of the entire population's feelings toward NPOs and their online campaigns. Nonresponse bias also resulted in some survey results being eliminated.

Future research could significantly add to the study. Another study with a larger demographic and sample size could more adequately encapsulate the average NPO's target audience. This could lead to stronger generalizations and assumptions regarding what makes NPO content go viral and call consumers to action. Also, this study only looked at feelings toward one NPO's campaign. Future studies should incorporate several different campaigns to allow for greater comparison.

Additionally, this research unintentionally identified differences between global and local nonprofit campaigns. Any subsequent research could look at these differences in a more controlled environment in order to potentially identify similarities and differences in strategy and success between the two types of NPO. This type of study could help small, local NPOs borrow from strategies used by more global nonprofits and customize them to their own organization.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Andreasan, A. (2012). Rethinking the Relationship between Social/ Nonprofit Marketing and Commercial Marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 31(1), 36-41.
- Bal, A.S., Archer-Brown, C., Robson, K., & Hall, D.E. (2013). Do good, goes bad, gets ugly: Kony 2012. *Journal of Public Affairs (14723891)*, 13(2), 202-208.
- Bearden, W.O., Netemeyer, R.G. & Haws, K.L. (1999). Handbook of Marketing Scales: multi-item measures for marketing and consumer behavior research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bearden, W.O., Netemeyer, R.G. & Haws, K.L. (2011). Handbook of Marketing Scales: multi-item measures for marketing and consumer behavior research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. P. 165
- Berger, J. (2012). Why Things Catch On. Simon & Schuster: New York.
- Botha, E. & Reyneke, M. (2013). To Share or Not to Share: The Role of Content and Emotion in Viral Marketing. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 13(2), 160-171.
- Boys & Girls Club of America. (2014). *Great Futures Campaign PSA* [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://youtu.be/r8li9r5LRsg>
- Brigham, M.P. & Noland, A.K. (2014). Making Humanitarian Advocacy Less “Abstract and Remote”. KONY 2012’s Representation of an Agent-Centered Approach. *Florida Communication Journal*, 42(2), 51-67.
- Bruner, G.C., Hensel, P.J., & James, K.E (2005). Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures, volume IV/ Gordon C. Bruner II, Paul J. Hensel. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, p. 106 – behavioral

Intention

- Cameron, C. (1991). Flow. *Magill's Literary Annual 1991*, 1-3.
- Constant Contact Nonprofit Pulse Surveys Attracting New Supporters Keeping Nonprofits Up at Night. (7 August 2012). *Constant Contact Media Newsroom*.
- Daniasa, C., Tomita, V., Stuparu, D., & Stanciu, M. (2010). The Mechanisms of the Influence of Viral Marketing in Social Media. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, 5(3), 278-282.
- File, T. & Ryan, C. (2014). Computer Use in the United States: 2013. *American Community Survey Reports*.
- Hausmann, A. (2012). Creating 'buzz': Opportunities and limitations of social media for arts institutions and their viral marketing. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17, 173-182.
- Henke, L. (2013). Breaking Through the Clutter: The Impact of Emotions and Flow on Viral Marketing. *Academy of Marketing Studies*, 17, 111-118
- Invisible Children. (2012). *KONY 2012* [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://youtu.be/Y4MnpzG5Sqc>
- Kotler, P., & Andreasen, A. (1991). *Strategic Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for Introducing Marketing into Nonprofit Organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 43, 37-44.
- Lang, B. & Hyde, K. (2013). Word of Mouth: What We Know and What We Have Yet To Learn. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction & Complaining Behavior*, 26, 2-17

- Liu-Thompkins, Y. (2012). Seeding Viral Content: The Role of Message and Network Factors. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 465-479.
- Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. (2012). Information, Community, and Action: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Social Media. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 17, 337-353.
- Maude, M.R. Marketing is Different in the Not-for-Profit World. *Partners in Philanthropy*. <http://www.develop-net.com/articles/marketing-is-different-for-non-profits.html>
- Mills, A.J. (2012). Virality in social media: the SPIN Framework. *Journal of Public Affairs (14723891)* 12(2), 162-169.
- Mochalove, A., & Nanopoulos, A. (2013). A Targeted Approach to Viral Marketing. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 13, 283-294.
- O'Toole, E. (October 2012). Despite its flaws, #firstworldproblems ad campaign breaks new ground. *The Guardian*.
- Phethean, C., Tiropanie, T. & Harris, L. (2012). Measuring the Performance of Social Media Marketing In the Charitable Domain. *WebSci 2012*.
- Pope, J. , Isely, E., & Asamoah-Tutu, F. (2009). Developing a Marketing Strategy for Nonprofit Organizations: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 21, 182-201.
- Robinson, J., Shave, P., Wrightsman, L. (2013). *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*. Academic Press, 2013. Page 43
- Scott, D. (2008). The New Rules of Viral Marketing: How word-of-mouth spreads your ideas for

free.

Sharma, R. (March 2014). How Nonprofits Use Social Media to Engage with their Communities. *Nonprofit Quarterly*

Pew Research Center. (2014). Social Media Update 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/>

United Way. (2014). *What is United Way?* [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://youtu.be/tDxOTD6dYm>

Water is Life. (2012). *First World Problems Anthem* [Video File]. Retrieved from http://youtu.be/fxyhfiCO_XQ

Water is Life. (2012). *First World Problems Response to @DanJordan2001* [Video File]. Retrieved from http://youtu.be/VmdkRQ_6-qE?list=PLNefYveISOJn-0MLwPYoAyS1ssiDXGKi2

Waters, R. & Jones, P. (2011). Using Video to Build an Organization's Identity and Brand: A content Analysis of Nonprofit Organizations' YouTube Videos. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 23. 248-268.

Wilson, R. (2012). 'KONY' Surprises as Record-Setting Viral. *Advertising Age*, 83(11), 2.

Wish of a Lifetime (2015). Webpage. Retrieved on 27 February 2015. <http://seniorwish.org/>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. Do not omit any items.

	Agree	Disagree	Mean/ Std.Dev
I find that I can help others in many ways.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	1.00/.00
To get along with people one must put on an act.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.86/.346
I often feel that no one needs me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.82/.382
I feel that I am better off than my parents were at my age.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.69/.465
I am so fed up that I can't take it anymore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.88/.329
In spite of many changes, there are still definite rules to live by.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.96/.192
It is difficult to think clearly about right and wrong these days.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.73/.444
One can always find friends if one tries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.91/.290
At times I feel that I am a stranger to myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.69/.465
The future looks very bleak.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.86/.346
Anyone can raise his or her standard of living if one is willing to work at it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.95/.226
If the odds are against you, it's impossible to come out on top.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.95/.210
Most people really believe that honesty is the best policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.73/.444
In general, I am satisfied with my lot in life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.93/.254
Many people are friendly only because they want something from you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.60/.492
People will be honest with you as long as you are honest with them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	.60/.493

Below are a number of statements regarding attitudes toward helping others. Please read each one and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean/ Std. Dev
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.20/.811
Helping troubled people with their problems is very important to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.86/.986
People should be more charitable toward others in society.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.92/1.009
People in need should receive support from others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.78/1.004

Below are a number of statements regarding attitudes toward charitable organizations. Please read each one and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean/ Std. Dev
The money given to charities goes to good causes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.66/.866
My image of charitable organizations is positive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.98/.855
Charitable organizations have been quite successful in helping the needy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.66/.830
Much of the money donated to charities is wasted.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.05/1.269
Charity organizations provide a useful function for society	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.88/.794

Wish of a Lifetime is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to foster respect and appreciation for senior citizens by fulfilling life enriching Wishes. Wishes granted fall under one of four categories: reconnecting loved ones, commemorating service, fulfilling lifelong dreams, and renewing passions.

Based on the information given about this organization, please indicate your feelings toward the following statements.

Rate the probability that you would visit this organization's webpage.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.31/1.761
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.72/1.636
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.49/1.606
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.19/1.484
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.28/1.686
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.43/1.521

Rate the probability that you would volunteer for this organization

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.58/1.716
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.76/1.534
Improbable:Probably	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.60/1.625
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.11/1.559
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.45/1.560
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.58/1.394

Rate the probability that you would donate to this organization.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.64/1.629
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.70/1.603
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.65/1.663
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.99/1.611
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.47/1.623
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.63/1.472

Please take a moment to watch the following video

<http://vimeo.com/seniorwish>

In one word, please express your feelings about the video you just watched. _____

Below are a number of statements regarding feelings toward this Wish of a Lifetime video. Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean/ Std. Dev.
This video is very appealing to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.62/ 1.149
I would probably skip this video if I were exposed to it online.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.04/ 1.625
This is a heart-warming video.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.05/ 1.113
This video makes me want to support the brand it features.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.65/ 1.080
This video has little interest for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.18/ 1.508
I dislike this video.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.69/ 1.478
This video makes me feel good.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.54/ 1.604
This is a wonderful video.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.46/ 1.271
This is the kind of video you forget easily.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.01/ 1.521
This is a fascinating video.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.08/ 1.446
I'm tired of this type of advertising.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.84/ 1.602
This video leaves me cold.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.06/ 1.669

For each set of adjective select the point that most accurately reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the video you just watched. **This scale is a continuum, in which respondents choose a point between the pair of bipolar adjectives

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Mean/ Std. Dev
Beautiful:Ugly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.62/1.457
Pleasant:Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.31/1.745
Gentle:Harsh	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.99/1.739
Appealing:Unappealing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.89/1.455
Attractive:Unattractive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.34/1.453
In good taste:In poor taste	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.79/1.558
Exciting:Unexciting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.45/1.620
Interesting:Uninteresting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.70/1.545
Worth looking at:Not worth looking at	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.50/1.569
Comforting:Frightening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.58/1.696
Colorful:Colorless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.58/2.025
Fascinating:Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.30/1.632
Meaningful:Meaningless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.10/1.394
Convincing:Unconvincing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.63/1.663
Important to me:Unimportant to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.14/1.630
Strong:Weak	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.41/1.514
Honest:Dishonest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.17/1.485
Easy to remember:Hard to remember	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.38/1.468
Easy to understand:Hard to understand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.02/1.332
Worth remembering:Not worth remembering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.29/1.554
Simple:Complicated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2.66/1.529
New:Ordinary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.59/1.700
Fresh:Stale	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.42/1.577
Lively:Lifeless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.76/1.628
Sharp:Washed out	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3.32/1.673

For each set of adjectives select the point that most accurately reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the video you just watched. **This scale is a continuum, in which respondents choose a point between the pair of bipolar adjectives

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unbelievable:Believable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.60/1.530
Not credible:Credible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.54/1.411
Not trustworthy:Trustworthy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.56/1.404
Unreliable:Reliable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.48/1.423
Undependable:Dependable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.31/1.460
Not Rational:Rational	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.44/1.532
Not Informative:Informative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.48/1.590
Deals with facts:Does not deal with facts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.07/2.189
Not knowledgeable:Knowledgeable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.26/1.453
Not logical:Logical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.40/1.448
Does not affect my feelings:Affects my feelings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.75/1.469
Does not touch me emotionally:Touches me emotionally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.69/1.583
Is not stimulating:Is stimulating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.22/1.641
Does not reach out to me:Reaches out to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.41/1.568
Is stirring:Is not stirring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.55/1.946
Is not moving:Is moving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6.56/1.553
Is not exciting:Is exciting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.09/1.753

Rate the probability that you would share this video with others.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.74/1.806
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.76/1.673
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.70/1.726
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.28/1.566
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.51/1.684
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.74/1.543

Rate the probability that you would visit this organization's webpage.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.84/1.751
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.00/1.623
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.97/1.633
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.33/1.625
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.74/1.625
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.77/1.520

Rate the probability that you would volunteer for this organization.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.02/1.815
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.13/1.713
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.98/1.756
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.38/1.705
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.72/1.646
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.85/1.586

Rate the probability that you would donate to this organization

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean/ Std. Dev
Unlikely:Likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.83/1.754
Nonexistent:Existent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.97/1.650
Improbable:Probable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.88/1.686
Impossible:Possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5.31/1.559
Uncertain:Certain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.74/1.553
Definitely would not:Definitely would	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4.91/1.455

Please enter your age.

Mean: 22.28 years

Std. Dev: 5.926

What is your gender?

- Male 40.7%
- Female 59.3%

APPENDIX B

Tables and Figures

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
SDR score	131	5	16	13.16	.190	2.180
Attitudes Toward Helping Others Score	130	2.00	6.00	4.9423	.06910	.78783
Attitudes Toward Charitable Organizations Score	131	2.60	6.00	4.6431	.05922	.67777
Average Probability of Visiting Webpage -before	123	1.00	7.00	4.5691	.12312	1.36550
Average Probability of Volunteering -before	122	0	7	4.64	.132	1.460
Average Probability of Donating -before	121	1.00	7.00	4.6702	.13430	1.47734
Average Behavioral Intention - before	121	0	7	4.6211	.131	1.492
Emotional Quotient Score	125	29.76	100.00	74.0611	1.28111	14.32321
Attractiveness Score- Reaction Profile	125	1.00	5.91	3.2490	.10429	1.16599
Meaningfulness Score- Reaction Profile	125	1.00	7.89	2.4926	.11628	1.30005
Vitality Score- Reaction Profile	125	1.00	6.80	3.3504	.11601	1.29706
Total Reaction Profile Score	125	1.00	6.87	3.0305	.10145	1.13425
PDI Ethos Score	124	27.50	100.00	81.2298	1.48576	16.54477
PDI Logos Score	124	20.00	100.00	76.4315	1.41243	15.72817
PDI Pathos Score	124	23.21	100.00	77.0304	1.44017	16.03702
Overall PDI Score	124	23.57	100.00	78.2306	1.27673	14.21705
Probability of Sharing- after	121	1.00	7.00	4.7879	.13942	1.53365

Table 2, (Continued)

Probability of Visiting Webpage - After	121	1.00	7.00	4.9412	.13631	1.49946
Probability of Volunteering-After	121	.00	7.00	4.9683	.15006	1.65066
Probability of Donating-After	121	1.00	7.00	4.9356	.13613	1.49744
Overall Average Behavior Intention - After	121	1.00	7.00	4.9083	.12212	1.34330
Valid N (listwise)	121					

TABLE 3

Berger's Six STEPPS, Applied

	KONY 2012	First World Problem Anthem	What is United Way?	Great Futures Campaign
Social Currency	High	High	Low	Medium
Triggers	High	High	Low	Low
Emotion	High	High	Low	Medium
Public	High	Low	Low	Low
Practical Value	Low	Low	Low	Low
Stories	High	High	Low	Medium

Rank	1	2	4	3
Views	100,000,000	6,000,000	12,000	13,000

TABLE 4

Mills's SPIN Framework, Applied

	KONY 2012	First World Problems Anthem	What is United Way?	Great Futures Campaign
Spreadability	High	High	Low	Medium
Propagativity	High	High	High	High
Integration	High	Medium	Low	Low
Nexus	High	High	Low	Low
Rank	1	2	4	3
Views	100,000,000	6,000,000	12,000	13,000

TABLE 5

Correlations

		Correlations							
		Respondent's SDR score	Respondent's Attitudes Toward	Respondent's Attitudes Toward	Average Behavioral Intention - before	Respondent's Emotional Quotient	Total Reaction Profile Score	Overall PDI Score	Overall Average Behavior Intention -
Respondent's SDR score	Pearson Correlation	1	.196*	.155	.148	.124	-.159	.168	.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.025	.076	.100	.167	.077	.062	.507
	N	131	130	131	125	125	125	124	121
Respondent's Attitudes Toward Helping Others Score	Pearson Correlation	.196*	1	.363**	.504**	.284**	-.326**	.240**	.318**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025		.000	.000	.001	.000	.008	.000
	N	130	130	130	125	124	124	123	121
Respondent's Attitudes Toward Charitable Organizations Score	Pearson Correlation	.155	.363**	1	.334**	.313**	-.203*	.205*	.193*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	.000		.000	.000	.023	.023	.034
	N	131	130	131	125	125	125	124	121
Average Behavioral Intention - before	Pearson Correlation	.148	.504**	.334**	1	.368**	-.386**	.412**	.670**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	125	125	125	125	122	122	121	120
Respondent's Emotional Quotient Score	Pearson Correlation	.124	.284**	.313**	.368**	1	-.720**	.638**	.580**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.167	.001	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	125	124	125	122	125	125	124	121
Total Reaction Profile Score	Pearson Correlation	-.159	-.326**	-.203*	-.386**	-.720**	1	-.737**	-.487**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.077	.000	.023	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	125	124	125	122	125	125	124	121
Overall PDI Score	Pearson Correlation	.168	.240**	.205*	.412**	.638**	-.737**	1	.536**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.008	.023	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	124	123	124	121	124	124	124	121

Table 5 (Continued)

Overall Average Behavior	Pearson Correlation	.061	.318**	.193*	.670**	.580**	-.487**	.536**	1
Intention - After	Sig. (2-tailed)	.507	.000	.034	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	121	121	121	120	121	121	121	121
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).									
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).									

Table 6

Paired T-Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Average Probability of Visiting Webpage (Before & After)	-.35192	1.40637	.12838	-.60613	-.09771	-2.741	119	.007
Pair 2	Average Probability of Volunteering (Before & After)	-.28099	1.23524	.11371	-.50619	-.05579	-2.471	117	.015
Pair 3	Average Probability of Donating (Before & After)	-.28068	1.36443	.12561	-.52943	-.03192	-2.235	117	.027

Table 7

ANOVA – Behavioral Intent Before & After

Overall Average Behavior Intention - After					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	165.064	66	2.501	2.823	.000
Within Groups	46.947	53	.886		
Total	212.011	119			

Table 8

Factor Analysis Pattern Matrix

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dependable	.934					
Reliable	.902					
Credible	.876					
Trustworthy	.812					
Rational	.788					
Knowledgable	.774					
Believable	.738					
Logical	.728					
Informative	.716					
Easy to understand		1.023				
Honest		1.023				
Easy to remember		.901				
Worth remembering		.764				
Simple		.733		.302		.478
Strong		.728				
Meaningful		.694				
Convincing		.685				
Interesting		.582				
Worth looking at		.491				
Important to me		.422				
Exciting		-.330	.838			
Colorful			.835			
Lively			.727			.301
Fresh		.365	.713			
New			.660			
Fascinating			.646			
Is exciting		.372	-.589			
Sharp		.498	.554			
Pleasant				.943		

Table 8 (Continued)

Gentle				.931		
Comforting				.811		
Appealing				.605		
Attractive				.582		
In good taste				.576		
Beautiful		.321		.459		
Touches me emotionally					.929	
Affects my feelings					.901	
Is moving					.875	
Reaches out to me					.751	
Is stimulating					.746	
Deals with facts						.841
Is stirring					.328	.706
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.						
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.						

Table 9

Regression - Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.735 ^a	.540	.510	.91320	1.347

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, Pleasant, Reliable Source, Interesting, Emotionally Stimulating, Respondent's Emotional Quotient Score, Easy to understand

b. Dependent Variable: Overall Average Behavior Intention - After

Table 10

Regression Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.686	.727		2.320	.022	.245	3.126					
	Respondent's EQ Score	.043	.010	.471	4.420	.000	.024	.062	.636	.393	.290	.379	2.636
	Reliable Source	.222	.125	.169	1.775	.079	-.026	.471	.482	.169	.116	.475	2.104
	Memorability	.217	.150	.161	1.446	.151	-.081	.514	-.450	.138	.095	.345	2.896
	Visual Impact	-.314	.115	-.241	-2.741	.007	-.541	-.087	-.528	-.256	-.180	.555	1.802
	Comfort	.319	.122	.238	2.607	.010	.076	.561	-.311	.244	.171	.516	1.939
	Emotionally Stimulating	.349	.141	.266	2.469	.015	.069	.629	.604	.232	.162	.370	2.703
	Gender	.164	.187	.062	.875	.384	-.207	.534	.287	.084	.057	.864	1.157

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Average Behavior Intention - After

Table 11

Residuals Statistics

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.7089	6.7471	4.9684	.95835	115
Std. Predicted Value	-3.401	1.856	.000	1.000	115
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.133	.603	.232	.066	115
Adjusted Predicted Value	1.8184	6.7334	4.9544	.97756	115
Residual	-2.91965	1.81815	.00000	.88472	115
Std. Residual	-3.197	1.991	.000	.969	115
Stud. Residual	-3.281	2.650	.007	1.015	115
Deleted Residual	-3.08069	3.22187	.01401	.97870	115
Stud. Deleted Residual	-3.444	2.729	.003	1.032	115
Mahal. Distance	1.428	48.677	6.939	5.580	115
Cook's Distance	.000	.678	.015	.065	115
Centered Leverage Value	.013	.427	.061	.049	115
a. Dependent Variable: Overall Average Behavior Intention - After					

Figure 1

Regression Line

