UNIVERSITAT
JAUME·I

Título artículo / Títol article:	Motivational Effects of the Perceived Image of Non-governmental Organisations
Autores / Autors	Pinazo Calatayud, Daniel ; Peris Pichastor, Rosana ; Ramos Ribelles, Anna M. ; Brotons Miro, Francisco Javier
Revista:	Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology Volume 23, Issue 5, September/October 2013
Versión / Versió:	Preprint de l'autor
Cita bibliográfica / Cita bibliogràfica (ISO 690):	PINAZO, Daniel, et al. Motivational Effects of the Perceived Image of Non‑governmental Organisations. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 2013, 23.5: 420-434.
url Repositori UJI:	http://hdl.handle.net/10234/92212

Title: Motivational Effects of the Perceived Image of NGOs

Running head: MOTIVATIONAL EFFECTS OF PERCEPTION OF NGOs

Abstract

The motivational effect of the perceived image of NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) was analysed in two studies. Results from the first study, comprising two samples (N=314 and N=220), point to three dimensions of the perceived image of NGOs (solidarity, misleading and instrumentality). These dimensions have different effects on intention to collaborate and to recommend others to collaborate. In the second study, with a sample of N=485, confirmatory analysis confirmed the three-factor solution as appropriate. The misleading image emerged as a source of reactance to NGO campaigns. Results suggest the importance of promoting the image of solidarity as a motivational strategy.

Keywords Perceived image, NGO, Motivation, Psychological reactance

Introduction

Whether or not people decide to support an NGO (Non-Governmental Organization) can be partly explained by the credibility of the perceived image of the sector. The perceived image can affect future involvement with NGOs or the rejection of their advertising campaigns. As a social institution, the perceived image of the NGO sector can affect citizens' motivation to collaborate with them or accept their messages. However, few studies have analysed the public's motivational response in terms of perceived image, and in particularly with reference to psychological reactance to NGO campaigns. The aim of this paper is twofold: first, to design a reliable, valid measure of the perceived image of NGOs; and second, to analyse the relation this perceived image has with motivation to collaborate and psychological reactance to promotional advertising.

Taken together, NGOs as a social institution require a commitment from citizens, and the perception of each NGO can be based on the characteristics of credibility attributed to these organisations as institutions. The need to take into account the circumstances in which potential donors decide to collaborate with NGOs is well established in the literature (Hibbert, & Horne, 1996). These circumstances influence whether people decide to help or not. Many studies, focusing on individual motivations, have suggested that citizens must be committed to the causes the NGO supports, or gain some advantage by volunteering and/or donating (Briggs, Landry, & Woods, 2007; Pope, Isely, & Asamoa-Tutu, 2009).

NGOs' motivational strategies will be different if they focus on commitment to the social causes that define the organisation, than if they link collaboration with individual rewards. Some studies have centred their analysis on charitable institutions' credibility in order to understand citizens' motivation to collaborate. Credibility is attributed to

NGOs when citizens consider it is supported by the image the NGOs project. Perceived aspects of NGOs related to competence in their activities, familiarity (Sargeant, West & Ford, 2004), and/or sincerity in defending their values (Gipp, Kalafatis, & Ledden, 2008), have been regarded as highly relevant in determining donor behaviour or intention.

Individual collaborator-centred perspectives and NGO image-centred perspectives are complementary. There seems to be consensus that motivation to donate or collaborate with NGOs can be influenced by the perceived image of whether or not NGOs meet their stated objectives of solidarity just as much as by individuals' personal values and interests. When the perspective of individual interests and the image of the organisation are related, both confidence (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2009), and motivation to collaborate increases significantly (Bennett, 2003). However, this motivation can also be guided by reactance to promotional messages, an area of motivational response that has received very little attention in the literature.

An organisation's credibility is a perceived quality that generates trust and acceptance of the message, by eliciting favourable thoughts (Petty, & Cacioppo, 1986). The attractiveness of NGO publicity campaigns and the public's familiarity with their message are associated with a credible image of the organisation (Bennett, 2009; Terwel et al., 2009). The message may be rejected if the sector's credibility is perceived to be low. An NGO can have a negative image if people consider that it does not behave correctly as a social institution. NGOs' behaviour as institutions can also be considered censurable, and can generate psychological reactance as a defence against NGOs' marketing messages. Analysis of the motivations that lead people to collaborate with NGOs has neglected reactance theory, despite the effect it can have on the effectiveness of their messages. Psychological reactance is a motivational response to a perceived

threat to one's freedom to choose how to behave (Brehm, 1966). Reactance increases

resistance to persuasion (Worchel, & Brehm, 1970), and even rejection of requests to

help (Plan,t & Devine, 2001; Fitzsimons, & Lehmann, 2004; Zemack-Rugar,

Fitzsimons, & Lehmann, 2007). The perceived image of NGOs can reflect their low

credibility, which would increase the perception of a threat to one's freedom to

collaborate in marketing campaigns, thus increasing psychological reactance.

Two studies with independent samples were conducted to pursue the aims of the

present research. In the first study, we designed a scale to measure the perceived image

of NGOs, and analyse its relationship with motivational factors associated with decision

making (willingness to donate, willingness to recommend others to collaborate). In the

second study, we conducted confirmatory analysis for the scale and analysed its

relationship with psychological reactance to NGOs' marketing messages.

STUDY 1

The aim of the first study was to design a questionnaire to evaluate the perceived

image of NGOs, and analyse its psychometric characteristics. We then studied the effect

of the resulting images on motivation to collaborate in the future or recommend others

to collaborate. The general hypothesis for the first study was that the images of NGOs

would be related to their credibility. The following hypotheses were put forward:

Hypothesis 1: Perceived images of NGOs reflecting high credibility in their activities

will be positively related to willingness to collaborate and/or recommend others to do

so.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived images of NGOs reflecting low credibility in their activities

will be negatively related to willingness to collaborate and/or recommend others to do

so.

Method

Procedure

A three-phase procedure was followed to prepare a measure of the perceived image of NGOs: 1. Exploratory analysis phase: evaluation of the frame of reference, or shared meanings, in which people socially construct their images of NGOs; 2. Knowledge synthesis analysis phase: in this phase, we analysed the internal structure of different images people were familiar with, which interact in the common frame of reference; 3. Synthesis of beliefs: analysis of the images that represent each person's set of beliefs. Phase 3 generated the final scale of perceived images of NGOs. This scale was used to evaluate the perceived image using various institutional credibility indicators.

Phase 1. Exploratory analysis of shared meanings of NGOs. A series of statements was compiled reflecting the public's opinions and the meaning NGOs have for individuals. The statements were identified and selected using the historical review technique in institutional text-based databases. The search generated a total of 143 statements These statements were then interpreted using the focus group method. The focus group (six people) produced a list of 68 statements classified in six categories. These 68 statements constituted the base questionnaire with which to analyse the image of NGOs

Phase 2. Analysis of the synthesis of knowledge on NGOs. The aim of this phase was to explore whether people arrange the categories resulting from the previous phase as mental representations of NGOs. Six types of questionnaires were prepared for this purpose. Each one included the same 68 statements selected in the previous phase. The first page of each type differed in that it presented a brief dialogue representing each of the mental or theoretical categories identified in the focus group (Annex 1). After reading the dialogue, each person was asked to respond according to the representation of NGOs reflected by the characters in the dialogue. The questionnaire sample was

made up of 314 university students, 70.4% ($N = 221$) of whom were women and 29.6% ($N = 93$), men. Average age was 21.27 ($SD = 3.38$).

The data analysis in this phase considered the typicality index and the polarity index of each item. The typicality index was obtained by following the methodology developed by Rosch (1975, 1978). It was obtained by using the average of the scores individuals gave. The following formula was used to calculate typicality:

$$TI1 = S(A) + (B) + (C)/N$$

IT1= typicality index for statement 1.
S(A): Score given to this statement by subject one.
S(B): Score given to this statement by subject two.
S(C): Score given to this statement by subject three...
N: Number of subjects who responded to the Theory 1 questionnaire

The item's polarity index is the relative measure that contrasts the typicality of one item in each theory with the typicality obtained in the other theories. It was obtained following Rosch's (1978) suggestions in Rodrigo, Rodríguez, and Marrero, (1993). The formula used to calculate the polarity of each item was as follows:

$$POL1_{(a)} = \frac{X1_a - \left(\Sigma X1_{(b,c,d...)} \right)}{n} \Big/ K$$

The polarity index of statement 1 in theory "a" ($POL1_{(a)}$) is equal to the difference between the typicality score obtained for the same statement in theory "a" minus the sum total of the scores for the same statement in the other theories. The result of this subtraction is divided by the number of categories minus 1 ("n"), all of which must be divided by the breadth of the measurement scale used minus 1 ("K").

For the typicality index, typical statements were considered to be those with an index of 3.5 or above. Items that were not representative, with polarities very close to 0, or were not very typical, were rejected. A total of 36 items, organised in four images, remained (Table 1). This phase of analysis therefore resulted in four images in which people recognise the work of NGOs in the public space: the 'Social Action

Organisations' Image ($\alpha = .90$), the 'Culture of Solidarity' Image ($\alpha = .87$), the 'Corrupt Organisations' Image ($\alpha = .96$), and the 'Social trend' Image ($\alpha = .87$).

(Table 1 here)

Phase 3. Analysis of the synthesis of beliefs. In this phase we explored the internal structure of the 36 statements selected in the previous phase. A questionnaire was prepared with the 36 statements resulting from phase 2. In this case, participants were asked to respond according to their personal opinion. In this analysis the statements were changed to read as self-referent. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 represented strong disagreement and 5, strong agreement).

Sample

The sample was made up of 220 subjects with an average age of 24, of whom 39.9% had begun or completed university level education, 39.9% had completed pre-university education and 20.2% had completed basic education. 47.9% were men and 52.1% women.

Variables

Perceived image of NGOs. To assess the internal validity and reliability of the images obtained we conducted an exploratory factor analysis. The principle components method with varimax rotation was used to obtain the most representative factors of the perceived image of NGOs. Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 1634.29$; df = 300; p < .001) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index ($KMO = .80$) verified the fit of the sample to the exploratory factor analysis. The most parsimonious structure was finally chosen, giving a questionnaire with three perceived images of NGOs (Table 2): Factor 1: NGOs are described as a way of acting and thinking in solidarity with others, based on denouncing social injustices, and commitment to promoting values of solidarity and social justice.

This factor suggests an image of high credibility, since NGOs are considered to be sincere in their actions and competent in carrying them out. We call this factor 'Image of Solidarity of NGOs' (M = 2.51; SD = .75). Factor 2: NGOs are described as fraudulent and corrupt entities that set out to deceive by manipulating values of solidarity, which they use as a way of obtaining financial benefits for themselves. This factor suggests an image of low credibility, since NGOs are considered to be neither sincere in their actions nor competent in carrying them out. We call this factor 'Misleading Image of NGOs' (M = 3.54; SD = .66). Factor 3: NGOs are described as generators of social prestige and as a trend. Collaborating with NGOs is a tool used to gain recognition and social prestige, which is the motivation for becoming involved with them. This factor suggests that NGO credibility is unconnected to the public's response to the organisation, since what matters is to take advantage of its social image to gain recognition or personal prestige. We call this factor 'Instrumental image of NGOs' (M = 2.89; SD = .86). The resulting explained variance is not very high, which indicates that there are meanings in the image of the NGOs that cannot be easily grouped under a common factor, and that were not detected in the present exploratory analysis.

(Table 2 here)

Intention to collaborate with an NGO. A single item measure that asks respondents to evaluate their level of agreement or disagreement, on a scale of 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), with the statement: 'I intend to collaborate with an NGO in the future' (M = 3.14; SD = 1.29).

Willingness to ask others to collaborate with NGOs. A single item measure that asks respondents to evaluate their level of agreement or disagreement, on a scale of 1

(totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), with the statement: 'I encourage my family and friends to collaborate with NGOs' ($M = 2.72$; SD = 1.35).

Results

Three images resulted from the creation of a scale for the perceived institutional image of NGOs. These images are related to the credibility of the organisations. We analysed the effect of these images on motivational factors using the linear regression method for each factor. Specifically, we used the stepwise method in order to differentiate between the contribution and importance of each perceived image (Table 3).

(Table 3 here)

The images of NGOs as Misleading and of Solidarity demonstrate a significant joint explanatory capacity for intention to collaborate ($R^2 = 22.9\%$) and willingness to ask others to collaborate ($R^2 = 26.4\%$) (Table 3). Hypothesis 1 posited that the images reflecting high credibility would have positive effects on motivational factors. The image that reflects the highest credibility is that of NGOs as institutions of solidarity; as expected, the image has a positive effect on intention to collaborate and willingness to recommend others to collaborate. Hypothesis 2 posited that images reflecting low credibility would have negative effects on motivational factors. Consistent with this hypothesis, the image of NGOs as misleading is negatively related to these indicators. However, the third perceived image, representing an instrumental view of NGOs, does not appear to have a significant relationship with these credibility indicators (Table 3).

The study enabled us to prepare a questionnaire with a consistent factor structure.. The second study was designed to confirm the factor structure and to further explore the relationship of the images with factors of credibility, specifically with psychological reactance to NGO promotion campaigns.

STUDY 2

The objective of the second study was twofold and complemented the previous study. We first performed a confirmatory analysis of the factors that explain the perceived images of NGOs to further explore the construct validity of the questionnaire. Secondly, we examined the relationship between the images of NGOs and motivational effects. Specifically, the second study analysed the relationship between the images and psychological reactance to NGO advertisements. We put forward the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3: Perceived images of NGOs reflecting high credibility in their activities will be negatively related to psychological reactance to NGO advertisements.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived images of NGOs reflecting low credibility in their activities will be positively related to psychological reactance to NGO advertisements.

Procedure

We created a questionnaire that included demographic data, the questionnaire on perceived images of NGOs, and psychological reactance. This questionnaire was administered to a sample of people with the only criterion that they responded voluntarily. The researchers asked respondents to complete the questionnaire and after waiting for them to finish, collected them immediately.

Sample

The sample consisted of 485 subjects, of whom 50.3% were between 18 and 25 years old, 21.2% 25 to 35, and 28.5% over 35. 62.5% of the respondents had begun or completed university level education, 19.0% had completed pre-university education and 17.5% had completed basic education. 44.9% were men and 55.1% women.

Variables

Perceived image of NGOs. The 23-item questionnaire prepared in Study 1 was used. Respondents were asked to evaluate their level of agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree).

Psychological reactance to NGO campaigns. The Hong Psychological Reactance Scale (Hong & Faedda, 1996) provided the basis on which to evaluate psychological reactance. The original scale comprises 14 items. For the present study we used the items that could be adapted to our purposes and changed the wording to refer specifically to NGO advertisements. We also added a seventh statement that was not included in the original scale, as we considered that it represented specific content of the type of advertisements used by NGOs that are susceptible to reactance from their target public. The surveyed respondents were asked to evaluate their level of agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree) with the statements presented in Table 4.

(Table 4 here)

Results

The correlations among the three factors reflecting the image of NGOs are presented in Table 5. The misleading image of NGOs and the image of solidarity have a negative correlation. In addition, the image of solidarity does not correlate significantly with the instrumental image. However, the instrumental image correlates significantly with the misleading image, indicating that the instrumental perception of NGOsit is associated with a perception of NGOs as being unreliable in their efforts to reduce social problems that they use as causes

(Table 5 here)

Confirmatory Factor analysis

Based on the factor structure obtained in the first study, a confirmatory structural model with the 23 items representing the perceived image of NGOs were used as indicators of the three latent factors tested (with the structural equation modelling software program AMOS 18; Arbuckle, 2009). This model was compared with a more parsimonious factor model with a single latent factor. In both cases, the covariance between the factor 'Image of Solidarity of NGOs' and the factor 'Instrumental Image of NGOs' was not included in the model, since the correlation between the two was practically non-existent ($r = .04$). Similarly, the correlational analysis of the exogenous variables indicated a high correlation between two of these, variable 8 ('Donating to an NGO brings social prestige') and 10 ('Collaborating in some way with an NGO brings social prestige) ($r = .75$). The Modification Index indicated that a solution with a better fit would result if the covariance of the errors of these variables was included in the model ($MI = 148.159$). In each latent variable one of the associated structural coefficients was set to one. In total, the tested models included a maximum of 23 free parameters. Following the recommendations of Bentler and Chou (1987) a ratio of 10 participants for each free parameter in the model is required for the results to be considered reliable in a confirmatory factor analysis; the sample was therefore sufficient. Maximum likelihood estimation was used since it allows the fit indexes of various alternative models to be compared in order to choose the best one, and is therefore recommended.

The three factor model produced a significant chi-square statistic χ^2 (227, $N = 485$) $= 633.46$, $p < .001$, as did the simple model χ^2(229, $N = 485$) $= 1.849.31$, $p < .001$. Given chi-square sensitivity to sample size, it should be complemented with other statistics. Hu and Bentler (1999) propose taking alternative statistics into account and offer criteria to establish the cut-off point to assess the model fit. Specifically, indexes

such as the TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) or the CFI (comparative fit index), in conjunction

with the RMSEA (root-mean-square error of approximation) offer a good combination

of fit indexes to determine the best fit of a structural model to the data. Hu and Bentler

(1999) suggest that the TLI and the CFI indicate a good fit with values higher than .90,

while the RMSEA should give a value close to .06. In line with these criteria, the three

factor solution showed a better fit (*CFI* = .91; *TLI* = .90; *RMSEA* = .06) than the single

factor solution (*CFI* = .64, *TLI* = .61; *RMSEA* = .121. The diagram of the three factor

model is presented in Figure 1. The exploratory factor analysis, using the principal

components method with varimax rotation, gave a factor solution with an explained

variance of 51.85. The factor loadings for this model ranged from .64 to .85 in factor 1,

from .50 to .67 in factor 2 and from .65 to .75 in factor 3.

(Figure 1 here)

Psychological reactance and perceived image of NGOs

The exploratory analysis by principal components of the psychological reactance

scale gave a single factor solution, which explained 50.27% of the variance and

presented α = .83, with factor loadings ranging from .66 to .77 (Table 4). Respondents

showed little reactance to NGO campaigns (*M* = 3.49; *SD* = 1.303). The mean of the

item evaluating resistance to being influenced was higher (*M* = 5.854; *SD* = 1.630),

indicating that general resistance to being influenced was higher than resistance to

accepting messages from NGOs (*t* = 26.39; *df* = 482; *p* < .001).

The analysis of the capacity of the images of NGOs to explain psychological

reactance to NGO campaigns was performed using the linear regression method for

each image using the stepwise method. The misleading image of NGOs explained

39.9% of psychological reactance to NGO campaigns (r^2 = .32; *F* = 111.27; *p* < .001; *β*

= .565). However, the image of solidarity of NGOs showed no negative explanatory capacity of psychological reactance, contrary to what we predicted in hypothesis 3.

Discussion and Conclusions

The objective of this study was to devise a scale to assess perceived images of NGOs and to study their relationship with motivational response to NGOs. The results indicate that the scale appears to be a good tool for evaluating NGO credibility, since they allow us to explain part of the intention to collaborate with NGOs and the acceptance of their campaigns.

The questionnaire of perceived images of NGOs shows a good factor structure. Based on the questionnaire devised in study 1, a confirmatory structural model with the 23 items serves as an indicator of three latent factors (solidarity, perversion and instrumentality). Confirmatory analysis in study 2 indicated that the three factor solution provides a better internal structure than the single factor solution. These are the same three factors as those obtained in the exploratory factor analysis, which gave three perceived images of NGOs: Misleading Image, Solidarity Image and Instrumental Image. The correlation between the three dimensions is relevant, except in the case of the instrumentality and solidarity dimensions, the correlation of which is not significant. The instrumental perception correlates positively with the misleading image of NGOs. This suggests although regarding NGOs as instruments to obtain personal gain may encourage self-interested collaboration, it does not confer prestige on the organisation, since it is associated with a negative function of NGOs.

However, we believe that this lack of intensity in the correlation is congruent with the significance of the perceived images that evaluate the scale, since instrumentality is a neutral dimension compared to solidarity. Therefore, the correlation between the scales, the explanatory capacity of the motivational response, the reliability of the three

dimensions, and the good fit of the three-dimensional model allow us to confirm that the construct validity of the scale is good.

The images perceived as indicators of credibility accorded to NGOs by the public demonstrated an important and significant capacity to influence motivation to collaborate with NGOs. As reported in the previous literature, motivation to collaborate with these organisations is related to their perceived image (Bennet, 2003, Gipp, et al. 2008, Sargeant, et al. 2004; Terwel, et al., 2009). This study has allowed us to test this hypothesis through a general measurement of the perceived institutional image of NGOs. However, in contrast to other authors' findings (Briggs, et al. 2007, Pope et al. 2009), the study results do not reveal any influence on motivation related to individual reward. The image associated with individual gain –instrumentality of NGOs– has no motivational effects when NGOs are perceived as a tool for individual gain. A person who perceives NGOs as instruments to gain personal prestige could be motivated to collaborate. However, our results do not reveal a significant relationship in this respect. This may be because the person who has this image is not interested in the NGO in itself, but rather in the personal use he or she might make of it. A person with an instrumental image of NGOs is not interested in collaborating, but in ensuring that others think or believe that s/he collaborates, and as such, his or her motivation to collaborate is indirect. The image of instrumentality could encourage donation if it is accompanied by instrumental reinforcement, but not by the NGO itself. Likewise, another type of collaboration – volunteering – will be more burdensome and less motivating for an individual who is seeking personal prestige, if significant instrumental reinforcement is not present.

Our findings indicate that emphasis should be shifted to generate an image of NGO solidarity rather than instrumentality as a way of motivating civil society to donate or volunteer.

The data show that the image of instrumentality has no motivational effects. In contrast, our results indicate that an image of solidarity is what brings credibility and positive motivational consequences. An image of corruption and deception provokes negative responses such as reactance to advertising or reticence to collaborate with NGOs. An instrumental view of NGOs indicates a neutral approach in which the core causes defended by the NGO are relegated to second place. Considerando la importancia de proyectar una imagen coherente con las motivaciones de la propia organización (Terwel, et al. 2009), future research might explore the relative importance of the image of solidarity as a source of persuasion, focusing on the importance of the causes these organisations defend as the central point of the message and the persuasive strategy.

In summary, the questionnaire on perceived images of NGOs appears to be a good tool with which to evaluate the institutional credibility of NGOs and its effect on motivational responses. The results also seem to suggest that the most effective persuasion strategy is to highlight the importance of the social causes the NGO defends, through an image of solidarity, as the main motivational factor to encourage collaboration with NGOs.

The factors we obtained cover a wide range of images associated with all types of NGOs. It is to be expected that, regardless of the type of organisation, a misleading image will negatively affect interest not only in donations, but also the recruitment of volunteers. In contrast, a positive image should encourage donation and volunteering. However, specific aspects of the function of certain types of organisations could modify

this relationship. How would these perceptions unfurl in an evaluation of more specific NGOs such as development or environmental NGOs, for instance? Incentives such as fashions or social prestige, both instrumental aspects, could have a specific effect at a given moment in time if they are associated with one type of organisation in particular. In addition, volunteers may be attracted by the prestige of an organisation in terms of its internal workings (Boezeman, & Ellemers, 2007), or by the perceived coherence between what the organisation does and the intention behind its actions (Terwel, et al. 2009). These are motivational factors that depend on the specific perception of one NGO or another. Future research might further explore how the specific images of NGOs affect the three general factors, and analyse their degree of stability. Similarly, each type of NGO has its own particular function and image to differentiate it from other types of NGO, which might affect its credibility in comparison. Future studies should explore the different comparative perceptions of NGO types, and the way they affect their credibility in motivating the public. We also suggest that future research might analyse the efficiency of communication to shape motivating images of organisations (once individuals in civil society feel motivated to act).

Limitations of the study

The study was undertaken in a specific cultural environment. Generalisation of the results is limited by the possibility that the images used in the study might correspond to cultural limitations. Furthermore, the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire require a more in-depth analysis, particularly with regard to validity. In this paper we have studied NGOs' image relationship with psychological reactance and interest in collaborating. Other aspects of NGOs' credibility should be explored to discover how useful these images are in designing effective communication strategies for NGOs.

Finally, this is a correlational study. Future evidence on the validity and persuasive

effect of the perceived images should be analysed using experimental methodology.

ANNEX 1. Dialogues representing mental categories or images

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench talking about NGOs:
  John: If it wasn't for NGOs the poor would die of hunger.
  Jane: You're right, governments only think about people when there's an election coming up...!
  John: That's why we need someone to take charge of thinking about the most needy and getting down to some real social action.
  Jane: It's true; it's only the NGOs that go to the places where there is a need".

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench having a conversation about NGOs:
  Jane: I want to do something with my free time, but I don't know what. I'd like to feel useful by helping other people.
  John: That's easy; join an NGO.
  Jane: You're right, I'd meet people there like me, people who are generous and think about others.
  John: Sure, because without people like us there wouldn't be any NGOs".

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench talking about NGOs:
  John: I'm fed up of my parents going on about how 'life is hard and everybody's got to look out for themselves and not bother about other people'.
  Jane: They are a couple of reactionaries; they don't understand that a fairer world is possible.
  John: Just look at NGOs, and everything they do to make that happen.
  Jane: It's true, NGOs are trying to bring about the social changes that we really need".

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench having a conversation about NGOs:
  Jane: Listen, I'm looking for a job. Do you know of anything?
  John: I saw a vacancy on the Internet with an NGO, but it's not that easy; they want three years' administrative experience and a good level of English.
  Jane: What do you expect? They need good professionals to manage those sorts of projects.
  John: Of course, in the end they're run like companies".

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench talking about NGOs:
  John: Did you know Michael has joined an NGO?
  Jane: Sure, the same one I'm in. If you're not in an NGO nowadays you're nobody; haven't you seen, everybody famous is in an NGO.
  John: And is it true that if you're in an NGO you get off with more girls?
  Jane: Of course. When you come out of the gym, pop in and I'll sign you up".

"In a park, two friends sit resting on a bench talking about NGOs:
  Jane: Have you heard about the bosses of that NGO who have lined their pockets with money from all the subsidies they got?
  John: That's normal... All those organisations are after the same thing: cash!
  Jane: It's true, and on top of that they take advantage of people's needs.
  John: Yes, they are a bunch of frauds. They should all be behind bars".

Table 1. Typicality and polarity indexes

Statements on the Image of Social Action Organisation	*Typicality*	*Polarity*
NGOs make peace a new social value.	4.11	.21
NGOs exist as a result of state entity incapacities	4.00	.21
Thanks to the work of NGOs, the abuses the most disadvantaged suffer are denounced.	4.39	.20
NGOs protest against discriminatory government actions.	4.25	.18

Statements on the Image of a Culture of Solidarity	*Typicality*	*Polarity*
The key to playing an efficient role in NGOs lies in being willing to give more than you receive	4.33	.23
NGOs put forward values for a better world.	4.36	.18
NGOs are made up of generous volunteers who cheerfully give up their free time to do good.	4.28	.29
NGOs exemplify a new way of thinking and living.	3.69	.07
NGOs defend global equality.	4.31	.19
NGOs denounce the manipulation of information.	3.36	.02
NGOs campaign to expose uncontrolled economic growth	3.67	.12

Statements on the Image of a Social Trend	*Typicality*	*Polarity*
NGOs are 'in', like digital photography, total recycling, eco-fuels or rural tourism.	4.40	.31
Donating to an NGO brings social prestige.	4.63	.45
Solidarity sells, and that's why NGOs are fashionable.	4.46	.45
NGOs are a fashion bandwagon that everyone wants to jump on.	4.74	.55
It's trendy to be an NGO volunteer.	4.94	.55
Collaborating in some way with an NGO brings social prestige.	4.89	.52

Statements on the Image as Misleading Organisations	*Typicality*	*Polarity*
Many NGOs are deceitful in their aspirations.	4.39	.59
NGOs trade on charity.	4.00	.38
NGOs only look for money to keep themselves going, not to do things.	4.35	.61
NGOs have hidden interests that have nothing to do with help and cooperation.	4.71	.67
Members of NGOs are swindlers.	4.68	.75
NGOs are "a good business" for those who manage them.	4.77	.55
Setting up an NGO is an easy way to get subsidies and then use them for your own ends.	4.65	.64
NGOs steal.	4.58	.73

Table 2. Structure and factor loadings of the Images of NGOs questionnaire

I think that…	F1 Misleading Image	F2 Solidarity Image	F3 Instrumental Image
NGOs only look for money to keep themselves going, not to do things.	*.579*	.054	.156
NGOs have hidden interests that have nothing to do with help and cooperation.	*.565*	-.155	.052
Members of NGOs are swindlers.	*.630*	-.179	.046
NGOs are "a good business" for those who manage them.	*.609*	-.176	.212
NGOs trade on charity.	*.590*	.009	.049
Setting up an NGO is an easy way to get subsidies and then use them for your own ends.	*.607*	-.095	.079
Many NGOs are deceitful in their aspirations.	*.730*	-.213	.057
NGOs steal.	*.793*	-.022	.028
NGOs exemplify a new way of thinking and living.	-.138	*.545*	.164
Thanks to the work of NGOs, the abuses the most disadvantaged suffer are denounced.	-.187	*.583*	-.065
NGOs defend global equality.	-.057	*.712*	.020
NGOs put forward values for a better world.	-.133	*.691*	.081
NGOs are made up of generous volunteers who cheerfully give up their free time to do good.	.017	*.609*	-.029
NGOs denounce the manipulation of information.	.102	*.623*	.100
NGOs campaign to expose uncontrolled economic growth.	-.035	*.678*	-.055
NGOs make peace a new social value.	-.308	*.498*	.117
NGOs protest against discriminatory government actions.	-.146	*.645*	.019
Donating to an NGO brings social prestige.	-.048	-.038	*.772*
Solidarity sells, and that's why NGOs are fashionable.	.311	-.007	*.621*
Collaborating in some way with an NGO brings social prestige.	-.073	-.040	*.793*
NGOs are 'in', like digital photography, total recycling, eco-fuels or rural tourism.	.053	.089	*.531*
It's trendy to be an NGO volunteer.	.343	.228	*.596*
NGOs are a fashion bandwagon that everyone wants to jump on.	.212	.070	*.545*
% Explained variance (44.25%)	20.629	15.165	8.500
α	.821	.814	.741

Table 3. Stepwise linear regression analysis

Independent variables: Perceived images of NGOs

Dependent variable: Intention to collaborate with an NGO			
Predictors	$\underline{R^2}$	$\underline{\Delta R^2}$	$\underline{\beta}$
Step 1:	.17***		
Misleading Image of NGOs			-.41***
Step 2:	.23***	.06***	
Misleading Image of NGOs			-.35***
Image of Solidarity of NGOs			.25***
Dependent variable: Willingness to ask others to collaborate			
Predictors	$\underline{R^2}$	$\underline{\Delta R^2}$	$\underline{\beta}$
Step 1:	.11***		
Misleading Image of NGOs			-.33***
Step 2:	.26***	.06***	
Misleading Image of NGOs			-.26***
Image of Solidarity of NGOs			.22***

Variables excluded: Instrumental Image of NGOs

Table 4. Factor analysis of Psychological reactance to NGO campaigns

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 totally disagree; 7 totally agree)	*Psychological reactance to NGOs*
I consider NGO campaigns to be an intrusion	.705
It irritates me when NGO campaigns point out things that are obvious to me	.686
NGO campaigns induce me to do just the opposite of what they are asking	.657
I resist the attempts of NGO campaigns to influence me	.655
I get annoyed when NGO campaigns hold up other people as examples for me to follow	.752
When I realise that NGO campaigns want to make me act in a way they think is better, I feel like doing just the opposite	.771
I get annoyed when NGO campaigns give examples of other people to make me feel sorry for them	.728
% Explained variance	50.269%
α	.834

Table 5. Factor correlations (N=485)

	Image of Solidarity	Instrumental Image
Misleading image	-.37 (<.001)	.42 (<.001)
Image of Solidarity	----	.04 (<.36)

References

Arbuckle, J. L. (2007). *AMOS 18 users guide.* Amos Development Corportation. Crawfordville, FL.

Bentler, P. M. & Chou, C. P. (1987). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 12-29.

Bennett, R. (2009). Impulsive donation decisions during online browsing of charity websites. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour,* 8, 116–134.

Boezeman, E. J. & Ellemers, N. (2007). Volunteering for charity: pride, respect, and the commitment of volunteers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 771-785.

Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. Academic Press, New York.

Briggs, E.; Landry, T. & Wood, C. (2007). Beyond just being there: An examination of the impact of attitudes, materialism and self-esteem on the quality of helping behavior in youth volunteers. *Journal of Nonprofits and Public Sector Marketing*, 18(3), 27-45.

Fitzsimons, G.V. & Lehmann, D. R. (2004). Reactance to recommendations: When unsolicited advice yields contrary responses. *Marketing Science*, 23: 82-94.

Gipp, N.; Kalafatis, S. P. & Ledden, L. (2008). Perceived value of corporate donations: an empirical investigation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 13(4), 327–346.

Hibbert, S. & Horne, S. (1996). Giving to charity: questioning the donor decision process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 13(2), 4-13.

Hong, S. M. & Faedda, S. (1996). Refinement of the HPRS. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 173-182.

Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Plant, E. A. & Devine, P. G. (2001). Responses to Other-Imposed Pro-Black Pressure: Acceptance or Backlash?. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(6), 486-501.

Pope, J. A.; Isely, E. S. & Asamoa-Tutu, F. (2009). Fidel 'Developing a Marketing Strategy for Nonprofit Organizations: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 21(2), 184-201.

Rodrigo, M. J.; Rodríguez, A. & Marrero, J. (1993). *Las teorías implícitas. Una aproximación al conocimiento cotidiano*. Visor: Madrid- España.

Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive representations os semantic categories. *Journal of Exprimental Psychology*, 104(103), 192-233.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In Rosch, E. & Lloyd, B. B. (Eds), Cognition and categorization. (I ed., pp. 27-48). Erlbaum: Hillsdale NJ, 27-48

Sargeant, A.; West, D. C. & Ford, J. B. (2004). Does perception matter? An empirical analysis of donor behavior. *The Service Industries Journal*, 24(6), 19-36.

Worchel, S. & Brehm, J. W. (1970). Effect of threats to attitudinal freedom as a function of agreement with the communicator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14(1), 18-22.

Zemack-Rugar, Y.; Fitzsimons, G. V. & Lehmann, D. R. (2007). Reducing reactance induced backlash responses to recommendations. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 34, 263-264.