

# Social Media and Women's Motivation to Donate(1)

by hofir134

## General metrics

<b>30,097</b>	<b>4,438</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>17 min 45 sec</b>	<b>34 min 8 sec</b>
characters	words	sentences	reading time	speaking time

## Score















This text scores better than 77% of all texts checked by Grammarly

## Writing Issues

<b>279</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>203</b>
Issues left	Critical	Advanced

## Writing Issues

<b>76</b>	<b>Correctness</b>	
<b>11</b>	Wrong or missing prepositions	
<b>21</b>	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	
<b>2</b>	Incorrect verb forms	
<b>13</b>	Misspelled words	
<b>3</b>	Incorrect noun number	
<b>9</b>	Improper formatting	

1	Unknown words	
10	Comma misuse within clauses	
3	Conjunction use	
2	Confused words	
1	Mixed dialects of english	
<b>12</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	
12	Wordy sentences	

---

## Unique Words

**21%**

Measures vocabulary diversity by calculating the percentage of words used only once in your document

unique words

---

## Rare Words

**37%**

Measures depth of vocabulary by identifying words that are not among the 5,000 most common English words.

rare words

---

## Word Length

**4.7**

Measures average word length

characters per word

---

## Sentence Length

**13.7**

Measures average sentence length

words per sentence

---

# Social Media and Women's Motivation to Donate(1)

Social Media and Women's Motivation to Donate

Widya Anggoro\*, Dewi Pudji Rahayu, Elda Mardiana, Rema Rismaya, Adityo Ari Wibowo

Faculty of Economic and Business

Muhammadiyah University of Prof. Dr. Hamka

\*widyaanggororeal@gmail.com

Abstract

Motivates to donate usually occur because of factors influencing directly or indirectly. This study aims to determine the level of empathy, donation campaigns, and social media in influencing women's motivation to donate. Respondents in this study were 124 female respondents <sup>1</sup> by using purposive <sup>2</sup> sampling method in sample taking technique. Data processing and analysis using data quality test, classic assumption test, multiple linear analysis, and hypothesis test. According to multiple linear regression, empathy <sup>3</sup> level variable (X1) has t <sup>4</sup> value 0.308 <sup>5</sup> with significance <sup>6</sup> level 0.759 <sup>7</sup> and concluded that empathy <sup>8</sup> level variable is not significantly influence <sup>9</sup> women's motivation to donate, inversely to donation <sup>10</sup> campaign variable (X2) with t <sup>11</sup> value 2.321 <sup>12</sup> and significance level 0.022 or social media variable (X3) with t value 2.255 and significance level 0.026 partially have significant influence to women's motivation to donate.

Keywords: empathy, campaign, social media, motivation to donate

## Preface

Proverty<sup>13</sup> becomes problem<sup>14</sup> and central<sup>15</sup> issue around the world, included<sup>16</sup> Indonesia. In developing countries like Indonesia, the poverty rate is quite high. Based on Central<sup>17</sup> Bureau of Statistic<sup>18</sup> (2021), current<sup>19</sup> proverty<sup>20</sup> amount is up to 27,54 million residents. Therefore, all of elements<sup>21</sup> have to work together to eradicate high poverty.

The majority of Indonesia's population is Muslim (indonesia.golid<sup>22</sup>, 2021)<sup>23,24</sup> or equal to 87,2% of Indonesia residents. Islam has a poverty alleviation method called zakat. Indonesia has several amil<sup>25</sup> zakat institutions such as Baznas, Laziz NU, Laziz Mu, and Dompot Dhuafa Republika. Donation motivation has an important role to grow one's enthusiasm, passion, and sincerity in donating. The increased passion and willingness to donate sincerely will help increase zakat income and help alleviate poverty in Indonesia (zakat.or.id, 2020).

Donation motivation is all factors that influence someone to donate. Mollick (2014) argues that there are four categories of crowdfunding donation motivations: a) motivation as a role model, b) motivation to seek rewards, c) motivation to give loans, and d) motivation to get ownership shares. Donors who are motivated as role models will donate in the form of funds without expecting the funds to return and do not expect to get a reward.

The motivation to donate is influenced by several things, including empathy. Pink (2019) suggests that empathy is the ability to put yourself in someone else's position and feel what other people feel. Latifah & Susanti (2016) stated that Empathy has a very close correlation with pro-social behavior. Eisenberg and Rafles (2018) suggest that prosocial behavior is the behavior of helping, sharing, and similar positive behaviors that are carried out intentionally and

voluntarily with unspecified and unknown motives, and carried out with or without compensation from the beneficiary. One of the prosocial behavior is donating. Of these<sup>26</sup> opinions<sup>27</sup> it can be concluded that the level of empathy has a relationship with the motivation of<sup>28</sup> donation.

In addition to empathy, donations can also be influenced by social campaigns that are currently starting to be discussed, campaigns and donation motivations are always related. Because through public campaigns it will be easy to get information on social activities such as donating and can raise public awareness of certain problems so that<sup>29</sup> raising motivation to donate. One of the easiest and fastest forms of socializing donation requests is on social media. Requests for donations on social media are included in the form of marketing campaigns that are increasingly being found in charitable organizations in recent times (Spines & Oswald, 2010). Social media is an internet-based application that can result in the creation and exchange of user content. Today, social media is one of the most influential communication channels (Bredl, 2015, p. 1). Social media has a relationship with people's motivation to donate because social media provides opportunities for individuals and organizations to participate in online discussions, connect with one another<sup>30</sup>, and create or share information. In addition, according to Barger (2012, p. 34-35), engagement and conversation on social media from an organization is not just a two-way dialogue, it also ultimately influences market behavior (encouraging customer loyalty, sales in business, generating volunteers, donations, or actions in non-profit organizations).

As described above, this study aims to determine the relationship between empathy, campaigning and<sup>31</sup> the use of social media on the motivation of donations to the community in Greater Jakarta (Jabodetabek).

## Literature Review

### Motivation to Donate in the Covid-19 Pandemic Situation

More and more research is identifying that donations can be in the form of money (Sura et al., 2017), blood (Williams and Masser, 2019), alms (Bin-Nashwan et al., 2020a, 2020b) or<sup>32</sup> organs (Ju et al., 2018 ). For charities to survive and thrive, financial contributions (monetary donations) are the most important form of support aimed at breathing new life into the relationship between excess funds and funding needs (Beldad et al., 2014).

Attitude is one sign of the level of positive feelings of donors to contribute in<sup>33</sup> monetary donations through online platforms (eg web pages and social networking sites) for those affected by COVID-19. Donations can not only be made physically but also in electronic form,<sup>34</sup> such as online donations. In 2006, Treiblmaier and Pollach found that people's beliefs and perceptions about fundraising sites are determined by trust on<sup>35 36</sup> the Internet, indicating that if positive perceptions of IT are strong, individual attitudes to donating online will be highly shaped. The literature has paid much attention to examining how social networking sites help and support online donations during the Covid-19 pandemic. Reddick and Ponomariov (2012) confirmed that charitable organizations also play an important role in predicting online donations by showing that the closer the donor is to the charitable organization, the more likely it is to make online donations.

### Empathy Level

According to Merriam-Webster's Medical Dictionary (2002), empathy is an act or ability to understand, be aware, be<sup>37</sup> sensitive so that you can feel for yourself

the feelings, thoughts, and experiences of others, either in the past or present without having feelings, thoughts, and experiences fully communicated explicitly and objectively. Empathy means being emotionally and cognitively attuned to another person and understanding what a situation looks like from the other person's point of view.

Several studies have stated that a person's factor in providing help is based on the empathy that each individual has, however, the empathy that each individual has is different, one of which is influenced by gender and motivation. Research conducted by O'Brien, Konrath, Grühn, & Hagen (2013) found the same results as Eisenberg and Lennon's 1983 study that when the empathy trait was measured it was found that women reported having high empathy scores compared to men in eliciting prosocial behavior.

In contrast to the research conducted by Mestre, et al (2009), the research conducted by McMahon, Wernsman <sup>38</sup> and Parnes (2006) on 150 African American adolescents gave different results, it was argued that men were shown to have higher empathy scores so they also tended to have high scores on measures of prosocial behavior. Several studies have shown that gender differences are consistent with shared stereotyped patterns, in which women tend to exhibit greater types of relational assistance behaviors (e.g. providing comfort) compared to men who exhibit more instrumental types of prosocial behavior (e.g. helping someone with homework). <sup>39</sup> In accordance with what has been described previously, it can be concluded that gender has an influence on a <sup>40</sup> person's empathy.

### Donation Campaign

This era of the COVID-19 pandemic brings misery and helplessness to people all over the world. So with these conditions people help each other and work

together and unite to support and provide assistance to those affected by this pandemic. Therefore, it is important to provide a good understanding of people's attitudes towards<sup>41</sup> involvement in fundraising campaigns to support those affected by the pandemic.

As Defazio (2021) points out, in a digital environment such as a crowdfunding project, a campaign appears as one part of a mosaic displayed with a title, photo, and a brief description of the promotional phrase with a hyperlink leading to the project page. his project has certain fundamental parts that build structured hierarchical information. Donors see the entire project content and hierarchically process the information and then decide whether to support it or not. herefore<sup>42</sup>, fundraisers need to invest more significant efforts to describe the quality of the project through the specific attributes associated with the project itself and pay more attention to the fundamental parts of the campaign to achieve success.

Quinton and Fennemore (2013) argue that fundraising or donation campaigns are being democratized through social networking sites by gaining public participation at the same time connecting them on a personal level. The findings of the study indicate that campaigns on charity projects, internet technology features, junior high school features, and religiosity are significant motivations that influence attitudes towards<sup>43</sup> online donations.

## Social Media

Social media is known as the best online tool for interaction and communication. They provide one-on-one communication, offering content personalization, self-interest, customization and<sup>44</sup> sharing. ikewise<sup>45</sup>, they can accurately describe target information and facilitate communities of similar interests (Castillo et al., 2014; Halikainen, 2015).



The literature shows that internet technology features such as social media have a lot to offer in shaping donor attitudes toward online donations (Shier and Handy, 2012; Sura et al., 2017; Treiblmaier and Pollach, 2006). For example, Shier and Handy (2012) state that perceptions of internet technology attributes as safe, trustworthy, effective <sup>46</sup> and efficient can provide a richer understanding of online donation behavior. Sura et al. (2017) found that general attitudes towards online donations were significantly influenced by features of internet technology. However, Bandyopadhyay (2012) claims that people are more concerned with privacy and security issues related to internet technology; this can affect the attitude of donors towards online donations both positively and negatively. It has been recognized that overall satisfaction with Internet technology can promote the online process of volunteering and finding satisfying opportunities.

The power of social networking sites can be harnessed to attract and retain potential and existing donors. In recent years, the use of social media such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat has become more widespread and <sup>47</sup> pervasive; for many, the use of this platform <sup>48</sup> is a daily routine. Previous research has revealed that a large number of donors prioritize using a spectrum of social media sites as a way of communicating with charitable organizations (Wong, DML and Jusoff, K, 2011).

## Methodology

### Research Method

The approach used in this study is a quantitative approach to test the hypotheses that have been prepared. This study aims to prove whether there is an influence between the independent variables, namely the level of empathy,

donation campaigns, and social media on the dependent variable, namely the motivation to donate. Data processing and analysis techniques in this study used data quality tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear analysis, and hypothesis testing using the SPSS version 25 program. The sampling technique used in this research is using purposive sampling technique method.

The criteria that have been set in this study are:

1. A woman
2. Age range 15 – 64 years
3. Educated at<sup>49</sup> least High School
4. Working/not working women

Data collection in this study was carried out by providing a closed questionnaire, namely a questionnaire whose alternative answers have been provided using a Likert scale. The following are the answer choices using a Likert scale that will be used in this study:

.

Table 1

Likert Scale

Keterangan

Skor

Strongly Agree

5

Agree

4

Undecided

3

Disagree

2

Strongly Disagree

1

Hypothesis Formulation

To facilitate research, the theoretical framework can be drawn up and described as follows:

H2

H3

H1

Empathy Level (X1)

Donation Campaign (X2)

Social Media (X3)

Motivation to Donate (Y)

(H4)

Figure 1

Theoretical Framework Scheme

From the description of the framework scheme, a hypothesis is obtained, namely as follows:

H<sub>1</sub><sup>50</sup> : Partially the level of empathy affects the motivation to donate

<sup>51</sup>H<sub>2</sub> : Partially the Donation Campaign has an effect on<sup>52</sup> the Motivation to Donate

<sup>53</sup>H<sub>3</sub> : artially<sup>54</sup> Social Media has an effect on<sup>55</sup> the Motivation to Donate

<sup>56</sup>H<sub>4</sub> : Simultaneously the level of empathy, donation campaign, and social media affect the motivation to donate.

Table 2

Variable Operational

Variable

Variabel<sup>57</sup> Concept

Indicator

Motivation do Tonate (Y)

The theory of altruism explains that charitable donations (donations) or the simple act of giving to others are a response to concern for the welfare of others (Otto and Bolle, 2011; Gates and Steane, 2009; Dixon, 2008; Gates and Steane, 2007; Simmons and Emanuele, 2007). , 2007; Webb et al., 2000).

A person's attitudes and actions toward donations are based on empathy-induced altruistic motivation. Important motivations for donating are recognition, self-esteem, prestige and<sup>58</sup> succeeding<sup>59</sup> in obtaining a greater contribution (Sargeant, 1999; Sargeant et al., 2004).

Response

Confession

Pride

Prestige

Big contribution

Empathy (X1)

Empathy is defined as "an affective state that comes from understanding another person's emotional state or condition" (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987). Empathy relies on automatically activated state matching<sup>60</sup> that results in shared representations and similar emotions (Decety and Jackson, 2006); such state-matching stands out wherever humans seek to cultivate more just and compassionate feelings (Gerdes, 2011). Researchers have found that empathy motivates prosocial behavior (Batson et al., 1995; Eisenberg and Miller, 1987; Murillo et al., 2016), such as donating money to charitable crowdfunding projects (Lee et al., 2014). Therefore, cultivating empathy is the main determinant of intention<sup>61</sup> to donate.

1. affective state: feelings, interests, attitudes, emotions
2. understanding the emotional state or condition of others
3. the same feeling can be activated automatically
4. produce similar emotional representations
5. cultivate a fairer feeling
6. Feeling loving.

#### Donation Campaign (X2)

According to Quinton and Fennemore (2013)<sup>62</sup> Campaigns for fundraising are some of the characteristics that can encourage individual attitudes and intentions to engage in project donations.

Donation-based campaigns consist mostly of community projects, charities, politics and<sup>63</sup> health issues.

1. individual campaign
2. community project

3. charity

4. politics

5. health problems

Social Media (X3)

Social media and communication tools <sup>64</sup> have the ability to attract users' attention and support, as well as to share information (Wong and Jussof, 2011; Cohen, 2011).

Social media has become a platform for non-profit organizations to carry out charity fundraising activities (Saxton & Wang, 2014).

Social networking apps like Facebook, Twitter, and Crowdrise offer new ways for nonprofits to engage communities in fundraising efforts.

Social media allows organizations to not only send and receive information but also connect with and mobilize the public (Lovejoy, Waters, & Saxton, 2012).

Ability to attract attention and support

A non-profit organization for fundraising

Use of social networking applications such as Facebook, Twitter, and Crowdrise

Mobilizing the public

Source: processed by researchers, 2021

Research Results

Validity and Reliability Test Results

Validity and reliability tests for the variables of motivation to donate, empathy, campaign and use of social media have valid and reliable values. So that the questionnaire can be distributed to the targeted community.

Classical Assumption Test Results

In the classical assumption test, there is no violation of the five assumptions so that a <sup>65</sup> hypothesis test can be carried out immediately.

### Hypothesis Test Results

The results of the regression test can be obtained results:

### Regression Equation

$$Y = a + b_1.X_1 + b_2.X_2 + b_3.X_3 + e$$

The results of the regression equation are as follows:

$$Y = 8,308 + 0,026.X_1 + 0,298.X_2 + 0,219.X_3 + e$$

Based on the multiple linear regression equation above, it can be concluded as follows:

The constant value ( $\alpha$ ) of 8.308 indicates that if there is no change in the empathy, campaign, and social media variables or the value ( $X = 0$ ) then the motivation variable to donate has a value of 8.308.

Empathy <sup>66</sup> regression coefficient value of 0.026 indicates that the empathy variable has a positive influence on the motivation to donate, which means that for every 1 unit increase in the empathy variable, the motivation to donate will increase by 0.026.

Empathy <sup>67</sup> regression coefficient value of 0.298 indicates that the campaign variable has a positive influence on the motivation to donate, which means that for every 1 unit increase in the campaign variable, the motivation to donate will increase by 0.298.

Empathy <sup>68</sup> regression coefficient value of 0.219 indicates that the campaign variable has a positive influence on the motivation to donate, which means that for every 1 unit increase in the campaign variable, the motivation to donate will increase by 0.219.

## Table 2. Hypothesis Testing

Variable	Regression Coefficient (Beta)	T	Significance	Explanation
Coefficient	8.308	3.745	.000	Significant
Empathy	.026	.308	.759	Not significant
Campaign	.298	2.321	.022	Significant
Social Media	.219	2.255	.026	



## Significant

Dependent: donation motivation,  $\alpha = 5\%$   $F = 17.810$   $\text{Sig} = (.0,000)$   $R = 55,5\%$ ,  
 $R^2 = 30,8\%$

Based on the table of t test<sup>69</sup> results above, it can be explained as follows:

Based on the results obtained in the table above, the significance value of the empathy level variable (X1) is  $0.759 >$  the significant level ( $\alpha$ ) is  $0.05$  and the t arithmetic value is  $0.308 <$  t table value is  $1.980$ . The value of t<sup>70</sup> table is obtained from the calculation of t table =  $t(\alpha/2 : n-k-1) = (0.025 : 120) = 1.980$ , then  $H_0$  is accepted. This means that partially the level of empathy (X1) has no effect on<sup>71</sup> the motivation to donate (Y).

Based on the results obtained in the table above, the significance value of the donation campaign variable (X2) is  $0.022 <$  significant level ( $\alpha$ )  $0.05$  and the t-count value is  $2.321 >$  the t-table value is  $1.980$ . The value of t<sup>72</sup> table is obtained from the calculation of t table =  $t(\alpha/2 : n-k-1) = (0.025 : 120) = 1.980$ , then  $H_0$  is rejected. This means that partially the donation campaign (X2) has a significant effect on the motivation to donate (Y).

Based on the results obtained in the table above, the significance value of the donation campaign variable (X2) is  $0.026 <$  significant level ( $\alpha$ )  $0.05$  and the t-count value is  $2.255 >$  the t-table value is  $1.980$ . The value of t<sup>75</sup> table is obtained from the calculation of t table =  $t(\alpha/2 : n-k-1) = (0.025 : 120) = 1.980$ , then  $H_0$  is rejected. This means that partially the donation campaign (X2) has a significant effect on the motivation to donate (Y).

Based on the results of the F test above, it can be seen that the calculated F value is  $17.810$  and the significance value is  $0.000$ . In this study, the F table value is  $2.68$  which is obtained from F table =  $F 0.05 (k; n-k) = F 0.05 (3; 122) =$

2.68. So the significance value is  $0.000 < 0.05$  and the calculated F value is  $17.810 >$  the F table value is 2.68. This proves that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted. This means that the variable level of empathy (X1), donation campaign (X2), and social media (X3) simultaneously (together) significantly affect the motivation to donate (Y).

Based on the table above, the amount of Adjusted R Square is 0.291 or equal to 29.1%, this figure means that the variable level of empathy (X1), donation campaign (X2), and social media (X3) affect the variable of motivation to donate (Y) by 29.1%. While the remaining 70.9% is influenced by other variables or variables not examined in this study.

#### Discussion of Research Results

An explanation of the interpretation of the test results between the independent variable (independent) and the dependent variable (dependent) is as follows:

The level of empathy (X1) partially has no effect on<sup>78</sup> the motivation to donate (Y) in women because  $H_1$  is rejected which means that the variable level of empathy (X1) has no effect on<sup>79</sup> the motivation to donate (Y). The results of this study are in line with the research of Mestre, et al (2009) which found that the level of women's empathy had no significant effect on motivating donations. The Donation Campaign (X2) partially affects the motivation to donate (Y) in women, because  $H_2$  is accepted which means partially the donation campaign variable (X2) affects the motivation to donate (Y). The results of this study are in line with the research of Quinton and Fennemore (2013) who argue that fundraising or donation campaigns are being democratized through social networking sites by gaining mass audience participation, at the same time connecting them on a personal level.

Social Media (X3) partially affects the motivation to donate (Y) in women, because H<sub>2</sub> is accepted which means that social media variables (X3) partially affect the motivation to donate (Y). The results of this study are in line with research (Shier and Handy, 2012; Sura et al., 2017; Treiblmaier and Pollach, 2006) which states that social media has a lot to offer in shaping donor attitudes towards online donations.

## Conclusion

This study aims to determine the level of empathy, donation campaigns, and social media in influencing women's motivation to donate. Respondents in this study were 124 female respondents, where the respondents were women with different religious backgrounds, age range 15<sup>80</sup> – 64 years, minimum education background is high school senior high school, and employment status which is the main requirement in candidate respondents in this study. Based on the results of the research conducted, it can be concluded as follows:

The level of empathy variable (X1) partially has a positive relationship but has no significant effect on donating (Y). H<sub>1</sub> is rejected.

The donation campaign variable (X2) partially has a positive relationship and the donation campaign variable (X2) affects the motivation to donate (Y). H<sub>2</sub> accepted.

The level of empathy variable (X3) partially has a positive relationship and the social media variable (X2) has an effect on<sup>81</sup> the motivation to donate (Y). H<sub>3</sub> is accepted.

Based on the results of simultaneous hypothesis testing (Test F) it shows that H<sub>4</sub> is accepted and the level of empathy (X1), donation campaign (X2), and social media (X3) variables simultaneously (together) affects the motivation to donate (Y) have a significant positive relationship.

Based on the results of the analysis of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) shows that the variable level of empathy, donation campaign, and social media have an effect on the variable of motivation to donate by 29.1%<sup>82</sup>. While the remaining 70.9% is influenced by other variables or variables not examined in this study.

It is necessary to add several variables for further research, for example<sup>83</sup> related to donation literacy, digitizing donations as well as officer services.

## REFERENCES

Ahn, J. chang, Sura, S., & An, J. C. (2018). Intention to donate via social network sites (SNSs): A comparison study between Malaysian and South Korean users. *Information Technology and People*, 31(4), 910–926.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-12-2015-0307>

Bandyopadhyay, S. (2012). Consumers' Online Privacy Concerns: Causes and Effects. *Innovative Marketing*, 8(3).

Barger, C. (2012). *The Social Media Strategist: Build a Successful Program from the Inside Out*. United States of America: McGraw-Hill

Benedict, E., & Ariestya, A. (2020). Pengaruh Penggunaan Media Sosial Instagram terhadap Sikap Berdonasi Melalui Platform Crowdfunding.

*Ultimacomm: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 12(2), 167–184.

<https://doi.org/10.31937/ultimacomm.v12i2.1649>

Bin-Nashwan, S. A., & Al-Daihani, M. (2020). Fundraising kampanyes<sup>84</sup> via social media platforms for mitigating the impacts of the COVID-19 epidemic. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 12(3), 576–597. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-07-2020-0200>

Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Al-Daihani, M., Abdul-Jabbar, H., & Al-Ttaffi, L. H. A. (2020). Social solidarity amid the COVID-19 outbreak: fundraising kampanyes<sup>85</sup> and donors' attitudes. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-05-2020-0173>

Bps.go.id. (2021, 15 Juli). "Persentase Penduduk Miskin Maret 2021 turun menjadi 10,14 persen". Diakses pada 24 Oktober 2021, dari <https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2021/07/15/1843/persentase-penduduk-miskin-maret-2021-turun-menjadi-10-14-persen.html>

Bredl, K. (2014). *Methods for Analyzing Social Media*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Defazio, D., Franzoni, C., & Rossi-Lamastra, C. (2021). How Pro-social Framing Affects the Success of Crowdfunding Projects: The Role of Emphasis and Information Crowdedness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 171(2), 357–378. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04428-1>

Efrat, K., Gilboa, S., & Wald, A. (2021). The emergence of well-being in crowdfunding: a study of entrepreneurs and backers of reward and donation kampanyes<sup>86</sup>. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 27(2), 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-12-2019-0685>

Hallikainen, P. (2015). Why people use social media platforms: Exploring the motivations and consequences of use. *Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organisation*, 5, 9–17. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09450-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09450-2_2)

Indonesia.go.id. (2021). "Agama". Diakses pada 24 Oktober 2021, dari <https://indonesia.go.id/profil/agama>

Latifah, L., & Susanti, R. H. (2016). Upaya Meningkatkan Empati Siswa SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Malang Melalui Penggunaan Teknik Sinema Terapi. *Jurnal Konseling Indonesia*, 1(2), 88–95.

Lili, L., Ayoung, S., & Christian, W. (2018). Empathy or perceived credibility? An empirical study on individual donation behavior in charitable crowdfunding.

*Internet Research*, 28(3), 623–651. [http://10.0.4.84/IntR-06-2017-](http://10.0.4.84/IntR-06-2017-0240%0Ahttp://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=llf&AN=130897876&site=ehost-live)

[0240%0Ahttp://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=llf&AN=130897876&site=ehost-live)

[direct=true&db=llf&AN=130897876&site=ehost-live](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=llf&AN=130897876&site=ehost-live)

Marko, S., & Peter, S. M. (2010). Developing a measurement approach for reputation<sup>87</sup> of non-profit organizations. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15, 276–299. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm>

Mollick, E. (2014). The Dynamics of Crowdfunding: An Exploratory Study.

*Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1–16.

Otto, P. E., & Bolle, F. (2011). Multiple facets of altruism and their influence on

blood donation. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40(5), 558–563.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2011.04.010>

Pink, H.,D. (2019). A whole new mind (diterjemahkan oleh Irene christen).

Jakarta:PT elexmedia komputindo.

Quinton, S., & Fennemore, P. (2013). Missing a strategic marketing trick? The

use of online social networks by UK charities. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(1), 36–51.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1450>

Raffles, F. Y. (2018). Tingkat perilaku prososial pada mahasiswa yang melakukan selectivishm. Skripsi. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Sanata Dharma.

Reddick, C. G., & Ponomariov, B. (2013). The Effect of Individuals' Organization Affiliation on Their Internet Donations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*

Quarterly, 42(6), 1197–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012452670>

Sargeant, A. (2015). A retrospective - Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behaviour<sup>88</sup>. *Social Business*, 4(4), 293–323.

<https://doi.org/10.1362/204440814x14185703122847>

Saxton, G. D., & Wang, L. (2014). The Social Network Effect: The Determinants of Giving Through Social Media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 850–868. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013485159>

Snipes, R. L., dan Oswald, S. L. (2010). Charitable giving to not-for-profit organizations: factors affecting donations to non-profit organizations.

*Innovative Marketing*, 6(1), 73–80

Straussner, S. L. A., & Phillips, N. K. (2005). The role of empathy in work with women offenders. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 1(2–4), 255–262.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17449200600554637>

Sura, S., Ahn, J., & Lee, O. (2017). Factors influencing intention to donate via social network site (SNS): From Asian's perspective. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(1), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.04.007>

Treiblmaier, H., & Pollach, I. (2006). A framework for measuring people's intention to donate online. *PACIS 2006 - 10th Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems: ICT and Innovation Economy*, 808–819.

Umayah, A. N., Ariyanto, A., & Yustisia, W. (2017). Pengaruh empati emosional terhadap perilaku prososial yang dimoderasi oleh jenis kelamin pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial*, 15(2), 72–83.

<https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2017.7>

<https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2017.7>

Wong, D. M. L., & Jusoff, K. (2011). Social Networking in Charity Advocacy.

*Special Issue on Computer Applications & Knowledge Management*, 12, 65–72.

[http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.4405&rep=rep1&type=pdf)

[doi=10.1.1.390.4405&rep=rep1&type=pdf](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.4405&rep=rep1&type=pdf)

Zakat.or.id. (2018, 07 Mei). "Daftar Lembaga Amil Zakat di Indonesia". Diakses pada 24 Oktober 2021, dari <https://zakat.or.id/daftar-lembaga-amil-zakat/>



1.	<del>by</del>	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
2.	the purposive	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
3.	the empathy	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
4.	a t	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
5.	of 0.308	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
6.	a significance	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
7.	of 0.759	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
8.	the empathy	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
9.	is not significantly influenced, is not significantly influencing	Incorrect verb forms	Correctness
10.	the donation	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
11.	a t	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
12.	of 2.321	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
13.	<del>Proverty</del> → Poverty	Misspelled words	Correctness
14.	a problem	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
15.	a central	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness

16.	<del>included</del> → including	Incorrect verb forms	Correctness
17.	the Central	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
18.	<del>Statistic</del> → Statistics	Incorrect noun number	Correctness
19.	the current	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
20.	<del>proverty</del> → poverty, property	Misspelled words	Correctness
21.	the elements	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
22.	<del>indonesia</del> → Indonesia	Misspelled words	Correctness
23.	. golid	Improper formatting	Correctness
24.	<del>golid</del> → gold	Misspelled words	Correctness
25.	amil	Unknown words	Correctness
26.	<del>theese</del> → these	Misspelled words	Correctness
27.	opinions,	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
28.	<del>of</del> → for	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
29.	<del>so that</del>	Conjunction use	Correctness
30.	<del>with one another</del>	Wordy sentences	Clarity
31.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
32.	, or	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
33.	<del>in</del> → to	Wrong or missing	Correctness

		prepositions	
34.	<del>form</del> → forms	Incorrect noun number	Correctness
35.	the trust, or a trust	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
36.	<del>en</del> → in	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
37.	and be	Conjunction use	Correctness
38.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
39.	<del>In accordance with</del> → By, Following, Per, Under	Wordy sentences	Clarity
40.	<del>has an influence on</del> → influences	Wordy sentences	Clarity
41.	<del>towards</del> → toward	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
42.	<del>herefore</del> → Therefore	Confused words	Correctness
43.	<del>towards</del> → toward	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
44.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
45.	<del>ikewise</del> → likewise	Misspelled words	Correctness
46.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
47.	widespread, pervasive	Wordy sentences	Clarity
48.	<del>this platform</del> → these platforms	Incorrect noun number	Correctness
49.	in at	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness

50.	H <sub>1</sub> :	Improper formatting	Correctness
51.	H <sub>2</sub> :	Improper formatting	Correctness
52.	<del>has an effect on</del> → affects	Wordy sentences	Clarity
53.	H <sub>3</sub> :	Improper formatting	Correctness
54.	<del>artially</del> → partially	Misspelled words	Correctness
55.	<del>has an effect on</del> → affects	Wordy sentences	Clarity
56.	H <sub>4</sub> :	Improper formatting	Correctness
57.	<del>Varibel</del> → Variable	Misspelled words	Correctness
58.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
59.	<del>succeeding</del> → success	Confused words	Correctness
60.	<del>state-matching</del> → state-matching	Misspelled words	Correctness
61.	the intention	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
62.	2013),	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
63.	, and	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
64.	<del>have the ability to</del> → can	Wordy sentences	Clarity
65.	<del>that a</del>	Conjunction use	Correctness
66.	An empathy	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
67.	An empathy	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness

68.	The empathy	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
69.	<del>t-test</del> → t-test	Misspelled words	Correctness
70.	the t	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
71.	does not affect	Wordy sentences	Clarity
72.	the t	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
73.	$\alpha/2$ :	Improper formatting	Correctness
74.	0.025 :	Improper formatting	Correctness
75.	the t	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
76.	$\alpha/2$ :	Improper formatting	Correctness
77.	0.025 :	Improper formatting	Correctness
78.	does not affect	Wordy sentences	Clarity
79.	does not affect	Wordy sentences	Clarity
80.	of 15	Wrong or missing prepositions	Correctness
81.	<del>has an effect on</del> → affects	Wordy sentences	Clarity
82.	<del>have an effect on</del> → affect	Wordy sentences	Clarity
83.	example,	Comma misuse within clauses	Correctness
84.	<del>kampanyes</del> → companies	Misspelled words	Correctness
85.	<del>kampanyes</del> → companies	Misspelled words	Correctness

---

86.	<del>kampanyes</del> → companies	Misspelled words	Correctness
87.	the reputation	Determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.)	Correctness
88.	<del>behaviour</del> → behavior	Mixed dialects of English	Correctness

---