

## **HOW A SMALL PLAYER CAN SUCCEED IN A WELL-ESTABLISHED OFFLINE AND ONLINE FUNDRAISING MARKET: RAISE CRAZE CASE STUDY**

**Bela Florenthal**  
**William Paterson University**

---

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

I would like to thank Alexis Hofmann, an MS student, for her contribution to the case study. She was instrumental in collecting and analyzing the data for this case, and in helping with secondary research supporting the information presented in this case study.

---

*Online fundraising applications, such as Kickstarter and GoFundMe, have rapidly become the dominant platforms for raising funds for individuals, nonprofits, entrepreneurs, and other for-profit businesses. To compete in the fundraising market in the U.S., Raise Craze came up with a slightly different approach. It was established by parents of K–12 students, who decided that it was time to reinvent school fundraising. Instead of asking students to sell in-person merchandise, they developed a platform allowing students to raise money through acts of kindness (AOKs). Once the idea started to take off and Raise Craze gained some media attention, schools began to seek its services. In 2021, with more successful campaigns under its belt, Raise Craze aimed to establish itself as a key player in the K–12 market. However, as a smaller company with limited resources, the owners of Raise Craze struggled to compete with large-scale traditional offline and online fundraising platforms. Raise Craze, therefore, faces three key challenges: (a) how to compete in a market dominated by well-known and established competitors, (b) how to increase their market share in their existing target market of K–12 students, and (c) how to attract the college student population. This case is suitable for instructors teaching lower and upper level marketing courses, such as principles of marketing (PM), marketing management (MM), and marketing research (MR). In PM and MM courses, instructors can ask students to perform a SWOT analysis, discuss segmentation, targeting, and positioning (STP) strategies, and exercise pricing strategies. In MR courses, instructors can ask students to complete a content analysis and/or perform a descriptive study analyzing and revising the existing survey and collecting and analyzing additional data.*

---

## **THE FUNDRAISING INDUSTRY**

Fundraising is the performance of gathering funds to support socially impactful causes. Online and offline fundraising operations saw positive and negative trends in the few years leading up to 2022. Kasia (2017) found that “90% of revenue collected from charities in the UK come from offline sources” (para. 5), and that direct mail was responsible for up to 79% of all donations. Some disadvantages of offline compared with online fundraising included older offline contributors (65 and older) and lower-income donors. Another downside was that the advancement of online technology made it harder to gain new customers through offline methods: “Online advertising is becoming an ever more important tool for fundraisers. In the United States, the share of online giving has been on the rise for the last ten years, reaching 8.5% of all donations in 2018” (Adena & Hager, 2020, p. 5). In 2020, online giving grew by 21% overall donations increased by 2% (MacLaughlin, Perrotti, Thompson, & Vellake, 2021).

A positive side to offline donations was that individuals could contribute via direct mail and bank transfers. Meanwhile, offline contributions could be collected through door-to-door campaigns, which allowed the fundraiser to talk to a prospective donor one-on-one and explain their cause thoroughly (Kasia, 2017). One advantage of online fundraising was that it was easier to convert pledges to money and attract a larger pool of donors, and that these donors tended to earn more money. Online fundraising was found to be also superior to its offline counterpart because it helped those initiating the fundraiser reach their friends and family members more effortlessly through social media. Some online fundraising methods were crowdfunding through platforms such as GoFundMe, Facebook’s peer-to-peer method, and text donations. On the negative side, online fundraising made up only 13% of donation revenue in 2020, and the average monetary donation was only \$177, compared to the \$737 overall average donation (MacLaughlin et al., 2021).

**Industry Trends.** Between 2015 and 2020, online giving, including mobile (text and mobile applications), grew to \$11.8 billion. In 2017, online giving reached a new high of \$31 billion, compared to the previous peak of \$19.2 billion in 2012. Over the past three years (2018–2020), online giving rose by 32% (MacLaughlin et al., 2021). In the U.S. alone, individual donations approached \$310 billion (Milena, 2021). Online and mobile banking pushed many donors to set up donations directly from their bank accounts. In 2020, 28% of online donations were performed via mobile devices (MacLaughlin et al., 2021). Garnett (2017) believed there was a correlation between Facebook users over the age of 65 and their use of

online banking, stating that “62% of online adults use Facebook” while at the same time “47% of online adults 65+ now do their banking online” (p. 2). Thus, this age group was now easier to target by online fundraising methods.

***School Fundraising.*** The K–12 education sector saw a decline in charitable giving of close to 5% from 2018–2020 (MacLaughlin et al., 2021). However, this sector received, on average, the second highest donations in dollars (\$1,278), trending closely behind higher education (\$1,671). School departments, such as choirs, sports teams, and clubs, had different ways of conducting fundraisers. A blog post entitled *10 Team Fundraising Ideas That Work for Any Sport* (2021, April 5) shared how sports teams raised money for their team’s jerseys. One suggestion was a t-shirt fundraiser with custom shirts designed and sold to school students and their families who supported the school sports teams. Another idea was to organize a peer-to-peer fundraising campaign—this method built on the personal network of each participant. Team members and volunteers created individual fundraising pages to attract donations from their extended network. Fundraising pages on Facebook were an excellent example of such campaigns.

Choir groups have been known to raise money by hosting live auctions online, pre- and post-concert donor receptions, benefit concerts, and walks for music and choral arts (Cook, 2018). A benefit concert could either have the school’s choir or band perform for the school or invite a comedian to perform in school to raise funds. Cook (2018) also suggested creative online options for raising funds, such as a crowdfunding campaign to fund a specific project through applications such as Kickstarter, GoFundMe, and Indiegogo. Mobile giving was also recommended to reach donors easily and quickly through applications such as MobileCause, Txt2Give, and Give by Cell.

School fundraising has always been considered an essential activity. “In addition to ensuring financial stability, it also brings a sense of cooperation by bringing students, staff, parents, and the community together” (Ibrisevic, 2018, para. 2). School fundraising could inspire creativity, promote the entrepreneurial spirit, and enhance the support network by adding new fans, friends, and followers. Unique and innovative fundraising campaigns could also draw local media attention. Such campaigns included performing community services in exchange for donations (e.g., working with Clothes Drive or Books for Bucks), organizing a guided hike and charging a fee, or creating and selling customized water bottles during school activities (e.g., sports practice and games).

The traditional K–12 school fundraising approaches, such as in-person merchandise sales, had been gradually phased out and replaced by purely online product

fundraising (Sullivan, 2014). Nonetheless, in-person merchandising was successfully applied in the U.S. for many years, with 2,000 operating companies raising \$1.5 billion per year, with \$30 million per state equating to about \$13,000 per school or roughly \$30 for every student. Online sites such as Fundraising.com provided numerous opportunities for offline fundraising ideas and products, with new ones published frequently. These opportunities were offered at various prices and had different percentage returns. However, deciding what products to sell could be very cumbersome. Another hurdle was ensuring students' safety with in-person sales and competing with other cause-based fundraisers. Regardless, some schools sticking to traditional fundraisers argued that "if it's not broken, don't fix it" (Sullivan, 2014, para. 9).

One popular way to raise funds in the offline environment was by applying the scratch card method described on EasyFundraisingIdeas.com. This fundraising method asked people to scratch two or three concealed dots out of 50 on a card. A scratched dot revealed an amount from 50¢ to \$3.00, indicating the amount to donate. The donors then received a sheet of valuable coupons (\$100 in value) to show appreciation for their participation. Table 1 illustrates the profit structure of such a method, and demonstrates the increase in profits with the increase in purchased scratch cards.

**TABLE 1: SCRATCH CARD PROFIT STRUCTURE**

# of Cards Bought	Price Per Card	Amount Each Card Raises	Total Profit in \$	Profit in %
1	\$30	\$100	\$70	70%
10	\$15	\$100	\$850	85%
25	\$12	\$100	\$2,200	88%
100	\$10	\$100	\$9,000	90%

The profit structure could vary across campaigns, and the costs could add up, as percentage return was only one aspect to consider. Among the significant costs to consider was the shipping of prizes to donors. Product selection, the popularity of products among potential donors, and product prices were additional factors to consider (Sullivan, 2014).

Whether an online or offline platform was used to conduct a school fundraiser, to succeed required mastering several key steps (Woroniecki, 2016). Goal setting was the first step, and involved determining the amount to be raised, the purpose of raising money, and the costs involved. The next step was identifying the fundraising

team (teachers, students, administrators, parents, and/or staff) and deciding on the donor pool, which was crucial for the campaign's success. The targeted donors might have been students, parents, family members, friends, or alumni. Organizing a few fundraising events (e.g., school auctions) was an option to increase donations from the targeted population. Fundraising software (e.g., mobile bidding and text to give) could be used to add to the success of such events. It was also essential to segment donors into giving levels to allow for small, medium, and large sized one-time giving, as well as annual and planned giving options. Mastering the strategies of asking for donations (before, during, and after campaigns) was a crucial step in this process (Jarvis, n.d.). Finally, providing multiple platforms for donors to give—online (e.g., Facebook, e-mail, and text) and/or offline (e.g., in-person, phone, and direct mail)—was invaluable to the fundraiser's success.

### **RAISE CRAZE**

***Company Background and Operation.*** Raise Craze was founded by parents looking for a new way of raising funds for their children's schools. The founders did not want to sell cookie dough, gift wrapping paper, or discount cards anymore. They decided to build an online fundraising platform where students performed acts of kindness (AOKs) in return for donations. Raise Craze operated by having people, primarily students, go out and perform kind acts individually or in groups; it was up to the fundraiser (e.g., schools) to decide what acts they did and how they wanted to complete their AOKs. Fundraising through Raise Craze was a straightforward approach and entailed a three-step process: set-up and planning, promoting, and tracking.

Set-up required students to receive from Raise Craze an identifying code (URL) for the school. Students typed in the identifying URL on Raise Craze's website to create a username and upload a photo. Planning involved creating a list of AOKs that students intended to perform. The AOKs could be selected from a predetermined list or customized to unique fundraising causes (e.g., a service day at a women's shelter). Developing the communication strategy was also part of the planning stage. Building on personal networks, each student was required to enter the e-mail addresses of people who were likely to donate in support of the completion of the selected AOKs. Other planning tasks included developing incentive ideas, creating a checklist, and building a timeline via a calendar. Creating a checklist benefited students when they checked off any completed kindness acts so that potential donors could see how far along students were in advancing their AOK goals.

Raise Craze understood that promotion was at the heart of any fundraiser's operation. Raise Craze supported schools with predesigned tools that required students and organizers to "just hit send!" (Raise Craze, n.d.). They also provided printable posters, kickoff programs and videos, social media campaigns, and save-the-date emails, to name a few. Progress tracking was critical for keeping a fundraising campaign on track. Raise Craze offered real-time information to schools through an online dashboard. The amount raised, number of participants, number of emails sent, number of donations, and AOK report were some of the data the dashboard displayed.

Although Raise Craze was established as an online platform, students could market kindness acts online and offline. They could log their acts on the specific webpage they created, or if they did not have Internet access, they could request "paper kindness trackers" (Raise Craze, n.d.). The company's website gave one example of an online marketing initiative by a high school band that partnered with Raise Craze. One student reached out to his favorite local rapper on Instagram. The rapper, who appreciated the idea, donated \$500 to the school's marching band. Multiple unique examples of AOKs were also published on Raise Craze's website, including contributing Halloween candy to deployed troops, giving coffee to cops, leaving thank you notes to unappreciated individuals (e.g., mail carriers and garbage collectors), or leaving love notes to family members around the house.

Incentivizing students to complete AOKs was a crucial element for a successful Raise Craze fundraiser. Schools were encouraged to provide tangible and/or experiential incentives to motivate youngsters to perform AOKs. Parties or other fun-driven events and free merchandise (e.g., keychains) had proven effective. Still, the extra costs associated with such incentives should be factored in at the planning stage by the organizers of the school fundraiser. The Kindness Coin project was an example of how students could be motivated to do AOKs by promoting a culture of kindness in the school (Raise Craze, n.d.). Kindness coins were exchanged between students in return for AOKs. Students could also mail these coins to their family members or loved ones. Fun and creative visual representations of fundraising progress (e.g., a space-themed pulley system in a rocket shape) were used in schools to motivate students to stay on track with their AOKs.

Table 2 demonstrates how Raise Craze operated within its target market. Although the primary market for Raise Craze was K–12 schools, it aimed to position itself as a service that could work for any group, organization, or team that desired to raise funds by focusing on performing AOKs. Table 2 provides a few examples of the schools and organizations that partnered with Raise Craze. The number of AOKs

varied significantly across their customers, from as low as 54 to as high as 5,520. There was also significant variation in the funds raised, from \$12,230 to as high as \$76,783. The strength of Raise Craze campaigns was the AOK concept tied to donations. Having young children performing AOKs encouraged people to donate. Another main advantage of these partnerships was the low costs to schools, which usually kept between 93% and 97% of the raised funds. Schools received their funds, minus the fees (up to 10%), through the WePay online payment processing program used by Raise Craze.

According to the data presented on RaiseCraze.com, they usually partnered with elementary schools. Thus, the company’s main weakness was that it was not well known outside of the K–12 market and that elementary schools were its main customers, with a 73% market share of their business. They did attract some middle schools (14%), high schools (10%), and even colleges (3%), but those contributed little to Raise Craze’s total revenue.

**TABLE 2**  
**AN EXCERPT OF SCHOOLS WHO PARTNERED WITH RAISE CRAZE**

School	Year	Funds Raised	Funds Kept (% of Profit)	# of AOKs
Holy Souls Elementary	2018	\$64,589	\$60,166 (93%)	3,591
	2020	\$76,783	\$71,933 (94%)	5,520
Cypress Woods High School (Marching Band)	2020	\$39,868	\$37,714 (95%)	Service day at a women’s shelter and playing for its residents
Wilkerson Intermediate Middle School	2020	\$15,725	\$14,642 (93%)	1,352
Arizona State University (Lambda Chi Alpha Chapter)	2020	\$12,230	\$11,691 (96%)	54

***The Competitive Landscape of Raise Craze.*** As an unknown brand, Raise Craze was considered a minor competitor in the fundraising market dominated by several well-known online applications. Facebook, the dominant U.S. social media platform, debuted its “donate” button in 2013 to capitalize on the opportunity to raise funds through social media. They continued to expand on the feature by adding more options, such as a birthday donation feature that allowed people to donate to a cause of the birthday celebrator’s choosing. The most significant advantage of Facebook was the convenience and ease of creating and sharing the fundraiser (Table 3). However, “Facebook fundraising may be good for getting quick cash for a specific project, but a poor option for building long-term relationships with donors” (Comcowich, 2018, para. 9). The limited marketing tools, delayed payouts, and lack of donor information could deter nonprofits from using this option. Still, from mid-2016, users had raised over \$5 billion on the Facebook and Instagram platforms combined (Hutchinson, 2021).

GoFundMe was another crowdfunding platform that allowed people to raise money for charitable causes. Users of GoFundMe sought donations to cover fees for graduations, parties, hospitalizations, accidents, or even deaths. It became a popular application for its benefits, such as receiving donated money quickly, protecting donated money, and donations being possible online or via a mobile application (L. Gaille, 2019). It had raised \$10 billion since it was founded, supporting 150 million donations from individuals and organizations globally (Business Wire, 2020). A fundamental weakness was security concerns, as the organizers needed to provide their social security numbers to withdraw their money. Another significant issue was taxable donations. For instance, “Casey Charf raised nearly \$50,000 on GoFundMe in 2015, and then discovered that she owed \$19,000 to the IRS in taxes” (L. Gaille, 2019, para. 20).

Kickstarter was a crowdfunding platform focused on raising donations for creative projects, such as making board games, making hair dye, and creating figurines. Entrepreneurs mainly used it to start their businesses, which was an alternative to raising money through venture capital. “While artists, filmmakers, and musicians might offer token rewards such as a producer credit on a documentary, many startup businesses like Thursday Boot Co. use the site to presell the product they are about to make” (Solomon, 2014, para 4.). The main advantages of this platform were its ease of use and the short time it took to raise money. Its disadvantages included providing a time limit for raising funds, stating a specific goal, and meeting certain standards (B. Gaille, 2016). Kickstarter was a prominent player in the fundraising landscape, reaching almost \$5.5 billion in pledges to projects between 2020 and 2021 (Statista, 2021).

**TABLE 3  
ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF ONLINE COMPETITORS**

<b>Fundraiser Platform</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Money Raised</b>
Facebook Fundraisers	A social networking site on which people can donate to peers, organizations, and other causes (e.g., natural disasters)	<p>Convenient and easy to use</p> <p>Donations are made within the network site</p> <p>Easily share donation news with followers</p> <p>Easy integration with nonprofit websites</p>	<p>Nonprofits must complete Facebook’s application process</p> <p>Marketers have limited creative tools</p> <p>Payouts may take up to 45 days</p> <p>Confusing reports</p> <p>No customer service</p> <p>Lack of donor information</p> <p>Limited control</p>	\$5 billion between 2016–2021
GoFundMe	American for-profit crowdfunding program that allows people to raise money for any cause	<p>Protection of donated money</p> <p>Receive donations quickly</p> <p>A mobile app is available</p> <p>No platform fees</p>	<p>No guarantee of success</p> <p>Not supported by all countries</p> <p>Organizers must meet specific withdrawal requirement</p> <p>Privacy issue with SSN</p>	\$10 billion between 2010–2020

		No time limits or deadlines for campaigns	Limited customer service	
		No requirement to meet any goals	No anonymous donations	
Kickstarter	A fundraising platform for creative projects, such as games, music, films, and art	Easy-to-use interface	The requirement to meet a specified goal	\$5.43 billion between 2012–2020
		Money can be raised quickly	90-day time limit	
		Projects can generate free exposure	All or nothing format	
		Provides personal review	Standards that must be met	
		No transfer of ownership		

---

According to the website PYMNTS (n.d.), in 2017 online fundraising applications (Facebook, GoFundMe, Kickstarter, and Indiegogo) charged transaction fees that were a percentage of the raised funds in addition to a monetary charge per donation. When comparing Raise Craze to its online competitors (see Table 4), it was evident that the payment structure was much simpler and easier to calculate. The percentage Raise Craze charges may end up being significantly lower, as shown in Table 4, with the transaction fee in some cases being only three or four percent.

The competitive landscape of online and mobile fundraising applications was constantly changing. New players had entered this lucrative space, such as GivingFuel, FundraiseUp, PayPal, RaiseDonors, and iDonate, competing with more established players to gain market share (Kindful, 2021). Thus, for Raise Craze to stay competitive, it needed to continually scan the competitive landscape and clearly communicate its competitive advantage to its target market, mostly K–12 schools.

**TABLE 4: FEES OF FUNDRAISING APPLICATIONS**

Fundraisers	Transaction Fees	Fee Per Donation
Facebook	6.9%	30 Cents
Kickstarter	8%	20 Cents
GoFundMe	7.9%	30 Cents
Indiegogo	8%	30 Cents
Raise Craze	Up to 10%	None

Raise Craze promoted its competitiveness on its website via a “Why Choose Raise Craze” tab. They emphasized their advantages over direct competitors, such as fundraising through “Fun Runs,” “Product Sales & Discount Cards,” and “Crowdfunding.” Raise Craze believed that its strongest selling point was a transparent pricing policy, which was very attractive to K–12 schools, especially if busy parents organized the fundraiser. The intricacies of the pricing structure of offline and online fundraising providers/applications could be overwhelming at best and misleading at worst. However, Raise Craze’s up to 10% transaction fee was straightforward (including processing fees) and did not include additional hidden costs, such as platform fees, like some of its competitors. The real-time tracking and reporting dashboard was the second advantage they promoted; Facebook’s reporting, for example, was weak in comparison. Finally, Raise Craze did not impose deadlines or monetary goals as did Kickstarter, therefore reducing the pressure on participants. Based on these strengths, Raise Craze sets itself apart from direct and indirect competitors. Still, a central weakness of Raise Craze remained not being well known in the fundraising marketplace.

***Adoption of Raise Craze by College Students: A Quantitative Study.*** Although the primary target market for Raise Craze was K–12 schools, it did try to attract the higher education market. As illustrated in Exhibit 2, Lambda Chi Alpha Chapter at Arizona State University used Raise Craze to raise funds through AOKs. Raise Craze knew that college students conducted many fundraising activities through clubs and other organizations on campus. To test the water for Raise Craze, a survey was administered in a public mid-sized university to assess its attractiveness to college students when considering fundraising activities. The survey investigated college students' attitudes, behavioral intentions, and actual behavior related to online fundraising. A questionnaire was developed based on research done via the Internet. Published surveys with relevant questions were identified, and their questions were modified to fit the needs of the current study. The questionnaire underwent several revisions, and the university’s Institutional Review Board

approved the final version. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix A. Qualtrics software was used to administer the survey, and data were collected from students through a convenience sampling method. The survey link was distributed in classes, through emails, on social media sites, and by text messages. Some students completed a paper-and-pencil survey for extra credit in their courses.

The final sample size was 77 completed questionnaires. Table 5 summarizes the descriptive characteristics of the sample. More than 60% of the respondents were female, more than half were Caucasian (54%), and about 70% were employed, part-time (42%) or full-time (29%). About half of the sampled students were business majors, and two-thirds were in their third and fourth years of school. They had either a high school diploma (49%) or a GER/Associate degree (30%). Overall, the sample represented a student body with diverse majors, some bias toward females, some ethnic diversity, primarily upper classmates (older), part-time or full-time employment, and either a high school diploma or degree from a community college.

**TABLE 5 DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS (N = 77)**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
Gender	
Male	38
Female	62
Ethnicity	
White/Caucasian	54
Latino or Hispanic	29
Black/African American	9
Other	8
Employment Status	
Student, Employed Part-time	42
Student, Employed Full-time	29
Student, Unemployed	24
Other	5
Major	
Business Majors	48
Non-Business Majors	52
Years in School	
1–2	15
3–4	68
5 or more (Master’s Degree)	13
Other	3
Highest Degree Achieved	
High School	49

GED & Associate	30
Bachelor's	13
Master's and Higher	8

---

The survey results are presented in Appendix B. The survey supported Raise Craze founders' concerns regarding the unfamiliarity of their platform among college students, as 90% of participants stated that they were unfamiliar or very unfamiliar with this application. Many recognized, however, the Facebook fundraiser (65%) and GoFundMe (76%) platform. Kickstarter was less familiar (42%). The study also shed some light on other attitudes toward fundraising. Students believed that people would donate to causes out of kindness (58%), empathy (82%), support for the poor (61%), desire to give aid (67), and activism (64%). Mostly students engaged in monetary donations (35%), shared fundraisers online (29%), and attended fundraising events (26%). Only a few asked for donations (5%), planned a fundraiser (6%), or solicited others to attend a fundraiser event (14%). Students preferred online (81%) to offline (61%) platforms if they decided to plan a fundraiser. Fifty-nine percent of the participants indicated that they donated \$100 or less to local charities annually, and 55% volunteered for four or fewer hours per year. They were very enthusiastic about sharing a request for donation on their social media (74%) and sharing their friend's request for donation (86%). Many (67%) were very active on social media, but less than half (42%) were confident about raising funds via social media sites.

Thus, students were comfortable with online fundraising campaigns, but most did not organize such campaigns. They were familiar with some online fundraising platforms but unfamiliar with Raise Craze. Moreover, although they were willing to share posts soliciting donations, they were not experienced with setting up fundraising initiatives on social media sites. These results indicated that college students were an untapped target market for Raise Craze's platform, which simplified the entire fundraising process for customers who were novices in such endeavors.

The founders of Raise Craze realized that they could provide a valuable service to organizers of fundraising campaigns in schools, and may even be able to branch out to student organizations on college campuses. The potential for expansion was excellent. However, with limited funds, they were faced with a few dilemmas if they wanted to build awareness and recognition within both K–12 and college student markets: (a) how to promote themselves most effectively within the K–12 market; (b) how to emphasize their competitive advantages like profit structure; (c) how to attract college student organizations; and (d) how to compete effectively with larger and more well-known fundraising platforms.

## REFERENCES

- Adena, M., & Hager, A. (2020). Does online fundraising increase charitable giving? A nation-wide field experiment on Facebook. *WZB Discussion Paper*, No. SP II 2020-302, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), Berlin.
- Bonfire Blog. (2021, April 5). *10 team fundraising ideas for teams that work for any sport*. <https://blog.bonfire.com/team-fundraising-ideas/>
- Business Wire (2020). *GoFundMe marks a decade in giving; releases annual giving report highlighting global data from the past 10 years and 2020*. <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20201208005311/en/GoFundMe-Marks-a-Decade-in-Giving-Releases-Annual-Giving-Report-Highlighting-Global-Data-From-the-Past-10-Years-and-2020>
- Comcowich, W. C. W. J. (2018, March 16). *Pros & cons of doing fundraising on Facebook*. <https://glean.info/pros-cons-fundraising-facebook/>
- Cook, T. (2018, July 13). *7 fundraising focus areas for community choruses*. <https://blog.chorusconnection.com/7-fundraising-focus-areas-for-community-choruses>
- Double the Donation. (n.d.) *The 20+ best online donation tools* <https://doublethedonation.com/tips/top-online-donation-tools/>
- Easy Fundraising Ideas. (n.d.). *Scratch card fundraisers: Got an itch to make money for your group?* <https://easy-fundraising-ideas.com/products/scratch-card-fundraisers/>
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2008). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92.
- Fundraising. (n.d.). *Latest fundraising ideas: do you want to stay up to date with the fundraising world? Look no further*. <https://www.fundraising.com/>
- Gaille, B. (2016). *14 pros and cons of Kickstarter*. <https://brandongaille.com/14-pros-and-cons-of-kickstarter/>
- Gaille, L. (2019). *17 GoFundMe pros and cons*. <https://vittana.org/17-gofundme-pros-and-cons>

- Garnett, R. (2017, April 14). *What's really driving the increase in online giving?* <https://npengage.com/nonprofit-fundraising/whats-really-driving-the-increase-in-online-giving/>
- Hutchinson, A. (2021). *Facebook says that people have raised over \$5b through its donation tools.* Social Media Today. <https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/facebook-says-that-people-have-raised-over-5b-through-its-donation-tools/597156/>
- Hutchinson, A. (2019, September 20). *Facebook provides stats on the success of its fundraising tools in new update.* Social Media Today. <https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/facebook-provides-stats-on-the-success-of-its-fundraising-tools-in-new-upda/563356/>
- Ibrisevic, I. (2019, June 21). *25 fundraising ideas for clubs and organizations.* <https://donorbox.org/nonprofit-blog/fundraising-ideas-for-clubs/>
- Jarvis, A. (2019, November 4). *14 smart school fundraising ideas to raise money fast.* <https://www.qgiv.com/blog/ideas-school-fundraising/#site>
- Jarvis, A. (n.d.). *Asking for donations: The nonprofit's guide.* <https://www.qgiv.com/blog/asking-for-donations/>
- Kasia. (2017, June 13). *Offline vs online fundraising - Which option is better?* <https://news.leetchi.com/offline-vs-online-fundraising-option-better/>
- Kindful. (2021, March 16). *Which online fundraising platform is best for your nonprofit?* <https://kindful.com/blog/best-online-fundraising-platforms/>
- Kozłowska, H. (2017, November 29). *Facebook is dropping its fundraising fees for nonprofits, but not for personal causes.* <https://qz.com/1141658/facebook-is-dropping-its-fundraising-fees-for-non-profits-but-not-for-personal-causes/>
- MacLaughlin, S., Perrotti, E., Thompson, A., & Vellake, A. (2021). *Using 2020 to transform your strategy.* Charitable Giving Report. [https://institute.blackbaud.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/2021\\_CGR\\_Print.pdf](https://institute.blackbaud.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/2021_CGR_Print.pdf)
- Milena. (2021). *Charitable giving statistics.* <https://balancingeverything.com/charitable-giving-statistics/>

- Non-Profit Source. (n.d.). *Charitable giving statistics: Americans gave \$410 billion to charities in 2017, up 5%*. <https://nonprofitssource.com/online-giving-statistics/>
- PYMNTS. (2017). *Facebook to eliminate transaction fees on donations*. <https://www.pymnts.com/facebook/2017/facebook-to-eliminate-transaction-fees-on-donations/>
- Paynter, B. (2018, December 10). *These 5 numbers show how GoFundMe is booming*. <https://www.fastcompany.com/90278025/these-5-numbers-show-how-gofundme-is-booming>
- Raise Craze. (n.d.). <https://raisecraze.com/>
- Raise Craze. (n.d.). *How this “kindness thing” works*. <https://raisecraze.com/how-rc-works>
- Solomon, S. (2014, November 13). *The pros and cons of raising money on Kickstarter to launch your business*. <https://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20141113/flatiron/pros-cons-of-raising-money-on-kickstarter-launch-your-business>
- Statista. (2020, November 19). *Kickstarter project funding success rate as of November 2020*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/235405/kickstarter-project-funding-success-rate/>
- Statista. (2021, January 11). *Cumulative amount of funding pledged to Kickstarter projects as of November 2020*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/310218/total-kickstarter-funding/>
- Sullivan, T. (2014). *Sales fundraisers: The basics*. <https://www.ptotoday.com/ptotoday-articles/article/216-sales-fundraisers-the-basics>
- Woroniecki, R. (2016, March 2). *8 Best Practices for K–12 School Fundraising*. <https://www.salsalabs.com/blog/school-fundraising-best-practices>

**APPENDIX A  
FUNDRAISING APPLICATIONS SURVEY**

This survey aims at learning how students utilize social media for fundraising activities. This survey is anonymous and personal data is not collected. The survey should take about 5–7 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation.

**Part A: Consent Form**

This survey is part of a study to see what fundraising platform people prefer and why. It is being conducted to fulfill the requirements of an independent study. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may stop completing the survey at any time and do not have to answer any question(s) I choose not to answer.

There are no anticipated risks involved when participating in this research. I accept any discomfort I may experience during this study. I know that if I choose, I can stop completing this study at any time with no penalties to me.

A benefit of my participation in this study is to learn how to conduct a survey, and I accept it.

I understand that any data collected as part of this study will be stored in a safe and secure location, and will be destroyed when the study is completed.

I understand that my identity will not be revealed in any way through my participation in this study. The results will not be reported in a way that reveal individual participants.

Consent:

By completing this survey and clicking submit, I give my consent to use my data for this research

**Part B: Donating, Volunteering, and Fundraising**

1. In your opinion, how likely would a person donate money because of the following reasons:

	Very Unlikely				Very Likely
a. Out of kindness	1	2	3	4	5
b. Out of empathy	1	2	3	4	5
c. The will to help the poor	1	2	3	4	5
d. The will to give aid	1	2	3	4	5
e. Out of activism	1	2	3	4	5

2. Within the last year, how frequently have you engaged in the following activities:

	Very Infrequentl y				Very Frequentl y
a. Donated money	1	2	3	4	5
b. Asked for donations	1	2	3	4	5
c. Planned a fundraiser	1	2	3	4	5
d. Worked on a fundraiser	1	2	3	4	5
e. Shared a fundraiser online	1	2	3	4	5
f. Attended a fundraising event	1	2	3	4	5
g. Solicited others to attend a fundraising event	1	2	3	4	5
h. Did not participate in any fundraising	1	2	3	4	5

3. When was the last time you participated in a fundraiser? (please circle)

- a. 0–5 months ago
- b. 6–11 months ago
- c. 1–5 years ago
- d. Never

4. What is your attitude toward fundraising for a cause you care about?

Extremely Negative					Extremely Positive
1	2	3	4	5	

5. How likely are you to commit to a fundraiser for a cause you care about?

Very Unlikely					Very Likely
1	2	3	4	5	

6. If you needed to plan a fundraiser for your favorite charity how likely are you to do it:

	Very Unlikely				Very Likely
a. Online	1	2	3	4	5
b. Offline	1	2	3	4	5

7. How familiar are you with the following fundraising applications?

	Very Unfamiliar				Very Familiar
a. Facebook	1	2	3	4	5
b. GoFundMe	1	2	3	4	5
c. Kickstarter	1	2	3	4	5
d. Raise Craze	1	2	3	4	5

8. How likely are you to use any of the following applications to raise money for a cause that you care about?

	Very Unlikely				Very Likely
a. Facebook	1	2	3	4	5
b. GoFundMe	1	2	3	4	5
c. Kickstarter	1	2	3	4	5
d. Raise Craze	1	2	3	4	5
e. Other, specify _____	1	2	3	4	5

9. In the last year how much have you donated to a local charity?

- a. \$0
- b. \$50 or less
- c. \$51–\$100
- d. \$101–\$150
- e. \$151–\$200
- f. \$201+

10. In the last year how many hours have you volunteered?

- a. 0
- b. 1
- c. 2
- d. 3
- e. 4
- f. If more, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

11. How likely are you to share on your social media page a request for donation involving:

	Very Unlikely				Very Likely
a. A post about a cause you care about	1	2	3	4	5
b. A post from a friend you care about	1	2	3	4	5

**Part C: Social Media**

12. How familiar are you with social media sites?

Very Unfamiliar					Very Familiar
1	2	3	4	5	

13. How much do you agree with the statement “I understand how social media works”?

Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

14. How much do you agree with the statement “I am very active on several social media sites”?

Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

15. How much do you agree with the statement “I know how to raise funds on social media sites”?

Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**Part D: General Information**

16. Gender: • Male • Female

17. Age: \_\_\_\_\_

18. Ethnicity:

- White/Caucasian
- Black/African American
- Latino or Hispanic
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Middle Eastern
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

19. What is your employment status? (Check one)

- Student, employed full-time
- Student, employed part-time
- Student, unemployed looking for work
- Student unemployed not looking for work
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

20. Are you an active member of a religious organization that mandates or encourages charitable giving, e.g., tithing, obligations during a religious holiday, etc.?

- Yes
- No

21. What is your major?

- Marketing
- Management
- Finance
- Global Business
- Financial Planning
- Accounting
- Other

22. What year are you?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Masters Student
- Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

23. What is your highest qualification of education that you currently own?
- High School Degree
  - Diploma
  - Bachelor's Degree
  - Master's Degree
  - Doctorate
  - Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX B: SURVEY ANALYSIS**

<b>Question Items</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<b>Q1. In your opinion how likely would a person donate because of the following reasons: (Scale: 1 – Extremely Unlikely; 5 – Extremely Likely)</b>		
Out of Kindness	1–2	18
	3	24
	4–5	58
Out of empathy	1–2	4
	3	14
	4–5	82
The will to help the poor	1–2	10
	3	29
	4–5	61
The will to give aid	1–2	16
	3	17
	4–5	67
Out of activism	1–2	13
	3	23
	4–5	64
<b>Q2. Within the last year, how frequently have you engaged in the following activities? (Scale: 1 – Very Infrequently; 5 – Very Frequently)</b>		
Donated money	1–2	40
	3	25
	4–5	35
Asked for donations	1–2	83
	3	12
	4–5	5
Planned a fundraiser	1–2	80
	3	14
	4–5	6
Shared a fundraiser online	1–2	54
	3	17

	4–5	29
Attended a fundraiser event	1–2	57
	3	17
	4–5	26
Solicited others to attend a fundraising event	1–2	64
	3	22
	4–5	14
Did not participate in any fundraising	1–2	53
	3	24
	4–5	23
Q3. When was the last time you participated in a fundraiser?		
	0–5 months ago	42
	6–11 months ago	18
	1–5 years ago	32
	Never	8
Q4. What is your attitude toward fundraising for a cause you care about? (Scale: 1 – Extremely Positive; 5 – Extremely Negative)		
	1–2	88
	3	9
	4–5	3
Q5. How likely are you to commit to a fundraiser for a cause you care about? (Scale: 1 – Very Likely; 5 – Very Unlikely)		
	1–2	85
	3	13
	4–5	1
Q6. If you needed to plan a fundraiser for your favorite charity how likely are you to do it? (Scale: 1 – Very Likely; 5 – Very Unlikely)		
Online	1–2	81
	3	11

	4-5	8
Offline	1-2	61
	3	22
	4-5	17
<b>Q7. How familiar are you with the following fundraising applications?                      (Scale: 1 – Very Familiar; 5 – Very Unfamiliar)</b>		
Facebook	1-2	44
	3	21
	4-5	35
GoFundMe	1-2	55
	3	21
	4-5	24
Kickstarter	1-2	25
	3	17
	4-5	58
Raise Craze	1-2	5
	3	5
	4-5	90
<b>Q8. How likely are you to use any of the following applications to raise money                      for a cause you care about?                      (Scale: 1 – Very Familiar; 5 – Very Unfamiliar)</b>		
Facebook	1-2	74
	3	10
	4-5	16
GoFundMe	1-2	74
	3	12
	4-5	14

Kickstarter	1–2	22
	3	24
	4–5	54
Raise Craze	1–2	16
	3	30
	4–5	54
Q9. In the last year how much have you donated to a local charity (in \$)?		
	0	15
	50 or less	43
	51–100	16
	101–200	8
	200+	18
Q10. In the last year, how many hours have you volunteered?		
	0	28
	1–2	17
	3–4	38
	5+	17
Q11. How likely are you to share on your social media page a request for donation involving: (Scale: 1 – Very Likely; 5 – Very Unlikely)		
A post about a cause you care about	1–2	74
	3	9
	4–5	17
A post from a friend you care about	1–2	86
	3	9
	4–5	5
Q12. How familiar are you with social media sites? (Scale: 1 – Extremely Familiar; 5 – Not Familiar at All)		
	1–2	86

	3	10
	4-5	14
Q13. How much do you agree with the statement “I understand how social media works”? (Scale: 1 – Strongly Agree; 5 – Strongly Disagree)		
	1-2	87
	3	11
	4-5	3
Q14. How much do you agree with the statement “I am very active on several social media sites”? (Scale: 1 – Strongly Agree; 5 – Strongly Disagree)		
	1-2	67
	3	15
	4-5	18
Q15. How much do you agree with the statement “I know how to raise funds on social media sites”? (Scale: 1 – Strongly Agree; 5 – Strongly Disagree)		
	1-2	42
	3	35
	4-5	23