

THE EFFECTS OF NONPROFIT BRAND PERSONALITY AND SELF-BRAND CONGRUITY ON BRAND RELATIONSHIPS

MYA PRONSCHINSKE GROZA, Northern Illinois University

GEOFFREY L. GORDON, Northern Illinois University

Nonprofits are facing a competitive marketplace in which securing resources has become a key concern. Branding is an essential activity, which may help nonprofits form stronger relationships with their constituents. This study looks into the brand relationships (i.e., financial, time, and social/recommending support) donors and volunteers have with a nonprofit organization. Different nonprofit brand personality dimensions (Venable, Rose, Bush, & Gilbert, 2005) are predicted to affect how individuals engage with nonprofits. After utilizing multivariate analysis of variances, survey data collected from a small nonprofit of 182 respondents indicates nurturance and sophistication brand personalities lead to one's willingness to volunteer time to a nonprofit organization. Nurturance and ruggedness dimensions affect an individual's willingness to recommend the nonprofit organization. By assessing one's own personality with the nonprofit's personality (i.e., self-brand congruity), nurturance is a strong indicator of brand relationship engagement.

INTRODUCTION

Nonprofit organizations' race for support, both financial and other, has never been more competitive. While larger nonprofit organizations such as World Wildlife Fund, American Cancer Society, Habitat for Humanity, the Salvation Army, and the American Red Cross refine and build their donor networks, smaller, local nonprofits continually struggle for survival. As of year-end 2015, there were close to 1,600,000 nonprofit organizations, of which over 500,000 had less than \$1million in revenue (NCCS Business Master File, 2016). Furthermore, the largest 2.25 percent of nonprofits accounted for 90 percent of total reported funding of the \$335.17 billion donated to United States charitable causes in 2013 (MacLaughlin, 2015). Adding to this perilous situation is the fact that state and local government budget crises are threatening the livelihood of agencies. Stories of nonprofit organizations having to slash their budgets and/or shut their doors, leading to much needed services no longer being provided is sadly a common news headline.

Against this backdrop, smaller nonprofits must discover the importance of marketing and, more to the point, branding activities. The need for active branding no longer relates to just raising revenues. Rather, for nonprofits hoping to connect and form meaningful relationships with individuals, branding is an essential component of the marketing toolkit. As a result of decreased available grant funding and more selective donor giving, nonprofits have launched themselves into utilizing business practices such as branding. Branding is important to a nonprofit brand as it may help them differentiate their organization from competitors and thus garner more resources (Venable, Rose, & Gilbert, 2003; Venable, Rose, Bush, & Gilbert, 2005; Sargeant, Ford, & Hudson, 2008). The way that individuals perceive the brand of an organization plays a significant role in making decisions about where to give volunteer efforts (Ryder, 2016). Nonprofits seek to attract and secure support from donors and volunteers thereby providing meaningful services to their clients. A strong brand clarifies what the nonprofit stands for and allows the nonprofit organization to acquire more resources (financial, human, and social) and to deploy them with more flexibility (Kylander & Stone, 2012). Hence, an important issue for nonprofits is: how do they form brand relationships in order to secure necessary financial, time, and social (i.e., recommending) support?

By identifying the needs and interests of individuals and understanding how the brand is meaningful to them, nonprofits can better build relationships (Schwartz, 2015). Nonprofit brand relationship is defined as an engagement that "may take the form of financial contributions, volunteer commitment, and recommendations to others" (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006). Thus, a goal of nonprofit organizations is to provide meaningful experiences so that individuals feel more engaged and continue to do so for a prolonged period. By accomplishing this, different brand relationship outcomes will be realized. Much like their counterparts in the for-profit sector, savvy nonprofit marketing executives realize it is much more revenue- and cost-effective to retain current donors and supporters than to bring in new donors. However, how does a nonprofit encourage this nonprofit brand relationship?

The model developed in this paper suggests different brand personalities may influence an individual's relationship with a nonprofit brand. Four nonprofit brand personalities identified as integrity, nurturance, ruggedness, and sophistication (Venable et al., 2005) are proposed to have varied and significant effects on brand relationship outcomes. Hypotheses are developed as to whether different brand personalities affect one's willingness to financially contribute to a nonprofit organization, one's willingness to volunteer their time, and one's willingness to recommend a nonprofit organization. To test these hypotheses, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing survey data collected from a sample of 182 individuals who are supporters of a small (less than \$1 million in revenue) nonprofit organization.

Additionally, to provide substantive guidance to nonprofits, d-scores measuring one's congruity with the brand personality are included. The purpose of this testing is to determine whether brand relationship outcomes are strengthened when congruity is higher between one's image of their own brand personality and one's image of the nonprofit brand personality. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. After reviewing relevant literature, the formal hypotheses are proposed. Next, a detailed account of the methods utilized to test the study's hypotheses is presented. The results and

managerial implications are then discussed. Finally, limitations of the study and directions for future research are provided.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Theoretically, brand personality is a "set of human characteristics associated with a brand" (Aaker, 1997, p. 347). Consumers view brands as having human characteristics even though brands are just inanimate objects (Aaker, 1997; Aaker, Benet-Martinez, & Garolera, 2001; Plummer, 1985). Aaker (1997), in her seminal article, identified five distinct dimensions of brand personality traits: *competence, excitement, ruggedness, sincerity, and sophistication*. Scholars have further identified certain personality traits which describe popular brands. For example, Pepsi soda pop is considered "young", while "cool" describes Coca-Cola soda pop (Aaker, 1997). Marlboro cigarettes are reflected as being "masculine" (Ekinici & Hosany, 2006), a BMW vehicle is "sophisticated" (Phau & Lau, 2000), and Dr. Pepper soda pop is considered to be "non-conforming" and "unique" (Plummer, 1985). The brands people choose to consume are using those that convey a distinct personality and are more self-expressive (Aaker, 1997). Aaker (1997) suggests consumers select brands which they consider to be acceptable to them. This might be due to the fact that brands act in a way that allows consumers to convey their values and beliefs (Aaker et al., 2001).

Brand Relationship

Decisions whether or not to support a nonprofit organization are frequently based on what an individual thinks an organization is doing and the sum total of their perceptions regarding the nonprofit (Frumkin, 2015). According to Becker-Olsen and Hill (2006), there are three possible positive outcomes that are realized when individuals have a strong brand relationship with a nonprofit organization. People are more willing to make financial contributions, volunteer their time, and recommend the nonprofit organization to others when they have a brand relationship with the nonprofit (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006). For example, the Omaha Community Foundation

attributed a 221 percent increase in new assets to branding and brand relationship efforts undertaken (Kanani, 2014). Conversely, when individuals experience a bad brand relationship with or a negative perception of a nonprofit organization, disastrous results can follow (Frumkin, 2015). One need only look at recent experiences associated with the Lance Armstrong Foundation (since renamed the Livestrong Foundation) for evidence (MacLaggan, 2012). Thus, nonprofit organizations must continually work to create intensity in one's engagement and sustained activity opportunities thereby forming deeper, positive brand relationships.

The three possible outcomes that arise from a brand relationship with a nonprofit fall on an image management continuum of one's giving behaviors. The most fleeting engagement with a nonprofit organization is the donation of one's money by giving a financial contribution to the nonprofit. While financial support is an important factor of a nonprofit's operating budget, giving financially represents quick, limited engagement with the nonprofit from the donor's perspective. The donor "feels good" momentarily but this engagement may not lead to a sustained commitment (Labroo & Mukhopadhyay, 2009).

Recent statistics show the difficulty of landing and sustaining a commitment from individuals. Baby Boomers, on average, donate to 4.5 nonprofit organizations per year while Generation Y donors are even more discriminating donating on average to only 3.3 nonprofit organizations per year (MacLaughlin, 2015). Unfortunately, the retention rate for first year donors is continually falling with recent rates hovering around 23.7 percent (Barry, 2014; MacLaughlin, 2015). The 58.4 percent retention rate of multi-year donors is also low (MacLaughlin, 2015). Finally, there were 62.6 million adults volunteering their time at least once to nonprofits in 2013, a 25.4 percent rate (Clolery, 2014). This volunteer rate was the lowest since 2002, further reinforcing the importance of relationship building activities by nonprofit organizations.

Researchers have suggested these varying levels of engagement may be affected by "image motivation" playing a part in an

individual's giving behaviors (Ariely, Bracha, & Meier, 2007). Image motivation is defined as one's "desire to be liked and respected by others and by the self" (Ariely et al., 2007, p. 3). One's willingness to financially contribute to an organization is the lowest level of image motivation because an individual may not receive any public acknowledgement of their donation and may be donating out of the goodness of their heart. Nonprofits, especially smaller ones, heavily rely on donations, which is a particular form of social exchange:

These might be called quasi-economic transactions in that there is money exchanged but the "other side" of the transaction does not involve goods or services. This is not to say that there are not important returns to donors or funders in psychic and social satisfaction (Andreasen, 2001, p. 87).

Donating of one's time (i.e., volunteering) requires giving of one's physical and emotional resources. Time is a valuable resource to many consumers. Subsequently, if a consumer places a high value on their time, they might be willing to donate money at a higher level than those whose time is less of a precious resource (Liu & Aaker, 2008). Liu and Aaker (2008) argue an emotional mindset is evoked when participants are asked to think about their time and comparatively, an economic mindset is evoked by money. That is, a financial contribution is viewed as a value-maximizing goal while volunteering one's time highlights an emotional well-being that comes from being charitable (Liu & Aaker, 2008). Thus, volunteering one's time is appreciated by society as this is seen as a greater level of engagement. Volunteers who evaluate their relationship with a nonprofit as positive are more likely to continue volunteering their time (Waters & Bortree, 2007).

Finally, the last level of engagement is one's psychological commitment to the nonprofit organization which manifests itself as one's willingness to spread positive word-of-mouth about the nonprofit. Speaking positively about a nonprofit organization requires a great deal of image motivation on the part of the recommender. Positive or negative word-of-mouth has important implications as it influences the opinions of other donors and

their donation behaviors (Williams & Buttle, 2013). We predict an individual's evaluations of the nonprofit's brand personality will lead to different brand relationship outcomes. Literature on nonprofit brand personality is discussed next.

Nonprofit Brand Personality

Building from Aaker's (1997) brand personality scale development article, authors have set out to identify the particular personality traits that are important to nonprofits (Grohmann, 2009; Sargeant et al., 2008; Venable et al., 2003; Venable et al., 2005). Venable, Rose, and Gilbert (2003) performed a scale development study by utilizing Aaker's (1997) brand personality scale and augmenting it with the personality traits identified through a qualitative study. The authors identified integrity, nurturance, ruggedness, and sophistication as four dimensions which make up a nonprofit brand personality. The four dimensions were then tested to examine if the different traits led to donors' giving behaviors (Venable et al., 2005). Correlations suggest the different personality traits are associated with intentions to give. Additionally, the donor's self-concept is impacted by the nonprofit's brand personality thus increasing an individual's giving intentions (Hou & Tian, 2009).

Based on this work, it is hypothesized that perceptions of the four nonprofit organization personality traits (1) integrity, (2) nurturance, (3) ruggedness, and (4) sophistication will lead to individuals being more likely to form a brand relationship with a nonprofit. These relationships are manifested through making financial contributions, volunteering their time, and being more likely to recommend the nonprofit organization. This leads to Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4:

H₁: *Integrity perceptions of a nonprofit brand personality will lead individuals to stronger intentions to financially contribute (H_{1a}), volunteer their time (H_{1b}), and to recommend the nonprofit (H_{1c}).*

H₂: *Nurturance perceptions of a nonprofit brand personality will lead individuals to stronger intentions to financially contribute (H_{2a}), volunteer their time*

(H_{2b}), and to recommend the nonprofit (H_{2c}).

H₃: *Ruggedness perceptions of a nonprofit brand personality will lead individuals to stronger intentions to financially contribute (H_{3a}), volunteer their time (H_{3b}), and to recommend the nonprofit (H_{3c}).*

H₄: *Sophistication perceptions of a nonprofit brand personality will lead individuals to stronger intentions to financially contribute (H_{4a}), volunteer their time (H_{4b}), and to recommend the nonprofit (H_{4c}).*

Self-Brand Congruity

Consumers use mental processes to compare and contrast the self to other objects. When there is a match or mismatch between the consumer's self-image and the image of a product or brand, a congruency or incongruency occurs (Sirgy, 1986). A matching of the self to a brand is known as self-brand congruity (Parker, 2009). The greater the congruity, the more one feels connected with the brand and thus, the individual has a more positive attitude toward the brand.

Researchers have utilized the brand personality construct to identify the congruity between one's own assessments of their personality in comparison to a brand (Parker, 2009). That is, the self-brand congruity is operationalized by comparing the (nonprofit) brand personality and self-image measures. We predict when consumers perceive a match between the self and a brand a positive attitude toward the brand will occur leading to favorable outcomes. Specifically, it is hypothesized that when self-brand congruity is high for each of the nonprofit brand personality dimensions, individuals will be more inclined to form a brand relationship with a nonprofit. That is, self-brand congruity will lead individuals to contribute financially, volunteer their time, and be more likely to recommend the organization. Therefore, the following hypotheses are put forth:

H₅: *People who perceive their personal level of integrity to be similar to their perceptions of the nonprofit organization's level of integrity (i.e., high self-brand personality*

congruence) will be more likely to financially contribute (H_{5a}), volunteer their time (H_{5b}), and will be more likely to recommend the nonprofit organization (H_{5c}) compared to those with an incongruence of self-brand personality.

H₆: *People who perceive their personal level of nurturance to be similar to their perceptions of the nonprofit organization's level of nurturance (i.e., high self-brand personality congruence) will be more likely to financially contribute (H_{5a}), volunteer their time (H_{5b}), and will be more likely to recommend the nonprofit organization (H_{5c}) compared to those with an incongruence of self-brand personality.*

H₇: *People who perceive their personal level of ruggedness to be similar to their perceptions of the nonprofit organization's level of ruggedness (i.e., high self-brand personality congruence) will be more likely to financially contribute (H_{5a}), volunteer their time (H_{5b}), and will be more likely to recommend the nonprofit organization (H_{5c}) compared to those with an incongruence of self-brand personality.*

H₈: *People who perceive their personal level of sophistication to be similar to their perceptions of the nonprofit organization's level of sophistication (i.e., high self-brand personality congruence) will be more likely to financially contribute (H_{5a}), volunteer their time (H_{5b}), and will be more likely to recommend the nonprofit organization (H_{5c}) compared to those with an incongruence of self-brand personality.*

METHOD

Sample from a Nonprofit Organization

An electronic mailing list of current and previous donors and volunteers associated with

a local, small (less than \$1million in revenues) community nonprofit organization was provided to the researchers. There were 635 surveys sent out, of which the researchers received 182 usable surveys, yielding a 28.6 percent response rate. The response rate is at a level consistent with Curran, Taheri, MacIntosh, and O'Gorman's (2016) findings which indicate a response rate of over 20 percent to be quite high when dealing with actual donors and volunteers of a nonprofit organization. Of the 182 respondents, 54.3 percent of the respondents were female and the average age of the sample was 29.2 years old. Fifty-two percent possessed a 4-year college degree or higher. Thirty-two percent of the respondents reported household incomes of less than \$30,000, 15.9 percent between \$30,000 and \$50,000, 12.5 percent between \$50,000 and \$75,000, and 18.7 percent between \$75,000 and \$100,000. Only 14.3 percent reported incomes between \$100,000 and \$150,000 and 6.6 percent of the respondents reported incomes over \$150,000. The nonprofit organization works with at-risk youths assisting them to become healthy adults through adventure-based activities (such as rock climbing, paddling, archery, snow-shoeing, camping, etc.)

Measures

Nonprofit brand personality is based on the framework of Venable and colleagues (2003, 2005) which identified four distinct dimensions with fifteen subtypes (i.e., measures) of personality traits. Respondents were asked to assess the extent to which each of the fifteen traits describes the nonprofit organization on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly disagree/strongly agree). The first dimension, integrity, includes the following traits: committed to the public good, honest, positive influence, reputable, and reliable. Nurturance, the second dimension, is made up of the following traits: caring, compassionate, and loving. The third dimension of nonprofit brand personality is ruggedness and includes the following traits: masculine, tough, and Western. Sophistication is the last dimension and includes the following traits: glamorous, good-looking, and upper class.

To assess how similar one sees their own personality to the personality traits of the nonprofit brand, self-brand congruity measures

were utilized (see Parker, 2009). Respondents characterized perceptions of their own personality by assessing (not at all descriptive/very descriptive) fifteen different personality traits (Venable et al., 2005). After characterizing their own brand personality, the respondents then used the same scales to characterize their perceptions of the nonprofit brand's personality (Venable et al., 2005). The self-brand congruity measure was calculated using the difference, or distance, between the nonprofit brand personality and the self-personality scales. Hence, the higher the d-score, or distance, between the nonprofit brand and one's own personality, the less congruity between one's image of the nonprofit brand personality and one's image of their own personality. Contrarily, a smaller d-score, or distance, can be interpreted as having greater congruity between one's image of the nonprofit brand personality and one's image of their own personality.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n = (B_{ij} - S_{ij})^2$$

where: S_{ij} = self-image (i) of one's own brand personality (j)
 B_{ij} = brand image (i) of nonprofit brand personality (j)

Finally, intentions to support the nonprofit organization were derived from Becker-Olsen and Hill's (2006) brand relationship scale. Individuals can connect with a nonprofit differently than with a for-profit organization and at varying levels. Thus, the following self-reported three items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree/strongly agree). One's intention to donate money was assessed through the following self-reported item: "I am likely to contribute financially to this organization." Additionally, "I am likely to volunteer for this organization" was asked to understand individual's intentions to volunteer their time. Lastly, to assess one's willingness to speak positively by recommending the nonprofit organization, the following self-report item was asked, "I am likely to recommend this organization." Tables 1 and 2 contain the means, standard deviations and the correlations for the independent and dependent variables included in the study.

Analysis and Results

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was utilized to analyze the data and test the study hypotheses (results are presented in Table 3). The MANOVA used the three brand relationship variables (intention to contribute financially, intention to volunteer, and intention to recommend) as the dependent variables. The four dimensions of nonprofit brand personality (integrity, nurturance, ruggedness, and sophistication) were used as the independent variables.

A requirement of using MANOVA analysis is the dependent variables should be correlated. Bartlett's test of sphericity (Hair et al., 1998) indicated MANOVA was appropriate for analyzing the data (Bartlett's $\chi^2(3) = 161.33$; $p < .001$), thus satisfying the assumption of equality of variance-covariance matrices.

To test H_1 , H_2 , H_3 , and H_4 that different nonprofit brand personality traits will influence intentions to financially contribute to, volunteer with, and to recommend the nonprofit, MANOVA was conducted. Results from the MANOVA reveal that across the three brand relationships, both nurturance $F(3,163) = 3.07$, $p < .05$, Wilk's $\Lambda = .947$, and ruggedness $F(3,163) = 2.58$, $p < .05$, Wilk's $\Lambda = .955$, significantly influence brand relationship with the nonprofit organization, thus supporting H_2 and H_3 . Follow-up univariate analysis tests were used to test the separate hypotheses on the different brand relationships (results presented in Table 4). The univariate analysis tests reveal no support for H_{1a} , H_{1b} , or H_{1c} with integrity not being a predictor of intentions to contribute financially, volunteer time, or intentions to recommend a nonprofit organization. However, H_{2b} and H_{2c} are found to be significant. That is, nurturance leads to intentions to volunteer one's time and to recommend the nonprofit organization. No support is found for H_{2a} ; nurturance does not predict one's intention to contribute financially to the nonprofit organization. Hypotheses H_{3a} and H_{3b} are not found to be significant. That is, ruggedness does not lead to intentions of one contributing financially or volunteering one's time. However, H_{3c} has support indicating ruggedness leads to intention to speak positively by recommending the nonprofit

TABLE 1:
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations
of Nonprofit Brand Personalities and Brand Relationships

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Integrity	4.07	.667	1						
2. Nurturance	4.12	.754	.676*	1					
3. Ruggedness	3.04	.792	.356*	.157*	1				
4. Sophistication	2.15	.875	.365*	.227*	.450*	1			
5. Donate	2.86	.996	.225*	.207*	.113	.057	1		
6. Volunteer	3.24	.943	.364*	.319*	.128	.170*	.623*	1	
7. Recommend	3.86	.909	.335*	.292	.227*	-.014	.522*	.522*	1

Note. * $p < .05$.

TABLE 2:
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations
of Self-Brand Congruities and Brand Relationships

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Integrity d-score ²	.524	.885	1						
2. Nurturance d-score ²	.738	1.21	.229*	1					
3. Ruggedness d-score ²	.827	1.25	.100	.063	1				
4. Sophistication d-score ²	1.09	1.75	.029	.011	.181*	1			
5. Donate	2.86	.996	-.062	-.184*	-.038	.002	1		
6. Volunteer	3.24	.943	-.067	-.196*	-.054	.065	.623*	1	
7. Recommend	3.86	.909	-.037	-.122	-.044	-.026	.522*	.522*	1

Note. * $p < .05$.

TABLE 3:
MANOVA Results for Nonprofit Brand Personalities on Brand Relationships

Independent Variable	Wilk's Λ	F	Partial η^2
Integrity	.983	.966	.017
Nurturance	.947	3.066*	.053
Ruggedness	.955	2.579*	.045
Sophistication	.959	2.340	.041

Note. * $p < .05$.

organization. No support is found for H_{4a} and H_{4c}; sophistication does not predict one's intention to contribute financially or intentions to recommend the nonprofit organization. Hypothesis H_{4b} leads support for the notion that sophistication contributes to an intention for one to volunteer their time.

To examine self-brand congruity, MANOVA was conducted utilizing squared d-scores as the independent variable (results are presented in Table 5). MANOVA results indicate that across the three brand relationships, nurturance $F(3,163) = 4.21, p < .05, Wilk's \Lambda = .928$ between the self and the nonprofit brand influences brand relationship with the nonprofit organization, thus supporting H₆. Once again to provide a more granular test of group difference, follow-up univariate analyses were conducted on those nonprofit brand personality dimensions and the brand relationship outcomes (results presented in Table 6). No support is found for H_{5a}, H_{5b}, or H_{5c} indicating one's congruence between integrity perceptions of the self and the nonprofit brand personality does not lead to increased willingness to financially contribute, volunteer time, or recommend the nonprofit organization. Hypotheses H_{6a}, H_{6b}, and H_{6c} are all found to be

significant highlighting that a congruence in nurturance perceptions of one's own self personality and that of the nonprofit brand personality leads to heightened willingness to financially contribute, volunteer one's time, and to recommend the nonprofit organization. No support is found for H_{7a}, H_{7b}, or H_{7c}. That is, a congruence between one's ruggedness perceptions of the self's personality and that of the nonprofit brand personality does not contribute to one's desire to financially contribute, volunteer their time, or recommend the nonprofit organization. Lastly, Hypotheses H_{8a}, H_{8b}, or H_{8c} are not found to have support indicating that congruence between sophistication perceptions of one's own personality and the nonprofit brand personality does not lead to intentions to support the nonprofit through financial contributions, volunteering of one's time, or recommendations of the nonprofit organization.

**DISCUSSION AND
MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As funding support from state and local government entities continues to decline, nonprofits, especially small and medium-sized ones, will become more reliant on the

**TABLE 4:
Full ANOVA Results for Nonprofit Brand Personalities on Brand Relationships**

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	MS	F	Partial η^2
Willingness to financially contribute	Integrity	.453	.544	.003
	Nurturance	2.307	2.766	.016
	Ruggedness	.041	.049	.824
	Sophistication	1.543	1.850	.011
Willingness to volunteer time	Integrity	1.172	1.804	.011
	Nurturance	2.816	4.336*	.026
	Ruggedness	.784	1.208	.007
	Sophistication	3.053	4.702*	.028
Recommendation intentions	Integrity	.986	2.065	.012
	Nurturance	3.732	7.818*	.045
	Ruggedness	2.002	4.195*	.025
	Sophistication	.198	.415	.003

Note. * $p < .05$.

TABLE 5:
MANOVA Results for Self-Brand Congruity on Brand Relationships

Independent Variable	Wilk's Λ	F	Partial η^2
Integrity d-score ²	.986	.791	.014
Nurturance d-score ²	.928	4.212*	.072
Ruggedness d-score ²	.991	.519	.009
Sophistication d-score ²	.992	.454	.008

Note. * $p < .05$. The squared d-score assessing self-brand congruity was calculated using the difference between the nonprofit brand personality and the self-personality scales.

TABLE 6:
Full ANOVA Results for Self-Brand Congruity on Brand Relationships

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	MS	F	Partial η^2
Willingness to financially contribute	Integrity d-score ²	1.054	1.256	.008
	Nurturance d-score ²	6.603	7.870*	.046
	Ruggedness d-score ²	.124	.148	.001
	Sophistication d-score ²	.676	.805	.005
Willingness to volunteer time	Integrity d-score ²	.065	.094	.001
	Nurturance d-score ²	7.111	10.248*	.058
	Ruggedness d-score ²	.877	1.265	.008
	Sophistication d-score ²	.788	1.135	.007
Recommendation intentions	Integrity d-score ²	.824	1.507	.009
	Nurturance d-score ²	2.969	5.429*	.032
	Ruggedness d-score ²	.347	.634	.004
	Sophistication d-score ²	.316	.577	.003

Note. * $p < .05$. The squared d-score assessing self-brand congruity was calculated using the difference between the nonprofit brand personality and the self-personality scales.

generosity of individuals to sustain their cause. The purpose of the current study is to determine whether a nonprofit's brand personality leads to different brand relationship behaviors. The findings indicate that certain brand personalities do lead an individual to be engaged in different ways with the nonprofit organization. Nurturance and sophistication brand personalities lend support for one's willingness to volunteer time to a nonprofit organization, while nurturance and ruggedness indicate an individual's willingness to recommend the nonprofit organization.

This study makes an important theoretical contribution to the nonprofit brand personality literature. The contribution of this research extends the work of Venable et al. (2005), who identified the nonprofit brand personality dimensions by connecting with the potential brand relationships (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006) that can be realized from a donor or volunteer's engagement with the nonprofit. By studying the effects of brand personality in a nonprofit context, the present study provides evidence that certain nonprofit brand personality dimensions lead to different levels of engagement with the nonprofit organization.

This research study also sought to understand if a congruence between one's own personality and assessments of a nonprofit brand personality leads to engagement with a nonprofit organization. This research asked respondents to indicate their own personality and the nonprofit brand personality. The authors of this study then created a simple differences score that looked at the distance between the two constructs (i.e., level of self-brand congruence). The findings are quite interesting and provide a contribution to the literature highlighting the importance of nurturance.

Several managerial implications and accompanying recommendations can be derived from the current study's methodology and results. First, the results reinforce previous findings that activities aimed at building nonprofit brands and brand relationships with donors can be fruitful. Proactive brand building activities provide clarity, allowing nonprofit organizations to better build and cultivate relationships with donors (Kanani, 2014). Unfortunately, for many smaller nonprofit organizations, marketing expenditures for staffing to develop these efforts still appear limited. Researcher conversations with numerous nonprofit marketing directors have led the authors to conclude that the marketing director is often also the marketing staff and the entire marketing department for the organization. Whether due to limited budgets, a reluctance to divert funding from service provision, or a negative view on undertaking "shallow" for-profit business practices, investments in donor acquisition and retention efforts are inadequate. Until marketing budgets are increased and more resources are invested in donor relations staff, nonprofit brand building and relationship activities will suffer. Suggested actions may include: 1) the sharing of fund-raising resources such as personnel, space, technology, etc. among nonprofit organizations; 2) the development of reciprocal relationships with universities where university consulting and marketing expertise could be traded for the provision of internships and student employment opportunities; and 3) the training of nonprofit staff to become more multi-faceted in their job tasks.

Second, study results provide evidence that success in better identifying the interests and personality traits of potential donors is an integral part of relationship building. Donors want the organizations they support to better understand them as individuals (Abila, 2015). Greater collection and use of data concerning donors and their preferences can help nonprofits boost donor giving across all areas (Comcowich, 2015). Activities that representatives of nonprofit organizations can undertake with donors (or potential donors) to achieve this goal are as follows. Nonprofit representatives should devote time to speak with and gather information on potential donors in addition to sending out mass e-mails. In addition to collecting standard demographic information, nonprofits should be collecting information (where appropriate) on donor spending patterns, giving frequency, and social activity/ media preferences by conducting short surveys. Where possible, invite potential donors and current donors to participate in the nonprofit's activities, providing the donor and staff opportunities to get to know each other. For example, arrange for tours of the nonprofit are facilities or invite donors to view an outing or two. It may also be fruitful to ask donors to engage in problem-solving activities. Specific donors can be asked for ideas on fundraising activities and ways to increase volunteer participation rates. The more nonprofit organizations can involve donors in activities not requiring (asking for) money, the more likely donors are to become fully engaged.

Third, findings suggest marketing managers of nonprofit organizations (at least the one studied) may be well served to highlight personality dimensions of nurturance, ruggedness, and sophistication when seeking to engage with potential donors, volunteers, and/or clients. Conversely, when highlighting the nonprofit brand dimension of integrity, the current study found no significant results. Thus, the staff of a nonprofit organization might focus their efforts on noting the three other nonprofit brand dimensions (i.e., nurturance, ruggedness, and sophistication). For example, the nonprofit organization involved in the current study began reinforcing the caring and compassionate (in a tough way) aspects of nurturance and ruggedness in its communication messages to donors. Varied videos depicted youths engaging

in high action activities being assisted (when needed) by considerate adults. Taking the time to develop a website and other promotional materials that accurately portray the brand traits of the nonprofit organization will yield positive results.

Fourth, if potential donors perceive the nonprofit's brand personality as being congruent with their own personality then increased support for the organization should follow. Nonprofits should work hard at better targeting potential donors and volunteers based on interests and personality traits. For example, a local nonprofit specifically targets parents of youth who participate in high school sports to contribute their time or money toward sports programs aimed at youth from low-income families. Likewise, the same organization targeted parents of students enrolled in advanced academic activities to sponsor a summer reading program. A nonprofit organization focusing on outdoor adventure activities could easily target members of bike, running, or canoe clubs for assistance.

Fifth, potential donor giving opportunities are limitless with so many nonprofit organizations vying for their time, money, and recommendations. Nonprofit organizations must work hard to not only achieve self-brand congruity but to do so in a way that differentiates them from competing organizations. Donors will contribute more money when they are offered opportunities to pick or choose specific uses of their funds. The success of DonorsChoose.org and Kickstarter campaigns provides evidence that shrewd organizations are asking donors to fund specific projects (Perry, 2015). Likewise, volunteers should be given wide latitude in choosing where their volunteer time and efforts go to assist the organization. Taking this finding step further, savvy organizations could also ask donors to develop their own suggestions for spending their donation. These ideas could then be vetted by the organization's board for appropriateness.

Nonprofit organizations should also continually undertake activities that truly make giving personal (such as giving personal thanks to the donor). For example, a local nonprofit found that giving increased significantly once the

nonprofit's board members began making personal thank-you phone calls to all donors who contributed \$100 or more. These calls not only included thanks for the dollar donations but also acknowledgements of other service activities and solicitations for advice as to how the nonprofit could better serve the community. This year, the same organization is also involving youth recipients in sending artwork (depicting them engaged in activities made possible through donations) to donors. Such personalized interactions can help nonprofits communicate their brand personality dimensions (e.g., nurturance in this example).

Finally, results of the study indicate that nurturance and ruggedness lead to a willingness to recommend the organization. Nonprofit organizations should make efforts to identify donors possessing these traits and follow up with calls to action. Currently, 73 percent of nonprofits do not offer a share option after an online donation (MacLaughlin, 2015). Lack of effort in getting engaged donors to recommend the nonprofit organization to friends and other individuals possessing similar traits can only lead to (donor) money and (volunteer) time being left on the table.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The current study's limitations simultaneously provide directions for future research. First, the sample was limited to one nonprofit organization and its supporters. An interesting future study would encompass comparing results between diverse (in terms of mission and services offered) nonprofit organizations to determine whether personality dimensions that lead to engagement differ. Second, comparing responses based on nonprofit organization size, clients served, geographic location, dollars spent on marketing activities and many other variables could yield valuable information to help nonprofit managers make better decisions. Third, it would be interesting to see if a high percentage of all donors to nonprofits possessed the nurturance and ruggedness traits, which would lead to a recommendation for all organizations to aggressively pursue referral marketing activities. Finally, future research could also examine whether differences among supporter demographics, giving traits, and/or

other factors lead them to engage with nonprofit organizations in varied ways and degrees.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 492-508.
- Abila. (2015). Abila engagement study finds disconnects between nonprofit practices and donor preferences (2015, April 15). Retrieved from <http://www.abila.com/company/press-releases/abila-engagement-study-finds-disconnects-between-nonprofit-practices-donor-preferences/>.
- Andreasen, A. R. (2001). *Intersector Transfer of Marketing Knowledge* (pp.80-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ariely, D., Bracha, A., & Meier, S. (2007). Doing good or doing well? Image motivation and monetary incentives in behaving prosocially. *Research Center for Behavioral Economics and Decision-Making*.
- Barry, F. (2014). One thing most nonprofits stink at (donor retention) and how you can change it in 2014. *NonProfit Fundraising* (2014, January 6). Retrieved from <http://npengage.com/nonprofit-fundraising/12-donor-retention-tips-from-nonprofit-fundraising-experts/>.
- Becker-Olsen, K. L., & Hill, R. P. (2006). The impact of sponsor fit on brand equity: The case of nonprofit service providers. *Journal of Service Research*, 9(1), 73-83.
- Clolery, P. (2014). Troubling numbers in volunteer rates. *The Non Profit Times* (2014, February 27). Retrieved from <http://www.thenonproffitimes.com/news-articles/troubling-numbers-in-volunteering-rates/>.
- Comcowich, W. (2015) How nonprofits can use data to improve donor engagement strategies (2015, April 21). Retrieved from <http://www.cyberalert.com/blog/index.php/how-nonprofits-can-use-data-to-improve-donor-engagement-strategies/>.
- Curran, R., Taheri, B., MacIntosh, R., & O’Gorman, K. (2016). Nonprofit brand heritage: It’s ability to influence volunteer retention, engagement, and satisfaction. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, forthcoming.
- Ekinici, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination personality: An application of brand personality to tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127-139.
- Frumkin, P. (2015). The eight building blocks of strong nonprofit brands. *Nonprofit Quarterly* (2015, October 2). Retrieved from <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2015/10/02/the-eight-building-blocks-of-strong-nonprofit-brands/>.
- Grohmann, B. (2009). Gender dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46(1), 105-119.
- Hair, J.F. Jr, Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hou, J., Du, L., & Tian, Z. (2009). The effects of nonprofit brand equity on individual giving intention: Mediating by the self-concept of individual donor. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 14(3), 215-229.
- Kanani, R. (2014). The secret to managing nonprofit brands. *Forbes* (2014, January 18). Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/rahimkanani/2014/01/18/the-secret-to-managing-nonprofit-brands/#364b1583640b>.
- Kylander, N., & Stone, C. (2012). The role of brand in the nonprofit sector. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring). Retrieved from http://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_role_of_brand_in_the_nonprofit_sector.
- Labroo, A. A., & Mukhopadhyay, A. (2009). Lay theories of emotion transience and the search for happiness: A fresh perspective on affect regulation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(2), 242-254.
- Liu, W., & Aaker, J. (2008). The happiness of giving: The time-ask effect. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 543-557.
- MacLaggan, C. (2012). Exclusive: Livestrong cancer charity drops Lance Armstrong name from title. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-cycling-armstrong-livestrong-idUSBRE8AE00020121115>.

- MacLaughlin, S. (2015). 50 fascinating nonprofit statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/sMacLaughlin/50-fascinating-nonprofit-statistics>.
- NCCS Business Master File (2016). Quick facts about nonprofits. *National Center for Charitable Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://nccs.urban.org/statistics/quickfacts.cfm>.
- Parker, B. T. (2009). A comparison of brand personality and brand user-imagery congruence. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 26(3), 175-184.
- Perry, G (2015). Top 10 fundraising trends and predictions for 2016 [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.gailperry.com/2015/12/top-10-fundraising-trends-and-predictions-for-2016/>.
- Phau, I., & Lau, K. C. (2000). Conceptualizing brand personality: A review and research propositions. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 9(1), 52-69.
- Plummer, J. T. (1985). How personality makes a difference. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24, 27-31.
- Ryder, J. (2016) Why Nonprofit Branding Matters [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.squareweave.com.au/blog/2016/01/15/why-nonprofit-branding-matters/>.
- Sargeant, A., Ford, J. B., & Hudson, J. (2008). Charity brand personality: The relationship with giving behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37(3), 468-491.
- Schwartz, M. (2015, February 16). 5 key benefits of designing a consistent nonprofit brand. *Constructive*. Retrieved from <https://constructive.co/insights/5-key-benefits-of-designing-a-consistent-nonprofit-brand/>.
- Sirgy, M. J. (1986). *Self-congruity: Toward a Theory of Personality and Cybernetics*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Venable, B. T., Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., & Gilbert, F. W. (2005). The role of brand personality in charitable giving: An assessment and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33(3), 295-312.
- Venable, B. T., Rose, G. M., & Gilbert, F.W. (2003). Measuring the brand personality of non-profit organizations. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 30, 379-380.
- Waters, R. & Bortree, D. (2007). Measuring the volunteer-nonprofit organization relationship: An application of public relations theory. *International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 24(6).
- Williams, M., & Buttle, F. (2013). Managing word-of-mouth: A nonprofit case study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 25(3), 284-308.