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Abstract

Orphanages raise part of their operation funds through online donation sites which provide means for money transfer and provide basic information on donation usage and orphanage details. Yet, current donation sites are insufficient for donors who want to track their donations and the resulting outcome it caused. Through our research it became evident that donation sites lack transparency with regards to information on who specifically benefited from the donation money, for what end it was used, and how it impacted the targeted community.

Upon researching various existing donation sites, we conducted a survey on 600 individuals, both donors and non-donors, to better understand the importance of transparency in donor motivation. A large number of donors in our survey were unaware of who their money helped and how it was being used. Many of these donors were also unsatisfied with the donation process and were therefore less likely to donate again. Our qualitative analysis on the data found that females with master’s degree are the ideal demographic that cares about transparency and donates far more than other groups.

We also performed usability testing on 12 participants to evaluate the effectiveness of current donation systems and effective ways to structure donation website layouts. Our finding suggests that donors cannot always find the necessary information on donation sites and that the page layout played a key role in this difficulty.

By understanding the importance of transparency and web design, we present a restructured donation site with a user-friendly layout and accessible information. The goal of the donation system is to increase donor participation and promote a more active interaction between donors and orphanages. In addition to our recommended solution, we also point to the role of community participation for a sustained impact.
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1. Introduction

With the deepening orphan crisis in India, the government has shown weak leadership in dealing with insufficient and fragmented resource coordination. The need for immediate attention and appropriate infrastructure is growing at a rapid pace, yet the governmental programs for orphans have only been able to reach a small fraction of the children most in need.

With an estimated 35 million orphans, India is home to the largest, fastest growing orphan population worldwide (UNICEF, India Statistics, 2009). Issues such as poverty, abuse, HIV/AIDS, and abandonment are the leading causes for India’s current orphan situation. Most orphans are not cared for in any type of formal care such as extended relatives, orphanages, and other institutional care. Human Rights Watch estimated that more than 20 million of these children live or work on the
streets of India. Out of necessity, the vast majorities of these children are involved in crime, prostitution, gang related violence, and drug trafficking, both voluntarily and forced (HRW, India orphans and vulnerable children, 2002).

Yet many street children and children living in orphanages do have living parents who cannot support them properly. Consequently many turn to streets, are left in orphanages or sold for a small amount of money. The term used to describe this specific group is "vulnerable children." In our examination, we take both groups into consideration as orphans and vulnerable children live in poor conditions with little hope of a better standard of living.

Although India has the largest number of orphanages worldwide and is the largest recipient of loans, its orphanages are under supported and inadequately equipped to answer to the growing orphan population. So far, the Indian Government has failed at providing orphans with the attention they need to create a better standard of life. Similarly, non-governmental organizations and individual donors have a slow response time and an unsystematic way of providing help to orphans. Clearly, the orphan epidemic in India, with its severe impact on children, is yet to be seen as an urgent priority both domestically and internationally.

One source of funds and donations come from online donation sites. The current sites lack transparency and a way to actively engage donors to increase donor participation. Interested donors often times must personally do research on organizations. With such responsibility, individuals are unlikely to donate their time and money.

Transparent donation systems can be an effective solution. Not only will donors have access to information on how the donation will be used, by whom, and what the impact may be, it will also provide a more interactive platform for donors to remain interested and connected to the orphanages on the ground as orphanages can directly communicate their needs. The aim of this thesis is to explore the motivation and design of donation systems in order to encourage donor participation.
In chapter 2 we take a close look at the background of the orphan problem in India. We begin with the definition of orphans and then the scope of our project, our target population, India’s societal structure, and issues orphans face.

In chapter 3 the concept of giving in examined closely from current trends in international and online giving to the study of donor motivation. Issues such as psychology and behavior of donors, demographics and background of donor population provide a comprehensive view on donors.

In chapter 4 we look at the importance of donation site designs and usability studies of donor behavior. Issues such as page layout, information grouping, and accessibility are discussed to understand how donors interact with online websites.

In chapter 5 we discuss the study we conducted during the Haiti disaster. The main goal of the study is to determine which demographic cares about transparency and has the highest donation potential. We discuss our procedures, methods, and findings. In chapter 6 we discuss the user study we conducted on 12 participants to investigate various layouts from famous donation sites and examine the effectiveness of each layout. Based on our finding, design recommendations were given.

In chapter 7 we propose our transparent donation system and a solution to the existing orphan crisis. And in chapter 8 we discuss how our work is related to existing literature and how our findings complemented and contradicted previous studies. We highlight the interesting and surprising results from previous chapters and explore potential reasons.
2. Background

This chapter reviews literature on the background of the orphan pandemic in India. It covers the definition of orphans for the scope of this thesis, the population structure and the socio-economic environment in India to give better understanding of what information is communicated to donors.

2.1 Definition

Orphans and Vulnerable children: Before going into statistics about orphans and vulnerable children, it is important to understand how these children are classified. With various definitions, ‘orphan’ are defined in a many ways. For the reasons of this thesis, I will look at a primary definition: “An ‘orphan’ is defined as a
child under the age of eighteen who has lost one or both parents. A ‘maternal orphan’ is a child whose mother has died, and a ‘paternal orphan’ is one whose father is dead. A ‘double orphan’ is a child who has lost both parents. An ‘AIDS orphan’ is a child who has lost his or her father or mother due to AIDS.” (UNICEF, A Framework for the Protection, Care and Support of Orphans and Vulnerable Children Living in a World with HIV and AIDS, 2004)

Beyond the definition of the orphan, we also consider the other orphan phenomena in India: not just death or desertion by parents, but children who experience parental abuse of alcohol and drugs, the mother’s sex work, physical or mental disability of a child, divorce, chronic illness of parents, poverty, restricted access to basic social resources such as education, health and social services, and inadequate clothing. (Kumar & Schofield, 2008)

For the purposes of this thesis, ‘vulnerable children’ are defined as: “children who reside in households where one or more members are affected with HIV/AIDS,” or lack protection and supervision from responsible adults, in other words street children. Usually however, “vulnerable children are those whose survival, well-being or development is threatened due to the possibility of exposure to HIV/AIDS. “ (Kumar & Schofield, 2008)

With the growing number of orphans worldwide, targeting and utilizing online users may prove crucial to the success of orphanages. UNICEF estimates a total number of 143 million orphans worldwide (UNICEF, state of the world, 2006). This number is estimated based on data from organization working on the ground. But the reach of organizations and the variability of the definition of what constitute to be an orphan, make it difficult to truly know the exact numbers. The number of children lacking necessary care, with or without parents is impossible to calculate. In India it is estimated, that 40 percent of known orphans are in orphanages and another 60 percent are left to fend for themselves (Nelson, 2008). Whether those 40 percent are being taken care of in an effective manner is a different discussion. The lack of infrastructure and effective reporting agencies
makes tracking the lives of orphans in developing countries difficult if not impossible. Some studies conducted in developed countries give a clue to the lives of known and uncared orphans. A Russian study showed that 70 percent of male orphans turn to crime while 60 percent of females turn to prostitution as means to sustain themselves (HRW, Abandoned to the state: cruelty and neglect in Russian orphanages, 1998). We suspect Indian orphans are in a far worse situation their Russian counterparts.

**Caregivers:** With lacking information and statistics on orphans, it is difficult to comprehensively talk about caregivers. However, with the little information available, many orphans and vulnerable children are taken care of within the extended family. However, this traditional social care seems to be diminishing as evidenced by the vast number of street children. The transition rate of street children to orphanages is unclear although I would guess the rate is low given that statistics shows that less than forty percent of orphans and vulnerable children are cared for in orphanages (UNISEF, 2005).

Orphanages are necessary for caring for high-risk children. They not only provide a safe house for children to grow, but also deal directly with the issues of crime, human slavery, and communal safety. However, orphanages lack the necessary funds and resources to care for the growing orphan population. Until orphanages are able to prove that they indeed directly impact communal safety and crime rates, governments are more likely to invest in police force rather than orphanages.

**2.2 Population structure of India**

The population of India is estimated at 1.15 billion persons is estimated to pass China’s population at 2025 with an annual growth rate of 1.6 (57% projected population growth) (bureau, 2011). The population is young with close to half of its population, about 450 Million, under 18 out of which 134 million are under five. At a life expectancy of 64 years of age, it is expected to see a growth in age groups of 40
and older in the coming years. This young country is also home to the largest orphan population worldwide. In India, every 1 in 10 children are orphans. (UNICEF, Info by country: India statistics, 2010)

2.3 Socioeconomic environment

Poverty: With advancements in IT and services, India has one of the largest and most diversified economies in the world, but due to its immense population, remains one of the poorest countries in the world. India is home to a little under one-third of the entire world’s poorest people. To give perspective, it has 828 million people, or 75.6% of the population living on less than two dollars a day, more than the sub-Saharan Africa countries combined – 72.2%. (TNN, 2008)

India suffers from extensive poverty despite the positive economic development which has benefitted the middle class of the country: the 2005 World Bank estimates that India has close to 456 million people, 41.6% of its population, living below the new international poverty line - $1.25 (PPP) per day. (Schifferes, 2008)

The effects of poverty can be seen in the number of existing Child laborers in India. A 1991 Census revealed that there were 11 million working-children in India with over 85% residing in the country's rural areas. This number has risen to more than 17 million in a 2006 study and is said to rise further in the coming decade. Of all the working-children, 54 percent are in agriculture, 15.5 percent are put to work in construction, 18 percent in household work, 5 percent in manufacturing jobs, and 8% scattered across other sectors. These statistics do not however cover children forced into sex trades and trafficked throughout the country. (Ramesh, 2001)

Despite economic growth, India has been on a steady decline in its human development raking, from 124 in year 2000 to 128 in year 2005 out of 177 countries of the world. (Finance, 2010)
**Health and Nutrition:** India has failed to adequately invest in agriculture and small farms and is now facing serious malnutrition problems: nearly half of its children are malnourished and one fifth of the total population is going hungry (Chamberlain, 2008). Countrywide, 28% percent of babies born with low birthweight and 48% of children under five are both moderately and severely underweight. Physicians remain scares in both rural and urban parts of the country with only 0.6 physicians per 1000 people on average. India was however able to invest in water sources: a study in 2006 revealed that 89% of its population has access to improved drinking-water sources. (UNESCAP, ADB, & UNDP, 2006)

**HIV/AIDS:** The HIV pandemic has not yet fully revealed itself in India. With only 1 percent of its population affected by HIV/AIDS, India has the second largest infected population worldwide – South Africa is the first. From the millions of people living with HIV/AIDS, 14 percent are children below the age of fourteen (Sridhar, 2003). Death in adults, men and women, occur in their thirties and early forties, the time in which most adults have formed families. As a result, many who die from HIV/AIDS leave behind young children as orphans. Compared to AIDS orphans worldwide, India has the largest population and is expected to increase this population by two folds in the next 5 yrs. (Kumar & Schofield, 2008)

Despite improvements in many sections of society, issues such as poverty, illiteracy, gender inequality, and the lack of basic infrastructure has disabled India’s HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs. According to the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC, 2005), HIV infected people face discrimination from multiple sources including schools, workplaces, and medical services among other things. It is difficult to fully understand the impact of the AIDS, especially since it has not begun to fully emerge in India. But even with poor documentation, AIDS related orphaning is a serious matter.

Not only do children orphaned by AIDS lose their primary source of care but also face harsh stigma and discrimination. In India, children orphaned by AIDS are
at a higher risk of experiencing poverty, illiteracy, child-labor, child prostitution, and police brutality. A study by the International Labor Organization (ILO) revealed that 35 percent of children whose parents are known to be infected with HIV are denied basic amenities while 17 percent are forced to take up petty jobs to help with the family income (Majumdar, 2003). As a result of the discrimination, parents face economic deprivation and children are forced to withdraw from school to care for their sick parents. As a result, these children are rarely given the help and services needed. The AIDS epidemic has made these children vulnerable: not only do they face psychological and emotional difficulties, but are also more likely to be malnourished, uneducated, and lack access to basic health care. With many of these children infected with HIV, the growth of the disease will be evident in the coming years. (IFRC, 2002)

**HIV/AIDS growth factors:** To fully address the problems orphans and vulnerable children face, there needs to be a Social prevention goal. Given that HIV/AIDS is an important factor in orphans and vulnerable children, I looked at the primary reasons for the spread of the disease.

**Unsafe Sex and Low Condom Use:** In India, 84 percent of HIV/AIDS cases are due to sexual transmission. The prevalence of HIV/AIDS transmission is at the highest rate among sex workers and their clients, injecting drug users, and men who have sex with men. Clients and drug users are mostly men, many of whom are married and pass the disease to their wives. To look at reasons for low condom use in commercial sex workers, a large study was performed. Results revealed that 70 percent of workers indicated that the main reason for not using condoms was because their customers rejected. (World-Bank, 2004)

**Drug Use through injection:** Studies indicate that in northern parts of India, drug users have turned to injecting drugs rather than the previous habit of inhaling drugs. This factor alone has shown sharp increases in HIV/AIDS prevalence in
those states. This trend is nationwide however: national survey revealed that 41 percent of drug use was by needles or syringes. Of the 41 percent, only 3 percent of those who cleaned their needles and syringes used an effective method - alcohol, bleach, or boiling water. (World Bank, 2004)

Low Status of Women: With a large population involved in unsafe sex, HIV/AIDS rates have been increasing among women and infants in some states. Analyst believe that unequal domestic power, low status of women in poor communities, limited access to financial and health services, are important factors that put women in a vulnerable state. In these conditions, the women are unable to protect themselves and demand safer sex. (World Bank, 2004)

Widespread Stigma: as mentioned above, stigma towards people infected with HIV/AIDS is widespread. This stigma not only creates harder condition for the HIV/AIDS infected people to seek help, but it also creates misconceptions and myths about how HIV/AIDS is transmitted. The ignorance that comes with this stigma creates misconceptions that HIV/AIDS only affects homosexual men, commercial sex workers, and drug users. Therefore societies see little importance in practicing safe sex and are defenseless to the spread of the disease. (World Bank, 2004)

Violence and human trafficking: India ranks number one in murders in the world (Karan, 2005). Violence has deep roots in poverty as more and more people are forced to fight for survival. A clear example is the sex trade. Conservative estimates suggest that around 300,000 children in India are active in commercial sex, willfully and forcefully (Gathia, 1998). In some sections of India, child prostitution is socially acceptable through the practice of Devadasi: Young girls from poor families and communities become religious prostitutes or better known as being are given to the 'gods'. These girls are not given education or basic health services. With no opportunities, more than 50 percent of the devadasis become prostitutes: 40 percent in urban brothels and the remaining prostitutes in their
respective villages. Besides Devadasis, most of the children in the sex trade live in India’s most dangerous environments: the street has become their home, where they lack protection, supervision, or guidance from responsible adults. A study done by Human Rights Watch estimated that 18 million children live or work on the streets with the majority involved in crime, prostitution, gang related violence, and drug trafficking. (Jonaki, 1998)

Human trafficking is rampant in India and serves as a very serious issue: men, women, and children are held in debt bondage and forced into working in sweat shops, brick kilns, rice mills, agriculture, and embroidery factories. Many women and girls are trafficked within the country and forced into commercial sexual and child marriage. These Indian women are trafficked abroad, to the Middle East for commercial sexual exploitation. Children are sold and often times forced into becoming factory workers, domestic servants, beggars, and agriculture workers. (UNESCO, 1997)
3. Giving

In this chapter we study giving in the United States, its trends, the psychology behind it and how to motivate donors to increase active participation. Finally, we look at Haiti as a case study for Impulse donation. We use Haiti’s disaster to conduct our survey in Chapter 5.

3.1 Trends in giving

Acts of charity in the United States has rapidly grown within the last decades. Experts argue with internet becoming more common place in households, it has made information readily available and the task of donation easier than previous ways. Evidently, millions of donation websites have been created and new organizations emerged uniting under together to form networks such as GlobalGiving. In 2007 alone, over 300 million dollars were donated to various
causes with individual comprising three forth of total donations given. The two figures bellow shows the increase in donation form 1967, at 10 million dollars, till 2007 at over 300 million dollars. (NRF, 2007)

Although the United State has gone through six recessions since 1967, the donations decreased less than 5 percent after taking inflation into consideration. Given the 2008 economic situation, Jupiter Research surveyed 175 million online consumers in the United States and found that 51 percent, more than 89 million, plan to donate online during on the holiday season. A large number of families that had suffered financially in the last 12 month also planned to donate – 46 percent. (Convio, 2009)

Although the total donation has been increasing, for the purpose of the thesis, I examined trends in online giving.

**Online Donation:** Currently, charitable organizations receive the majority of their donations locally. In 2008, a target survey study conducted by the Norman Group on charitable organizations indicated that 91 percent of donors were local donors (non-internet donors). The decline of local donors from 1 percent in 2004 to 3 percent in 2008 is being offset by online donors (from a 33 percent in 2004 to a 39 percent in 2008). The increase in the number of online donors comes as no surprise, as this trend is prominent with the penetration of personal computing and its influence on our lifestyle. What is surprising, however, is a greater yield in donations per online donor the cumulative donation amount per donor over the course of the past 5 years was $237 compared to $86 for offline donor.

The Norman Group has estimated that by 2020, online donors will account for the majority of donors (Nielsen, Donation· usability, 2009). A growth in charitable activities online is unlocking ever growing pools of funding. Capitalization potential in this space, alongside current technology and market gaps – all serve as a precursor for this thesis proposal to explore how to motivate more people to make informed decisions about donating to orphanages.
In 2006, Network for Good, published a report on online giving trends by analyzing a 5 year span of donations. The report, “The Young and The Generous: A Study of $100 Million in Online Giving to 23,000 Charities” found that the median age of online donors is 38 years of age while offline donors were over the age of 60. With online donations becoming more common place, this age is predicted to only show the age of people who do not have access to internet rather than signifying a certain preference. Demographics studies also revealed online donors were mostly females, comprising over 50 percent of all donors in the United States. (NFG & Andresen, 2007)

When comparing the reasons for choosing to donate online, participants indicated that their primary reason for choosing to donate online was for its convenience. They felt it was easier to find the answer to their questions, read about the organization’s work, and access their financial information. Other finding suggest individuals with a bachelor’s degree are more likely to donate and the top three reasons for donating were helping others, religious beliefs, and reinvesting in the community. (NFG & Andresen, 2007)

Jupiter research also found women were more like to donate than men (54 percent versus 48 percent). When looking at families rather than individual, found families with that had an income more than $100K who participated in the study, 64 percent planned to donate online – an increase from 54 percent three years prior. From these families, 9 percent planned to increase their donations. In the 18-24 age group, 46 percent and in the 25-34 age groups, 50 percent donate online. In the 18-24 age groups, 13 percent planned to increase their online contribution. Although research consistently suggests that online donors mostly comprise of the young, 53 percent of 55-64 year olds surveyed also donate online. From those surveyed, 51 percent prefer giving online. (Convio, 2009)

One of the reasons for donating online is that donors feel a better connection with organizations. Participants in the study were more eager to donate to organizations which are run by individuals similar to themselves (race, country,
economic status, education school and level) and therefore donate more to those organizations. (Convio, 2009)

**International Giving:** New Ventures in Philanthropy and Community Foundation Leadership Team conducted a project in order to better understand the donors of the future. The research was mostly conducted to examine the trends in international giving. They found that among all types of donors (online and offline) International giving has increased by 48.4 percent since 2006 and will steadily continue its increase. The most active international donors happen to be foreign born citizens who feel a deep connection to their country of birth and hence send more money than US born donors to their countries of origin. Also, in times of disasters, media has a great impact on flash giving – a sudden need for funds due to causes such as natural disasters and conflict. (TFC, 2008)

### 3.2 Psychology of giving

We first review literature pertaining to donor participation and motivation, discovering how both lead to an increase in the volume of online donations. The meta-analysis of psychology of giving can be summarized in the following six steps of Brand development, Campaign development, deserving factor, self-efficacy, targeted approach, and sustaining donor relationship.

**Brand development and target market:** Most people know about a “cause”, but not of a certain charity, and therefore do not contribute to specific charities. Currently charities lack a specific role in the “market”, making it difficult to distinguish between their message and other charities’ messages. A brand and a specific function of a charitable organization must be clearly defined in the introductory stage, as it is increasingly difficult to change the perception of your brand by people over time. (Hibbert & Horne, 1996)
**Campaign development:** Developing a brand and identifying a target market are vital to the success of a charity; however, the cause needs to be promoted multiple times in order for donors to remember. Promotions need to establish social knowledge of a “cause” for a donor. Many promotional campaigns focus on attracting attention through songs. Moral obligation and the need to donate must be emphasized in fundraising campaigns. (Ujciç, Beaulieu, Votolato, & Unnava, 1996)

**Deserving Factor:** Once brand and cause are clearly defined, donors become familiar with the organization. However, donors give when they feel an organization “deserves”. Brand and a clear description of work and mission are two elements that increase the deserving factor. Giving information about the recipient, increases the deserve factor and therefore alters behavior. (Eckel & Grossman, 1995)

**Self-efficacy:** Knowing who the recipient of a donation increases the deserving factor which potentially increases the likelihood to donate. The deserving factor however, primarily directs the attention at the person in need and not the donor himself. Research factors incentivizing individuals to donate are self and outcome efficacy, moral obligation, need for donation, and attribution of the problem. Self-efficacy refers to one’s ability and skill to perform a certain act and is the strongest indicator for intent to donate. Outcome efficacy speaks to the impact of the donation. Emphasizing self-efficacy and outcome efficacy will greatly influence individual behavior. Therefore a thoughtful planning is required in donation websites. Having a clear brand and a deserving recipient does not touch upon donor motivation. Although both impact donor motivation, they remain external factors. There needs to be a clear message to the donor indicating that their contribution is valuable and impactful to greatly increase the likelihood of donation. (Cheung & Chan, 1998)

**Targeting people:** When creating any type of service, customers or users of the service need to be identified. For a donation website, current user is a person who has donated at least once. Studies have been conducted to see what some characteristics of donors are. It has been found that people with more human
capital are more likely to donate and volunteer: middle to higher-middle class people, older people (except the elderly), highly educated people, females, whites, and people living in cities, and married people. The target group was within the United States and white comprises the majority, it can be derived that majorities are more likely to donate in comparison to minorities. These characteristics however are voided after a single donation if there is no further relation with the charitable organization. (Bryant, Jeon-Slaughter, Kang, & Tax, 2003)

**Sustaining donor relationship:** All factors mentioned above are important to get a donor’s attention and then translate the attention to an act of donation. However to ensure future involvement, a relationship must be established with the donor. Utilizing organizational networks and personal connections is paramount to attract and keep potential donors and volunteers. (Sokolowsld, 1996)

The relationship between a donor or volunteer and the charitable organization requires time. When individuals become aware and involved with charitable organizations, they become more favoring towards charity and their attitude and life goals change which results in perusing the “next worthy deed”. The desire to seek worthy deeds results in more participation in philanthropic activities which in turn, perpetuates the activity. Small campaigns in communities and providing opportunities to donors and volunteers to advocate the cause of a charitable organization is an example of maintaining the relationship. Organizations must realize that philanthropy, like any other important relationship, requires constant care and dedication. Therefore charitable organizations need to make sure to keep donors close and informed about new developments within the organization. (Sokolowsld, 1996)

### 3.3 Behavioral economics

When creating a system to increase donor participation one must take donor psychology and behavior into consideration. In order to better understand what
drives behavior and how to positively influence donor participation, I took a look at a field called “Behavioral economics” (Smith, 2002). Behavioral economics primarily focuses on the effects of social, cognitive, and emotional factors on the economic decision of consumers, borrowers, and investors. Although the field is primarily centered around the groups mentioned above, many behavioral models derived from this field can give insight into donor behavior as well. The act of donation is a financial and economic decision that is highly influenced by emotions as I will discuss in the Donor Psychology section. Behavioral analysis not only studies market decisions but also closely evaluates public choice. A shift in public choice and perception of orphans and orphanages can greatly influence the orphan crisis in India.

There are three main focuses in the study of Behavioral Economics. The first focus is Heuristics. At its core, it studies irrational and stereotypical thoughts which heavily influences the decision making process. Such thoughts are referred to as “rules of thumb” where individuals are highly influenced by societal and personal rules of thumb and make decisions accordingly. The second is the concept of Framing. The idea is that communication itself highly influences how the decision-maker will solve or answer the problem. Lastly Behavioral Economics touches upon the effect of Heuristics and Framing on society as a whole, a focus known as Market inefficiencies. Here, it takes a look at how market outcomes can be influenced by non-rational behavior as a whole (Smith, 2002). The three focuses of Behavioral Economics are presented in the following case studies.

**Irrationality:** In his article, “What Makes People Give?,” David Leonhardt explains the benefit of irrational donors: if donors were basing their decision to give based on rational decisions, when news about million dollar donations on media would take the front page, donors would be less likely to donate. However, donors do not act rationally and therefore donate primarily based on emotions and are likely to partake in donation because others are donating, even if it is a million dollar donation, as well. (Leonhardt, 2008)
People act in irrational ways and therefore we must take away the assumption that providing information alone will not result in increase in donor participation.

**Financial motivation:** It was estimated that on average people see 3000 advertisements every day influencing financial decisions. These also include donation sites. (Matters, 2007)

With the increasing number of advertisements trying to influence people, fundraisers have a particular difficulty time as they ask people to give money and receive nothing tangible in return. The author of “Predictably Irrational,” Dan Ariel, speaks about two norms in which an organization can appeal to: social norms and market norms. Social norms speak to desired social senses like value of community, selflessness and helping others.

Market norms on the other hand speak to self-interest. When people are communicated to in terms of social norms, they are more likely to be emotionally involved and therefore act out of altruistic motives. Ariel gives a quick study of two scenarios. The first scenario involves asking Lawyers to give their services at a reduced cost to elderly. While in the second scenario, Lawyers were asked to give service to the elderly for free.

When faced with these two scenarios, lawyers showed significantly more interest in the second scenario to a degree that in some cases, they even competed with each other. Therefore, when people are communicated through social norms, the chances of tapping into emotions and altruism rises significantly. (Ariely, Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions, 2008)

The study above gives insight into norms in which people think and interact in. However, in standard donation scenarios – where individuals donate money - people tend to think in terms of dollars spent. Oftentimes individuals do not know how much things are worth – a term used in behavioral economics called “coherent arbitrariness.” Because individuals are unaware of monetary value, a concept
referred to as “anchoring” can highly influence how much is donated. (Ariely, Coherent Arbitrariness: Stable Demand Curves Without Stable Preferences, 2003)

Using the finding from Ariel’s study, Rachel Croson conducted a phone pledge drive and varied the information provided to potential donors. To the first group she said that other donors, on average, gave $75. To the second group, she repeated the plea and only changed the figure to $300 and gave the individuals time to decide on the amount they wanted to donate. The results were consistent with Ariel’s findings as the second group which was given a much higher number donated 12 percent more than the group that was given a lower number (Shang & Croson, 2007). Successfully asking for monetary donations, both the mindset, norm, and the values asked for are important factors influencing the amount of donation.

Decision making factors: The book “Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness” (Cass Sunstein and Richard Thaler, 2008), speaks about influencing individual decision which will make consumer, citizens, students, and individual better off. The authors, Sunstein and Thaler, use the term “Libertarian Paternalism” as one of their key behavioral-influencing concept.

Libertarian speaks to the need to allow individuals to do what they like; while paternalism refers to creating systems which will influence individual’s lives in order to ensure they make the right decision for themselves and society. (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008)

According to the book “Switch: how to change things when change is hard” by Heath and Heath, people have two main ways their decision and behavior is influenced: by rational and by emotion. Chip and Dan Heath, the authors of the book, give the analogy of a rational, yet small rider, on top of a large, emotional elephant. According to their book, to influence positive behavior, people require a clear order which is examined by their rational and then then focus our attention on their emotions in order to make it “easy” for them to make the right decision. They provide three main steps for directing and influencing behavior. The first step, as they frame it, is to “Direct the rider”, provide clear guidelines for action as the
rational part of the brain requires clear and tangible directions and does not perform well in ambiguity. Consequently, instead of asking people to “stop global warming”, for example, which lacks actionable items actually overwhelms the mind. A more effective approach and language would be to say “change your light-bulbs,” a very clear, familiar, and actionable guideline.

The second step is referred to as “Motivate the elephant,” a step with great emphasis on emotional encouragement. In order for people to internalize the directions given in the first step, and to begin to decide on whether or not they would like to take part, it is important to cheer them in the right direction. Once people “feel” they are capable of performing the tasked asked from them in step one, they are more likely to act.

Step three is “Shape the path”. Getting people to “do” becomes very easy if in fact the process itself is easy. For example, asking people to change the light bulbs in their home is an easy task but asking people to create a Facebook “change your light bulb” group may be a difficult task for many. This step also relates closely to ease of access on online platforms such as donation sites. (Heath & Heath, 2010)

**Role of Statistics:** People donate because they truly care (Small A. D., 2009). Therefore creating a lasting emotional connection is key to increase donor motivation. According to their study, some organizations market their cause with emotional notes as well as statistics. This specific manner of communicating with donors is meant to both stimulate rational as well as motivate emotions. However, according to research conducted by Deborah Small and Paul Slovic, communicating through statistics does not lead to guaranteed success. (Small, Loewensteinb, & Slovic, 2006)

Deborah Small examined donor behavior and motivational influences. Based on her discovery, organizations need to first and foremost appeal emotionally to donors in order to attract their emotional attention rather than appealing to their logic. Similar to Nudge, she found that only after a person’s emotions are evoked do clear directions become effective.
In her research, she discovered that people are twice as like to donate or act when they are presented with an emotional story rather than a statistical story - what researchers refer to as the “identifiable victims” rather than the “statistical victims”. (Small, Loewensteinb, & Slovic, 2006)

Accordingly, Paul Slovic, a researcher in donor motivation examined three scenarios for donations. In his first scenario he gave a story of a girl and her struggle with starvation in Africa. The second scenario fully focused on giving statistics on millions of children’s struggle with starvation in Africa. The last scenario combined the first two scenarios and began with a story of the girl's struggle with starvation in Africa and concluded with some statistics of starvation for children in Africa.

He found that the story of single individual generated generous donations while statistics generated less and the story combined with statistics generated much less than the story alone. Even in the second scenario when there was a story of the initial girl in addition to a story of a boy, the donations dropped even further. He concluded that as the number of lives increases, the value of life saving actions such as donations decrease. (Slovic, If I look at the mass I will never act: Psychic numbing and genocide, 2007)

In another study by Paul Slovic, individuals were asked to donate to a cause that would save 4500 lives: the donations differed based on the size of the overall target group. Holding 4500 lives consistent, in case one when the total camp size was said to be 11,000 people donated more compared to the second case when the camp was reported to be 100,000 people. (Slovic, If I look at the mass I will never act: Psychic numbing and genocide, 2007)

Another interesting finding showed people care about the percent affected in a target group more than the affected number itself. In a study he asked individuals to choose between two options. The first option involved spending 10 million dollars on a disease which claims 20,000 lives a year and can save 10,000 lives. The second option was to use the same amount of money on a different disease that claims
290,000 lives and could help 20,000 lives. Consistently, the participants chose to donate to the first option which would cure far less individuals than the second option. (Slovic, Perception of Risk Posed by Extreme Events, 2002)

Another important discovery came from List and David Reiley’s research. They send in-mail donation requests to two different groups. The first group of letters said $2,000 of $3,000 was raised and $1,000 is still needed and asked for contributions. While the second group of letters said $300 was raised from a goal of $2,700. The results of the study showed that the first case raised more funds. Persistently, donors responded to the first donation request as they felt that their donation could make a difference and help the organization “win.” (List & Lucking-Reiley, 2001)

Groups influence: People around individuals influence their behavior and reactions greatly. Humans tend to imitate and follow what groups of people around them are doing. In their research, John Darley and Bibb Latane examine emergency situations in which individuals act which gives testament to group influence on individuals. In their study, individuals were less likely to help a person in need when others around them were not. In their study, individuals waited to see what the people around them did before acting. This study mainly focuses on situations in which individuals have not dealt with in the past. (Rodin & Latane, 1969)

Research by Robert Cialdini suggests not only does the individual follow groups in unknown situations but also in everyday situations. In his book, “Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion”, he examines three messages in a hotel room with the goal of increasing towel reuse. (Cialdini, 2003)

The first message read, “Reuse your towel to save the environment.” The second message read, “A majority of guests in this hotel have reused their towels. Join them and help save the environment”. While the last group was presented with “A majority of guests in this room have reused their towels. Join them and help save the environment”.
The results of the study revealed that the first message was the least likely to influence behavior. The second message was 18% more effective than the first message and the last message was 33% more effective than the first. Cialdini concluded that when social norms are made clear, especially if it is a closer connection, individuals adhere. (Cialdini, 2003)

SocialSeeds will show how others are taking action and participating on the platform. As creating a sense of “group” highly influences behavior, we can connect the donors through events or social platforms.

Legitimacy: Individual behavior is highly influenced by authority. The famous Milgram experiments give testament to this influence: when individuals were asked by an authority to give electric shocks to participants for every incorrect answer, individuals performed the task even if it was against their will. 65 percent of individuals even accepted to give the “deadly” shock which would “kill” the participant. (Milgram, 1963)

3.4 Disaster Donation case study: Haiti

The Haiti earthquake was a catastrophic disaster effecting over 3 million Haitians. The cries of the people communicated through media coverage and campaigns brought $528-Million in donation to the victim’s aid. We took this opportunity to study donor behavior in order to better understand what individuals care about transparency. To do so we created a survey on donor participation in Haiti’s disaster and received feedback from a little over 600 individual. The findings of our survey can be found in chapter 5.

Background on Haiti disaster: Major disasters, like the earth quake in Haiti, receive much attention due to the dire need on the ground. Consequently, giving in the time of disasters is unique and based on compulsion. Such donation is termed Impulse-donations given the drastic increase in donations. With wide
spread campaigns and media, disasters attract a wider range of donors as well. Individuals who usually do not donate contribute their time and money.

Impulse-donations: A study done by the Case Foundation showed that from year 2000 to 2005, online donation raised from half a billion dollars to more than $4.5 billion. However, online donations only accounts for a small percentage of total donations. (Case & Anderson, 2008)

Yet in times of publicized, major disasters, online donation has proven to be ideal for disaster relief. Because of its ease of use and access, online donation sites see up to 75 time normal traffic and 20 time more donations. Yet, online donation based on impulse is not sustainable for relief organization as after the major increase in a two to six day time frame, the donations suddenly decrease back to normal rates. In that four day time frame, luckily for relief organizations, online donors are more generous than offline donors. In times of disaster, the larger, well-known nonprofits are the primary receiver of donations even though donors like numerous options to choose from.

Online donation as a whole has created a new type of donor where more individuals are creating their own fundraising campaigns and donating the money to their favorite NGO. The term used to describe these donors is “citizen philanthropist”. Media is credited for being a major drive for citizen philanthropist and largely drives the donations to relief efforts. Yet, media coverage on fundraising fraud has increased donor skepticism.

Interestingly, during the sudden increase in impulse donations, there is no visible reduction in donations to non-disaster areas. This is attributed to the existence of to the “recurring gift” program which has increased donor retention over a longer period of time. (Andresen, 2006)

According to this study, the method in which individuals donate and the time frame is quite clear. Although the drivers of donation in disaster times is different
than those of non-disaster, transparency can still be a variable in making the
decision to donate to specific organizations, need, and victims over others.

Who donates in the times of disasters?

**Corporate:** By mid-January research showed Americans had donated $8 million via text messaging alone. Between 49 corporations and companies donated close to $50 million. The response to the disaster was fast and not only did corporations and companies donate money, they also provided some free services. Many of these companies donated to the Red Cross and other large relief organizations on the ground. (Post, 2010)

**Individuals:** On Martin Luther King Jr. Day a survey found that 64 percent of respondents have either donated or plan to donate to Haiti – 33 percent had already donated with 31 percent planning to do so. (Zogby, 2010)

3.5 Discussion

Haiti’s disaster seems to create some discrepancy with non-disaster statistics. In previous donor demographic research, in Chapter 3, it was shown that Caucasian or “white” American donated more than other ethnic groups. However in this recent study, 81 percent of Black American respondents had either donated or planned to donate to Haiti – 47 percent had donated and 34 percent were intending to. This approximates to two-thirds of the 2,003 American adults surveyed (Zogby, 2010). Because the “race” indicator is skewed from other studies, we eliminated any questions pertaining to race categories for our survey design covered in Chapter 5.
4. Website Design Usability Overview

Website design plays an important role in promoting online donor interaction. We take a close look at studies conducted on effective information grouping and visual elements in order to better understand website design. In the last section of this chapter, we evaluate famous donation sites and select the top ones.

4.1 Usability studies

The Norman Group performed usability studies for 12 charitable organizations from which they developed design guidelines. Initially, the group asked the subjects to rank the most important content. The mission, goal, objectives and work were by far the most sought information. The study proved that the front
page of charitable organizations must provide a clear mission statement along with either content or a clear link for goals, objectives, and work. At first glance, a user must be able to find “what” the organization does and “how” the organization uses charity. (Nielsen, Donation-usability, 2009)

The Norman research group has discovered that an organization’s mission, goals, objectives, and work were by far the most important information to donors. How the websites uses donations and contribution was second question donors searched for. On the homepage however, only 43 percent of the sites studied answered the first question and 4 percent answered the second question. Although organizations do have answers to the questions, it is within the site and not easily accessible. (Nielsen, Donation-usability, 2009)

Factors which prevent users from donating are lack of clear information on the organization and an unobvious donation button. Individuals were unable to make informed donations when the website lacked adequate explanation. Donors also indicated that unclear explanation on how the donations are used makes them unlikely to donate. A website which looks cluttered and unprofessional also creates skepticism among donors and leads to donors believing that the organization may also be unprofessional. In the donation process, if a donor came across a third party checkout, they were discouraged to complete the donation. One factor is the knowledge that the third party will receive a portion of their donation. Other factors like, hard to read text, confusing and undefined terms, and existence of unrelated news and events were other factors which made donors unlikely to contribute. Many of these factors reflect negatively on the organization that is seeking the donation. (Nielsen, Donation-usability, 2009)

To prevent donor dissatisfaction, the front page of organizations should also clearly mention “why” a user may be interested in donating. Highlighting why a user may be interested in becoming a donor increases self-efficacy and therefore creates motivation to donate. Users want to see highlighted news as it shows the current work or projects of the organizations. When organizations are able to show
results (impact) users may perceive them to be more deserving of donation and therefore, donate to the organization. The following figure is a potential outline for a front page for a charitable organization. The boxes contain design elements. The content is placement is based on donation-usability studies, in addition to interface design research.

4.2 User interface design

The focus of research in interface design is to set up a website for easy access which combines psychology of donation, donation usability studies, and user interface research. Eye tracking is an effective method to test how well interfaces have been designed. Eye tracking is a process which participants use a device over their eyes in order to track where the eye is looking and for how long. The process has given great insight on web pages.

Visual organization: In his research, “Visible Narratives”, Luke Wroblewski has given insight on how to effectively organize data to improve user attention and comprehension. The “visual organization” of a web page can communicate valuable information about the similarities and differences between elements and their relative importance. The organization of a page displays a “visual relationship” between elements. (Wroblewski, 2003)

As Wroblewski argues, the principles of perception explain how we visually group information together dependent on the layout of a page. When placing the design elements on the page, a close examination of existing relationships is important. Similar elements must be placed close while dissimilar elements apart.

To effectively display differences in elements, the designer can use what is known as Visual Contrast. Visual Contrast is created by varying shape, color, texture, size, and direction: the more contrast elements of a page have, the farther apart their relationship is perceived by the user.
Figure 1: Visual contrast (Wroblewski, 2003)

While the color, distance, and shape groups information together, a page hierarchy displays the purpose of the page. The following graphs show how hierarchy is communicating if the page has similar content or varying ideas. (Wroblewski, 2003)

Figure 2: Page Hierarchy in Web Pages

The pages displayed below each have a unique relationship between the elements on the page.

Figure 3: The Hierarchy “Story”

Hierarchy unifies the webpage and enables the reader to easily capture the “story” of the page. To set up a hierarchy, the page needs to initially begin with an attractor. The attractor may be a number of elements such as a banner or a heading. The banner should be the first place the designers meant for the user to
look at. This initial attractor may present an introductory idea and the subsequent sections will then work to complete the idea. The visual hierarchy may be built with the help of elements which have high Visual Weight: large font, bright color, or shapes. (Wroblewski, 2003)

The use of human pictures: People look at the picture of a face and then follow the eye direction of the face. Pictures can be a powerful tool for remembering an advertisement or cause. However, using pictures alone may not increase the content comprehension. When using human photos on a webpage, the layout of the page must be in a way that utilizes the picture to the fullest: users look initially at the photo, and then, to the spot the photo is looking at. Therefore, in order to ensure the user is looking where the most vital information is, the photo also needs to be looking at the vital information. If a photo is looking at an element in the page which has little information, the user is unlikely to use the page as intended by the designer. (Breeze, 2009)

![Figure 4: The difference in attention to vital information with the direction of pictures (Breeze, 2009)](image)

Banner Blindness and Advertisement-looking elements: Internet users with a minimum of a year of internet use, rarely read advertisements. Therefore if there is an element which seems like an advertisement, only a tiny fraction of users may look. Also, as users are used to having advertisements on the right side of the page, in order to fully utilize the entire page, the page layout must exclude advertisement
looking elements, especially from the right hand side. The page layout must be carefully planned in order to prevent page-blindness – when users are trained to ignore advertisements and therefore are “blind” to elements that resemble promotions or advertisements. The 2 highest attention grabbers are plain text and faces. (Nielsen, Banner Blindness: Old and New, 2007)

Figure 5: User Brand “blindness (Nielsen, Banner Blindness

**F-shaped reading pattern:** Users tend to read the upper level of the website horizontally. Then read the next level of the page in another horizontal strip. Finally the reader scans the content on the left side of the page vertically (forming an F) Therefore it is extremely important to place the most important information on the first 2 paragraphs on the top of the page. Also to regain attention after readers have finished the first 2 horizontal readings, begin the rest of the left hand side of the page (paragraphs or subheadings) with words. (Nielsen, F-Shaped Pattern For Reading Web Content, 2006)

Figure 6: F-Shaped Reading Pattern (Nielsen, F-Shaped Pattern For Reading Web Content, 2006)
Three styles of website navigation: figure A in the figure below shows a classic search-dominant user. This specific type of user first scans the website page briefly, starting on the left hand side of the page. Then after a couple of seconds, looks towards the search bar. The user begins to type in the search bar rather than look further in the website for the answer. This was the predominant behavior in this study, accounting for 57% of users.

Figure B shows the behavior of a navigation-dominant user. This specific user looked at the navigation options which were located in the center of the page and down the left hand side. After searching the navigation option, they began clicking on the most promising link. The navigation-dominance user had rare behavior in this study.

Figure C shows a tool-dominant user who scans the page but it ultimately attracted to the drop down menus and type-in fields of the website. They are less likely to read the navigation options and simply head straight towards the tools available on the website. Although many sites do not have such interactive features, but when they do exist, they tend to attract a good proportion of users. Tool-dominant users were the second most common behavior. In general, people like parts of websites where they can do something beyond read.

(Nielsen, Search-Dominant Users and Other Behaviors, 2007)

4.3 Evaluating Current Donation Sites

Although donations sites vary greatly in design, they have the same goal of attracting donors and donations. There are many great organizations which are
utilizing web pages and information tools for gathering attention around their cause. From 54 website examined, I chose the top 7 websites which successfully communicated their cause and had unique interface layouts.

Methods: Based on Norman Group and website design studies we chose evaluation criteria to help with our website examination. We have marked each criterion on the Donation Sites in the figures bellow. Listed are the valuation criteria:

1. Organizational information · Mission, Work, Goal, or Objectives
2. Locatable donation button
3. Use of donation
4. Good use of visual contras · colors, pictures, or figures
5. Clear page story and hierarchy

**World Vision**: A faith-based, Christian organization which focuses on poverty and injustice for children. The organization works in 100 countries across the world serving more than 1000 people. They have a financial accountability model where all their overhead and operating costs are calculated and displayed in an annual financial statement. World Vision has a unique feature on their front page. They display individual children, along with name, activity, bio, and other information for individuals to donate to. The profile of the child has a preset dollar amount for his wellbeing. World Vision also allows for donors to “buy a goat” for a family, or “fight hunger” worldwide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front page design &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear upcoming event</td>
<td>- Brand not visible in contrast to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visible search bar</td>
<td>the colorful background of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear quick links</td>
<td>center picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good color contrast</td>
<td>- No description of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scroll down menu</td>
<td>- 2 donation buttons (gifts and money) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Featured child</td>
<td>1 sponsor button</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Features
- A drop-down menu of holiday gifts with price
- A featured child on the left hand side along with a donation tool
- Projects featured at the bottom of the page
- Unclear secondary search (there are 3 menus)

Figure 8: [http://www.worldvision.org/](http://www.worldvision.org/)

Care: A humanitarian organization with special focus on women. The organization’s primary focus is poverty alleviation. The organization focuses on economic opportunity, influencing policies, emphasizing self-help, and tackling discrimination. Their website has a small donate button with preset dollar amounts.
However, the dollar amounts are not linked to usage. On their donation page, Care specifically indicates that 91 percent of all donations go towards the people in need, and 9 percent towards services and fundraising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front page design &amp; Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visible brand</td>
<td>- Small donation link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good use of picture</td>
<td>- Text heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Featured story in the center</td>
<td>- No search bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Latest news on the bottom along with links to participate</td>
<td>- No brief description about the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearly gives users a method to “get involved”</td>
<td>- No explanation of donation use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A slide show of Featured projects in the center of the page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- each of the project displayed on the slideshow have a donation button along with a link to “learn more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotional material available on the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Featured stories available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kiva: A lending website which connects investors to real entrepreneurs who are in need of money. Is has partnered with micro-finance institutions and brought transparency by facilitating a person to person connection. Kiva claims to be “the first online lending platform connecting online lenders to entrepreneurs”. 100 percent of the money donors lend goes to the entrepreneur on the ground. Kiva receives donations from donors. The front page of the website has a collage of various entrepreneurs with specific needs.
Global Giving: An online marketplace for philanthropy where project compete for funds – organizational information. Global Giving chooses the best performing charitable organizations and features them on the website. Their website has a “featured” organization on the front page along with pictures and pre-set donation amounts to optimize their page story. Each item on the donation amount has a description of how the money will be used – use of donation. Global Giving is the third largest “host” for projects worldwide. The website has an easily locatable donation button while using colors and boxes to give contrast to the different elements on the page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front page design</td>
<td>Small header</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear brand on top left</td>
<td>Text heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A one-line explanation of work</td>
<td>Pictures could be looking at text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Featured news/event center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear quick links and search bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of White Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear donation button</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projects by topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projects by region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple methods of donating (money, gift cards, buy goods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Primary Quick links and secondary navigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Room To Read: An on-ground organization which provides education to rural villages through building schools, libraries, and partnering with communities. They have an emphasis on girl education. Their slogan is “World change starts with educated children”. Room To Read currently works in nine countries: India, Nepal, Bangladesh, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Zambia, South Africa, and Lesotho. Their website features education projects in these nine countries. Individuals may choose to donate to an existing project, start a new one, donate to Room To Read, or give their time to collect books and other volunteer activity. If an individual chooses to
donate to existing projects, a list of preset donation amounts along with description will be presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front page design &amp; Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear donation button</td>
<td>- Small brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Centered feature story</td>
<td>- Small member login link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little text</td>
<td>- No description of work, mission on web page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good use of white space</td>
<td>- No search bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear information grouping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visible quick links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear display of location of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides a map of operation location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scrolling over the highlighted countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will open a small description of history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Slide show of projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 ways to donate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Country list of donor location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Give India: A donation platform which gives donors the capability to donate to over 3000 NGOs. 200 of these NGOs have been measured based upon transparency and credibility. Give India works upon providing the Choice to donors, and the Convenience of donating from home, and the Confidence that the donation is used towards the intended goal. Organizations receiving the donations provide the donors with feedback on how they spent the money or will spend the money. Give India places “causes”, organizations that work for a specific cause, in ten categories: Children, disabled, education, elderly, employment, environment,
health, human rights, women, and youth. It also has a prominent “tax benefit” feature as added incentives for donors. The causes are located in India and their focus is in Indian communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front page design &amp; Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilizes picture for cause</td>
<td>- Brand location is clear but the small text is difficult to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear work description</td>
<td>- Unclear page hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear copy right</td>
<td>- Quick links are not noticeable as they are placed above the large photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides a sense of credibility with the display of the Secured Logo</td>
<td>- Poor grouping of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gives links to share the page</td>
<td>- The donation button is not in simple text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Donation by cause</td>
<td>- The underlined test leads to other pages yet that is not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides information about what the money will buy in a list format</td>
<td>- There are more than one donation button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 star voting capabilities on project pages</td>
<td>- Search bar is in an unusual location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Donors leave comments and new donors can read about their experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lists tax benefits once donation is made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bring joy to 70 street children of Kolkata by sponsoring a one day outing to Monobitan Park

Your donation will be used by Child In Need Institute as follows:

**Donation Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Break-up Cost (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average admin cost (telephone, internet charges, accounting and reporting)</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast/lunch and snacks for 76 children and 5 coordinators</td>
<td>5250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus hire cost from central Kolkata to park 30 kms away</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment-boat/fitness/excursion event</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid kit with housewives</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance cost of park and staff maintenance</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes (toys, books and stationery) to children for games</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental charges for electric generator for games etc</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to donate [ ] units

Proceed To Donate

- Yes! I would like to Gift this Donation

- **Tax benefit**
  - 80G - for Indian Taxpayers

You will receive a feedback report in 4-6 months

Feedback Report that you will receive will contain:

- Date, time and address of park, write up on visit, how children felt about trip
- Accompanying photograph

Figure 13: http://www.giveindia.org/
**Inadequacies:** Although the organizations I examined gave either a description of overhead costs or financial statements, they were not easily accessible. For that reason, Charity Navigator displays total program costs and use of donation in a one page report of the organization. Charity Navigator is an organization that has taken upon the task to inform donors on some of the background processes behind charitable organizations in North America. They have collected data on organizations across the US to bring a level of transparency to donors. Yet the organization acts as a separate entity from the charitable organization it is reporting which leads to missing information at the time of donation. The figure below is the score given by Charity Navigator to Global Giving.

CharityNavigator gives overall ranking of the organization along with financial breakdown of the organization’s expenses, shown in box 1. This allows donors to understand how GlobalGiving uses their donation money. To give a better understanding, the website shows the expenses in percentage form as individuals are able to comprehend numbers better when in relative form, shown in box 2. Finally, Charity Navigator shows a 4 year trend of the organization’s finances, shown in box 3.
4.4 Conclusion

The information gap present at the time of donation will place the responsibility of research on the donors. With such responsibility, fewer people are willing or able to find the information to make a decision and are therefore, hesitant to invest in orphans. An organization’s webpage also plays a key role in donor participation. The manner in which information is displayed, the page layout, visuals, and the page story are all play significant in communicating how “deserving” the organization is.
In my research I found that the homepage often displayed current news. These donation systems provided options (choice of project by cause or region) and in some cases, lists of items the donation would go towards. However, they lack transparency and adequate information on when the money was spent on needs and if indeed the goods were delivered. Additionally, information such as overhead costs, beneficiaries, impact, and the need which are vital to a donor, was not easily accessible.

Additionally, the websites which advocated for various projects - Global Giving, Kiva, and Give India - did not give access to the people receiving donations directly. Such an approach is somewhat limited as it is not providing the people in need with a resource or platform to communicate their needs and discover a solution. In other websites which advocated their own mission and work – World Vision, Care, and Room To Read - a progress bar is needed in order to motivate donors even further. Based on psychology of donation, if the organization is raising money for a new school, the work done so far or how much has been raised motivates donors further.
5. Survey

There has been extensive research conducted to understand characteristics of donors and their demographics information. In the Giving chapter I have looked at some of these studies but for the purposes of this chapter I will mention the findings of one study: Individuals who are middle to higher-middle class people, older people (except the elderly), highly educated people, females, whites, and people living in cities, and married people are more likely to donate (Bryant, Jeon-Slaughter, Kang, & Tax, 2003).

Although the study was thorough, it cannot be inferred that the same demographic cares about transparency in the donation system as the studies did not have a transparency variable. In order to determine which demographic finds transparency to be an important factor, we decided to design a survey.

Focusing our attention on the demographic that cares about transparency will fasten our process of attracting early adopters to transparent donation systems.
5.1 Objectives

To determine the target group that cares about transparency in donation systems.

5.2 Method

In this section we discuss the steps we took to design our Survey, which promotion channels we used, and how we analyzed the data we gathered from 600 responses. SPSS was our primary statistical methods tool we used which allowed us to identify which specific demographic cares about transparency.

5.2.1 Survey Design

The process began with designing a survey which is mainly focused on transparency. In his book “experimental Design,” Dr. Luftig gives steps to designing the survey to yield best results. He sections every experiment, user study, or survey’s process into: plan, do, study, and act (Luftig, 1998). For the purposes of designing the survey the plan chapters were our primary focus. The planning process described in the book provides clear guidelines to creating the survey. It is as follows: refine and develop statement of problem, define the research study framework, write the research questions/hypothesis, define/select the dependent variables and criterion measures, identify and classify treatment, independent, and nuisance variable, create the most appropriate and efficient user design possible, design the sampling plan, assess the data collection instrument. Accordingly, we designed our survey using Google’s Forms.

The logic graph below shows the questions and paths participants can choose from. The survey did not have a fixed number of questions the participants had to answer, but rather, the number of questions depended on whether they answered yes to certain questions. The only fixed questions the participants had to answer the questions regarding their gender, age, and education. Through isolating answers which pertained to transparency, we were able to identify which demographic cares most about transparency. The survey questions can be found in Appendix a.
Have you donated to Haiti?

Yes

Plan

No

Donate to orphanage? | Plan to donate to orphanage? | Consider donate to orphanage?

There will be specific questions in each of these sections. However, at the end of each related section there will be a question about orphanages.

Yes

Are you a previous Donor?

No

Yes

Influence

Are you a previous Donor?

No

Submit

Yes

Thank you. Comments?

Yes

Submit?

No

Thank you

Yes

Gather comments
An initial survey was drafted based on Dr. Luftig’s process and also with consideration for previous research conducted on donor motivation and donor characteristics. The survey was refined and focused after several rounds of reviews.

5.2.2 Survey Dissemination

Upon completion of the survey, appropriate paper work Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was completed. Once approved, the survey was put up on social media sites such as Facebook and twitter to attract potential participants. Due to time restraints we were unable to follow a random sample procedure noted in Dr. Luftig’s book. The survey was primarily focused on participants above the age of 18 due to the nature of our study – previous research suggests the most active donors are above mid-twenties and hence we excluded minors in our study. (Bryant, Jeon-Slaughter, Kang, & Tax, 2003)

5.2.3 Analysis

Once the target number of participant completed the survey, we determined which analyses will help answer our survey’s research question: What demographics mostly cares about transparency and is most likely to donate?

First, we isolated all independent variables in the study that related to transparency in 3 answer categories: Yes, No and Maybe (to the question of whether they donated to Haiti or not). The questions in YES category could be grouped in 3 different ways with all the variables listed out in the following tree:

- Care about transparency
  - Factors influenced donation:
    - Need
    - Knowledge of organization working on the ground
    - How money was used (% going to victims)
    - Organizational Effectiveness (results)
  - Communicated transparency through the donation process
    - Donation was used for the cause intended
    - How much of money went to victims
- How my money helped
- My donation created a positive impact
- Satisfied with the level of transparency in the donation process
- How my money was used
- Impact of my donation

The questions in NO and MAYBE sections referred to transparency related obstacles that influenced their decision not to donate at the time. The variables are:

- Unable to reach victims on the ground
- Missing information about donation use
- Lack of familiarity with the organization doing work on the ground

In order to answer our research question, we analyzed responses across all 3 groups. We first studied what profile of people cared about transparency, cared and were communicated transparency, and lastly, cared, were communicated and were satisfied with the level of transparency present. We also looked at a profile of people who didn’t care about transparency from those who donated. We thought that by looking at both sets of results, it would be easier to make inferences about which profile of individuals truly care and seek out transparency when they donate. For those who didn’t donate at a time, we looked at 2 distinct profiles: those who were influenced by lack of transparency and those who didn’t care about transparency in a significant way.

After isolating transparency questions from the survey, we coded the data in SPSS through Automatic Data Coder from String values into Ordinal Numerical values and filtered data out that didn’t pertain to the question at hand. For example, when looking at the profile of people who cared about transparency, we filtered out all respondents who we less than “Influenced” by a certain component of transparency, like how their donation was used.

Once we have isolated demographics of participants who care about transparency, we had to determine if a parametric test would be appropriate, or a non-parametric test. Accordingly, we tested to see if our study could be analyzed using an ANOVA test. ANOVA
is a parametric test which assumes that the underlying population distribution for the dependent variable is continuous and is measured continuously. Below is the experimental design setup which defines three tests for every of our demographic variables: Age will be known as test 1, Education as test 2, and Gender as test 3.

Test 1 - The Dependent Variable for our first variable is Age. The Criterion Measure for this variable is Age Group and given the structure of the survey, the Underlying continuous function was Measured Ordinally – each participant had a list of age ranges to choose from. As mentioned above, there are specific questions we isolated to study transparency and therefore our independent Variables are those questions and their answer category. The Underlying Nominal Function was Measured Nominally and had Fixed Effects. Finally, our participants were divided into 3 categories when answering the question: did you donate to Haiti and therefore the test for Age is in 3 Levels (yes, no, or maybe).

Dependent Variable: Age
Criterion Measure: Age Group
- Underlying continuous function / Measured Ordinally
Independent Variable: Answer Category
- Underlying Nominal Function / Measured Nominally / Fixed Effects
Levels: 3 (yes, no maybe)

Test 2 - The Dependent Variable for our second variable is Education. The Criterion Measure for this variable is Education and given the structure of the survey, the Underlying continuous function was Measured nominally – each participant had a list of Education levels to choose from. As mentioned above, there are specific questions we isolated to study transparency and therefore our independent Variables are those questions and their answer category. The Underlying Nominal Function was Measured Nominally and had Fixed Effects. Finally, our participants were divided into 3 categories when answering the question: did you donate to Haiti and therefore the test for Age is in 3 Levels (yes, no, or maybe).
Dependent Variable: Education
Criterion Measure: Education
- Underlying nominal function / Measured nominally

Independent Variable: Answer Category
- Underlying Nominal Function / Measured Nominally / Fixed Effects
Levels: 3 (yes, no maybe)

Test 3 - The Dependent Variable for our third variable is Gender. The Criterion Measure for this variable is also Gender and given the structure of the survey, the Underlying continuous function was measured nominally – each participant had 2 options to choose from. As mentioned above, there are specific questions we isolated to study transparency and therefore our independent Variables are those questions and their answer category. The Underlying Nominal Function was Measured Nominally and had Fixed Effects. Finally, our participants were divided into 3 categories when answering the question: did you donate to Haiti and therefore the test for Age is in 3 Levels (yes, no, or maybe).

Dependent Variable: Gender
Criterion Measure: Gender
- Underlying nominal function / Measured nominally

Independent Variable: Answer Category
- Underlying Nominal Function / Measured Nominally / Fixed Effects
Levels: 3 (yes, no maybe)

Given that in neither tests listed the dependent variable’s distribution nor measurements are continuous, using One Way Fixed Effect ANOVA would be in violation. There are other violations, like uneven sample size within all of the J levels. Moreover, we could not use any parametric test to analyze the data; hence, we are going to resort to non-parametric analysis that accommodates ordinal and nominal functions. Below is the list of all key non-parametric statistical tests:
Thus, for test 1, we will use Kruskal-Wallis Anova by Ranks to analyze Age. Kruskal-Wallis Anova works with our study because its underlying assumption is that the three levels in the study are independent. In our study, Yes, No, and Maybe are our 3 levels which are fully independent from each other.

For test 2 and 3, we will use The Chi-Square Test for Independent Proportions. Before performing the Kruskal-Wallis Anova or the Chi-Square tests, there are seven steps which need to be performed. These steps involves setting up what is known as the “null hypothesis” which accounts for the first 4 steps, testing the hypothesis which will either lead to rejection or accepting of the hypothesis, preparing data by creating a “count order” as Non-parametric tests are performed on counts, not raw data itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test for J &gt;2 / Pair-Wise Post Hoc</th>
<th>Importance Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal ( Dichotomous ) Data</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Test of independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square / Exact Binomial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA</td>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>Phi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Omega- Squared on DRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran’s Test ( C )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNemar’s Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman ANOVA</td>
<td>Approximate Omega-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Signed Rank</td>
<td>Squared on DRT Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 15: Choosing Tests for independent and dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AgeN</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>Donated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 46-50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 51-55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 56-60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 61-65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 66-70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 76-80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning to</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>61-65</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Planning to</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 21-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 26-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 31-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 36-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 41-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 46-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 51-55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 56-60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 61-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning to</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>61-65</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Planning to</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 21-25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 36-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 46-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 51-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 56-60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “21-25” group has the largest sample size amongst all other groups as our primary method of attracting participants was through Facebook. Yet, the only statistically valid sample size, highlighted in Blue, is in the “Yes” dataset.

For test 2, we perform all the steps listed above. However, instead of manually counting males and females within each level we will use SPLIT FILE compare function in SPSS, and then go and run Frequency analysis on educational data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>educationN Education</th>
<th>Donated</th>
<th>Donated?</th>
<th>1 No</th>
<th>2 Planning to</th>
<th>3 Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 College Undergrad Education</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within educationN Education</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated Donated?</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2 High school | Count | 6 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| Expected Count | 5.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 10.0 |
| % within educationN Education | 60.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.9%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
<th>2.9%</th>
<th>3.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated Donated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>58</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
<th>2.9%</th>
<th>3.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated Donated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% within educationN Education</th>
<th>% within Donated Donated?</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Masters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>-.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Professional Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Some college Undergrad</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistically acceptable sample size is more than 30, due to small sample sizes, the only datasets which could be analyzed were “college undergraduate”, “masters”, and “some college undergraduate” students which are highlighted in blue.

In test 3, the gender distribution in the three levels (Yes, No, Maybe) were different from one another so we rejected Null hypothesis. However, we have sufficient evidence to infer that there is a relationship between gender and weather individuals cares about transparency and donated to Haiti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GenderN Gender</th>
<th>Donated Donated? Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenderN Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within GenderN Gender</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>14.2</th>
<th>-3.6</th>
<th>-10.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Some high school Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within educationN Education</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated Donated?</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within GenderN Gender</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Donated Donated?</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4 Results

Out of 158 respondents who donated, 70 cared about transparency, or about 44%. Out of those, about 46 cared and were communicated a significant level of transparency while donating. Lastly, only about 22% of all respondents cared were communicated and satisfied with the level of transparency in their experience. This same number is 50% out of those who cared, which is not such a great satisfaction level on transparency with people who care about it.

From the analysis on the demographic groups, we discovered that Gender and Education played a very important role in determining who cares about transparency and is most likely to donate. The demographic with the highest potential were Women with Masters Degrees who cared about transparency and donate. Women with Masters Degrees were twice as likely to donate as Women with College Undergraduate degrees while Women with College Undergraduate degrees are twice as likely as Women with Some College Undergraduate education. Women were twice as likely to care about transparency and donate as Men with the same education were.

Cared: Over 30 percent of participants with Age between 21 to 25 years cared greatly about transparency: these are individuals that donated because of transparency and individuals that did not donate because of lack of transparency. The second leading Age groups are 36 to 40 and 56 to 60 year olds following – 10 percent of the two age group cared. The 36 to 40 and 56 to 60 age participants were much more satisfied with their donations than the 21 to 25 group.
A majority of college undergraduates cared about transparency. More than 50 percent in the Education category. In all level of the survey (Yes, No, and Maybe) women cared most about transparency.

Knew: Perhaps not surprising, the participants that knew the impact of their dollar and other related information where also the ones that greatly cared about transparency – same demographics as the group above.

The analyses of data lead to information on age, education, and gender of our target market: individuals who care about transparency in donation systems. When reaching out to potential donors, we will be able to better guide our focus in order to develop a group of early adopters. I believe transparency in donation systems will lead to closer engagement between donors and orphans and hence increase donor participation, an important step towards increased living conditions for orphans in India.

We surveyed a total of 600 individuals with Facebook as our primary promotion channel. After analyzing the data we gathered, we discovered that Women with Masters Degrees were the ideal demographic we should target as our primary users. This group cared about transparency and is most likely to make a donation.

5.3 Discussion

As Facebook was our primary method of promoting the survey, further analysis on demographics was desired because “21-25 year old” group made up more than one fifth of the total population. Although our study was congruent with other studies, a Random Sample was not possible due to time restrictions. For further research, choosing a Random Sample would be highly desirable. Below are two specific analyses which would have been highly useful which we attempted but were unable to perform:

Principal Component Factor Analysis: The underlying data was not of the right type. The variables for the Factor Analysis must be continuous at
the interval or ratio level. Categorical data (such as education or gender) are not suitable for factor analysis. Other assumption could also be taken into considering, explaining why Principal Component Analysis was not performed: the data should have a bivariate normal distribution for each pair of variables, and observations should be independent. The factor analysis model specifies that variables are determined by common factors (the factors estimated by the model) and unique factors (which do not overlap between observed variables); the computed estimates are based on the assumption that all unique factors are uncorrelated with each other and with the common factors.

**Nova test:** ANOVA is a parametric test which assumes that the underlying population distribution for the dependent variable is continuous and is measured continuously. Below is the experimental design setup which explains why parametric one way ANOVA is not an appropriate statistical test.

We understand that our primary donor-receivers were different than the victim of Haiti earthquake: In Haiti’s case, there was a sudden disaster which left behind many victims and the need was highly publicized. Most research indicated that Caucasian or “white” American donated more than other ethnic groups. However in the Haiti disaster, 81 percent of Black American respondents had either donated or planned to donate to Haiti – 47 percent had donated and 34 percent were intending to (Zogby, 2010). This approximates to two-thirds of the 2,003 American adults surveyed. Because the “race” indicator is skewed from other studies, I will eliminate any questions pertaining to race categories.

Another factor which may have skewed the findings it that the majority of participants said no to “have you donated to Haiti”.

### 5.4 Conclusion

We surveyed a total of 600 individuals with Facebook as our primary promotion channel. After analyzing the data we gathered, we discovered that Women with Masters Degrees were the ideal demographic we should target as our primary users. This group cared about transparency and is most likely to make a
donation. We used this population in our User Study which is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.
6. User Study

Researchers have realized the importance of the role of design in donation websites in relation to donor participation and fund raising. The Norman group has pioneered usability testing and has shared their findings with many organizations with the hope that it will improve organizational popularity with donors.

In this section we perform low-fidelity, usability testing on twelve participants to determine effective page layouts over the course of two weeks. The usability test consisted of presenting four designed page layout and two organizational websites to participants. Each participant was asked to perform specific tasks and comment on their thinking and areas of difficulty. The findings led to design recommendations for effective donations sites.
6.1 Method

In this section we discuss the steps to design the User Study, our metrics, and how we evaluated the results. We ultimately give design recommendations based on the findings of our study.

6.1.1 Study Design:

Previous studies performed by the Norman group have determined the most important information relevant to donors on donation sites. A summary of their findings was discussed in Chapter 4. Our user study used the foundation of the Norman Group’s findings and focused on varying page layouts with constant information. Transparency is the key element and differentiator in our system definition. Hence, in the process of creating the tasks which were to be assigned to participants, the theme of transparency played an important role. The tasks were primarily focused on finding information which gave our participants information about the work of Socialseeds and the orphanage which would be receiving their “donation money” – no participant donated actual money but rather pretended to donate.

The major goal of this study was to determine which page layout, along with specific elements, promotes the greatest understanding of the transparent donation model and allowed for fastest task completion time. In other words, the main task was for donors to make an informed donation in the least amount of time.

There were four designed web layouts along with two organization page layouts presented to participants. We noted every action performed by each participant while they were interacting with our interactive, low-fidelity interface. We chose to use PowerPoint due to its great ability to imitate the real-time response of an actual webpage.

Navigation

Based on our user behavior study in Chapter 4, there are three main navigation patterns users typically follow when scanning a webpage for specific information. From the three patterns, search-based and tool-based navigations
dominated, with search-based users using the search bar extensively while tool based mostly used the drop menu. Accordingly, we used these two main navigation tools in the design of our test page layout.

**Search bar:** For search-based users, we placed a search bar on the top right of the screen. Although our prototype did not allow for an active search bar, users indicated that the presence of the search bar gave the website more legitimacy.

**Menu:** the menu has six tabs which participants can click on to be taken to the appropriate page. We varied the position of the menu from the top of the page to the left hand-side of the page. Users indicated that pacing the menu at the top of the page made it easier for them to read the tabs and also made the page “less cluttered”. After the completion of each task, participants would use the Home tab to return to the front page in order to begin the next task. Even in cases when the participants were already on the correct page, once they had completed a task, the Home tab represented the end of their previous task and the readiness to begin the next rather than simply a location or page on the website.

**Finding information**

In our one hour time frame, participants had to complete twenty two tasks on the four page layouts and the two organization websites. The tasks mainly focused on finding information. Information grouping was an important element in the study design. Based on the findings of the Norman group, we placed the most important information about SocialSeeds on the front page and grouped the remaining information in other pages. Norman Group’s finding was discussed in Chapter 4. Most of the information is related to the process behind donation, partners, founders, and news. Participants had to navigate through various pages in order to answer the tasks.

**To Donate**

The main goal of a donation site is to encourage donors to donate money. To that end, we placed a donation button on the button of the page as a constant
element which appears on every page. When participants were asked to donate, the donation button was their main method of completing the task. Participants could have also donated if they had chosen a specific orphanage from the Orphanage page but it was difficult to distinguish between the two ways.

The donation process has more steps than donations sites we examined in Chapter 4. The basic donation process was to simply donate to the orphanage or organization. Other sites allowed donors to choose from a list of items. Our donation process built upon the list and allowed donors to choose an item from a list and also choose a provider, store owner or farmer, to provide the item directly to the orphanage. This added step was foreign to our participants and at first they did not draw a direct connection between the providers and the orphanages.

6.1.2 Target population:
We performed a low-fidelity user study with 10 individuals over a course of two weeks. Participants had to be Female and between the ages of 23 and 40 years. In addition they had to be Caucasians who have not donated before. All participants had to have a bachelor’s degree or higher. Lastly, if single, their income had to be above $32,000 (statistics, 2006-09), and if married, household income had to be above $50,000 (Census-Bureau, 2006-09). Our primary reason for the criteria was based on previous research on donor population discussed in Chapter 3 and our findings from our Survey presented in Chapter 5. According to research, the listed criteria are characteristics of individuals who donate to charity more than the societal average which is congruence with our findings. The reason for choosing individuals who have not donated before was to insure that participants have unbiased feedback during the study and will not influenced by their previous experience.

6.1.3 Study Flow:
The study began on April 9th and continued through April 21st. Each study began with a short description of the study after which participants signed a consent form and filled in her demographic information. The average age of
participants was 28.3 and the most frequent education degree was Masters. Participants were then assigned a randomized number chosen from 1 – 12 in order to conceal their identity.

The study was performed in approximately one hour. Participants were presented with four page layouts and two organizational pages to complete assigned tasks. The study was considered done if either the participants had completed all tasks or if the one hour time was reached. To show our gratitude for their time, we thanked participants and gave them Persian calligraphy of their name.

6.1.4 Evaluation Criteria:
The effectiveness of each page layout was primarily evaluated based on three criterions: number of Errors, Time spent, and number of Clicks. Number of error specifically measured how often the participant would either show the wrong information, or go to the incorrect page as means to complete the assigned tasks. The amount of time each participant took to complete tasks successfully is the Time criteria while the number of clicks required to complete the task is the Click criteria.

6.1.5 Study
Before I began the study, we acquired an IRB approval. The approval was necessary for recording the data on our participants. I studied twelve participants in a two week period, one hour each. The majority of studies took place in the evenings, in the Engineering library rooms. Patients signed a consent form after the study was explained to them. Participants were asked to perform a task at a time with no further direction.

**Setup:** I used paper fliers as the primary method to advertise the study. I placed fliers in the UMC Women’s center on the fourth floor, in Norlin library’s coffee shop, in engineering’s Bold center, in the engineering center’s lobby, and in other coffee shops on Pearl street. Interested individuals contacted me directly via phone. Upon contact, a short phone interview was done to ensure the individual fit our target demographic. The study was performed in a single session.
Individual were sat in front of a screen and presented with one out of four website layouts, six pages each found in appendix b. Participants were asked to perform specific tasks without guidance. The list of tasks can be found in appendix c. The study relied on participants “thinking out loud” in order to understand they thoughts and struggles along with meticulous note taking on the participant’s navigation. Then two actual organization websites of Asha and Room To Read were shown. The last part of the study consists of answering questions about the actual websites.

6.2 Results

From the 6 layouts presented to participants, layout 4 was the most successful in minimizing Error. Yet, due to its interactive interface, to successfully complete a task required far more Clicks than Layout 1 and 2. Participants took almost the same amount of time when completing tasks on Layout 3 and 4. The two organizational layouts we used during the test was not greeted as eagerly, as 2 participants refused to complete tasks while 3 others gave up midway through the tasks.

Home Page: In our study, we found that most people thought SocialSeeds’ mission was important because “it’s the first displayed”. Yet they felt that the descriptions on the front page were vague, with no clear differentiation between SocialSeeds and other organizations, the region of work was unclear along with the ‘work’ of the organization. The front page did not bring interest to the participants or a clear sense of what the goal of the organization is.

Participants had difficult time finding information on donations. The way in which information was organized confused participants and the hardest tasks were finding projects, stories, and impacts of donations. Participants did not like the fact that the information was “so scattered”. Most of the participants pointed at more than one piece of information as a potential answer to the task. They did however enjoy clear information on how money was used and how much of it was used.
**About us:** Participants did not like that the “About Us” page did not have information on SocialSeeds. Participants cared primarily about gathering information about the company rather than the founders. Most participants said that they do not care much about who the founder is before knowing about the company. However, they did indicate that as recurring users, this information would be more relevant. None of the participants were happy about reading an entire paragraph and they would have preferred a linkedIn like profile.

**Impact/project:** The page layouts were confusing. On the impact page, participants were not sure if they were looking at impact category or project category. Also they were not sure what the difference was and how they, as donors, were involved. It was confusing to have stories, impact, and then projects. They were not sure why it was scattered and why it was presented in that format. When I explained after the study that the projects are done by other groups they said that donating only involved orphanages and not those groups so they were confused about the general relationship.

**Orphanage:** Donating to an orphanage was an easy task for participants. Most participants enjoyed the process of donating. However, they were not pleased with the list of cities and wanted a map rather than a list of cities and filters which could group orphanages based on need such as hunger and education. Participants not only wanted a map for city locations but also for orphanage location. An initial, big turn off was the fact that they did not know where any of these orphanages were located and could not read the names properly.

In the Donation process, participants did not know what to select first, need or an orphanage. Some participants wanted the option to “just donate”: the standard way of giving money to the organization and not be involved in the entire process. What many of the participants found was that the process itself was very unique and exciting. After donating rice they wanted to donate other things as well. Some parts were confusing because in Layouts 3 and 4, there was a need on the
bottom of the page. Participants indicated that the process itself made them want to donate.

**Partners:** Most participants did not understand the difference between partners, groups, organizations, and orphanages were unclear. Participants did not enjoy any of the Layouts more; they however, did enjoy partner logos in template 4 but did not enjoy reading long paragraphs.

**How:** Participants thought the “How” behind donations is important, yet it should not be separate from the donation process. Template 1 and 2 were the most liked because all steps were present in one page and did not require users to click on additional tabs.

**Room To Read:** All the participants thought the front page along with the map was one of the organization’s strong points. They really likes how there was only 3 main tabs on the top. It was a clean and coherent website. However, it was not as transparent as SocialSeeds. They could not find to whom their donation would go to. They also saw that their donation would be translated into books or other school related things and lacked freedom of choice. The participants were not able to go beyond the set parameters of the website and could not, for example, donate to children that were good students. Additionally, donations could not be tracked and it was hard to find how much of the money would go to the children. Although the participants enjoyed the map and other visual effects, it was difficult to perform the tasks as the labels in the website were not detailed enough.

**Asha:** This website was very difficult to work with. It took participants a very long time to try to find the information related to the tasks. The website did not have clear labels and lacked a visual structure. All participants got tired reading through the text and were even unable to find a donation button in which they could donate. There were far too many categories and none of the participants wanted to read through the option list. The participants however, did like the stories on the right side of the page and thought it could be a powerful feature.
6.2.1 Design Recommendation

Primarily, participants were unable to find information because information grouping was unclear. To ensure a better understanding, the layouts need models and visuals which explain relationships and processes. Most participants did not think “who we are” was of great importance as first-time users therefore it should be removed as a primary tab and instead be placed as a subcategory of another tab.

It was confusing to have stories, impact, and projects in one page with no clear connection between the three groups. The model of SocialSeeds needs to be clear where users can see all the parties in play but most importantly, how they are involved. They also wanted to see their personal donation added to impact list along with an impact score based on the importance of the need. User accounts could be a good solution for donors to track their individual contributions.

The donation process should be emphasized on the front page as participants indicated that it was the most interesting aspect of the study. Also, the process behind the donation should be part of the donation rather than a separate “How” tab. To make the donation process easier, a map and filters should be added. Also users should be given the option to simply donate to SocialSeeds.

6.3 Discussion

Although I had tested the study for time, the main problem during the study was lack of time. A potential cause may have been that I did not perform the test on the same demographic as the target group but rather tested the study on two engineering, undergraduate males who were very tech savvy.

Most participants took a very long time to complete the tasks surrounding finding information. Also, after finishing one of the four layouts, they still had various problems completing tasks on other layouts.
An additional problem was the inability to revise the layouts after each participant. Consequently, most participants had similar difficulties on similar tasks. According to the Norman Group, in order to fix most of usability problems with the website, only 5 participants are needed (Nielsen, Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users, 2000). However, this is with the assumption that after each interview, the study is “fixed”. Given the documentation required from IRB, revision of problems was not possible.

6.4 Conclusion

The study provided valuable insight into donor interaction and psychology. Through understanding our target population, we were able to extract clear design recommendations which will ultimately lead to higher donor participation for donation sites. Most importantly, most participants indicated that the donation process made them feel SocialSeeds is a worthwhile organization and they were willing to donate their money to orphanages listed on SocialSeeds’ website.
7. Proposed solution

In this chapter we propose a solution which will address the need for transparency in donation systems and in the donation process.

7.1 Vision

The vision of SocialSeeds is to integrate transparency in society to give all orphans and other vulnerable children the opportunity to live to their full potential and have access to food, shelter, education, and medical services.

7.2 Mission:

SocialSeed’s mission is to provide a new infrastructure to increase donations, government and societal involvement, and to create a wide support network for orphans and vulnerable children.
7.3 Proposed solution

7.3.1 Start from the bottom

Increase Orphanage quality by programs and support network

7.3.2 Build infrastructure and measurement systems

I propose a donation platform which has accountability as part of its key design. Accountability in websites most often refers to the ability of the organization to effectively display costs and indicate what percentage of donations were used towards the donated cause. (CDA, 2008)

Similarly, building accountability into the system itself would be to ensure the proper use of donated money by notifying the donor upon the completion of the promised task (buying 30 books for a school). Building such a system would increases motivation as it builds upon the psychology of giving. The motivation in turn increases volume.

The method to create “accountable” platform would be to focus on two factors: transparency of operation and need-based communication.

Transparency is a factor which mostly affects the donor: seeing the process of donation and realizing that the donor is “creating” the change builds upon promoting self-efficacy and outcome efficacy. On the other hand, a need-based communication deeply involves the orphanages. The purpose of this platform is to give orphanages and indigenous people opportunities to communicate their needs and resources (both the platform and donors) to come up with solutions to their problems rather than imposing solutions to problems.

Platform outline:

A need-based, transparent donation system that:

- give orphanages the opportunity to express their needs
- connect donors to orphanages and show donors how their money is used
- give the donor the freedom to choose a specific need of the orphanage
- update the donor upon the delivery of the need
- Gather information to assess needs
- can show impact of donation

In order to confidently ensure the arrival of a specific need to the orphanage, a need-provider or local business must be involved. Initially orphanage will personalize a page and give a description about their work and focus. Once they have a personalized page, they will list their needs along with the appropriate cost. Each need will be accompanied by list of local businesses which are their primary provider.

The second step involves the local businesses. Once a local business is proposed by an orphanage, the local business's information will also be entered into the platform.

The platform is now ready to use. The donor will be able to identify an orphanage or cause to donate to. Then choose a contribution to the orphanage and then place an order for the specific need. Once the order has been placed, the donor can then choose a local business which will provide for the need. The donor can see how their purchase has brought profit to the local business as well.

The local business is then responsible for delivering the need which was donated by the donor. Upon arrival of the need, the platform is responsible for notifying the donor and making the appropriate changes in the orphanage information page.

7.4 Tools outline
There are two main tools needed to communicate and gather appropriate information. To communicate with the local business and the orphanage, a commonly used tool is needed. Computers and laptops are rare in rural India (TOC, 2006), yet it is safe to assume both local businesses and orphanages own cell
phones: Indian cell phone customers are the faster growing cell phone subscribers worldwide (Bellman, 2009).

Gathering and displaying needs would help show the impact of donation.

7.4.1 Proposed use of tools
After a user makes a donation, two text messages will be sent: first, the chosen business will receive an automated text message with order details; second, the orphanage will receive a text with the business owner and order details. The business will then take the item to the orphanage. Upon arrival, both the orphanage and the business will message the system to indicate that the service has been provided. At this time, first, the system will transfer money to the business’s account along with a transfer notification text message and second, the donor will be notified via text message or email that the item has reached the orphanage.
7.4.2 Market Analysis of tools

In the cell phone technology category, all services have a direct way of connecting with their customers. However, all these systems are a one way form of communication. The systems are independent of the needs of the people. If ClickDiagnostics receives a picture and sends back the information for the medication, how does it ensure the receiver has the knowledge to act upon the information? The system does not have a tracking mechanism which shows the doctor how the patient was affected. The same is true for Txteagle and twillio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cell Phone technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Txteagle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clickdiagnostics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twillio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our system however differs in two ways: first, the system is not in direct contact with the orphanages. When a donor wants to donate rice to the orphanage, a local vender will receive the order and take the rice to the orphanage directly. The orphanage will be in a secondary contact with the system however: the orphanage
will message the system upon the arrival of the goods; second, the systems will show donors the progress of the orphanage as the needs are constantly updated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gap Minder</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A service which provides and displays statistical data on social, economic, and environmental development at various levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WorldMapper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A website which modifies the world map to emphasis various issues (poverty, illiteracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Freedom Atlas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visual tool which allows users to visually view statistics based upon chosen criteria. The main focus is on freedom, democracy, human rights, and governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information tools listed are used to present data in an interesting display. However, the data cannot be used by organizations as it serves more as an information tool rather than providing guiding research. There is no direct information about individuals or organizations. Rather, there is information as a whole—a broad perspective on countries and development. The data does not have a human face attached and therefore presents no emotional connection between the viewers of the information and the cause—for example gender disaggregation.

Information alone cannot solve a problem. It is not because there is no knowledge of poverty that people do not act. It is the lack of a potential solution that stops individuals from acting. The information systems mentioned, provide quality information yet, with no proposed solution they do not do much.

Our information center will provide information both on a micro and macro level. Users will see the organizations they donate to and the children they effected. Once there are more orphanages listing needs, there can be a macro graph of the needs currently existing in India. The information provided on our website will directly link the donor to the vendor and the orphanage.

Also, the system will have a page of possible solutions. Experts may even participate and include a feasibility analysis for the proposed solutions.
7.5 System Strengths
- The process of Donation is truly transparent
- The platform gives access to both donors and orphanages to enhance free interaction
- The system has a method to ensure the delivery of needs
- System Weaknesses:
  - Only the donor aspect of the design has been considered
  - In order to build the orphanage aspect of the system active research is needed (on the ground research)
  - No current funding
  - The system needs to prove that it works

7.6 Desired Impact
The purpose of this project is to give orphanages opportunities to communicate their needs and resources to discover solutions to their problems. Rather than imposing solutions, the platform will simply create a connection between donor and orphanage and allow for a natural relationship to form.

However, in order to seek the involvement of orphanages and local businesses, an extensive research must be done to understand the incentives of both parties.

Throughout my research, there is little information on how to incentivize orphanages and local businesses. As the system requires community involvement to succeed it is of great importance that Participatory action research be performed.

After incentivizing orphanages and local businesses to participate, the orphanage part of the system can be built. Fortunately, in order to fix most of usability problems with the website, only 5 participants are needed. (Nielsen, Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users, 2000)

The graph below shows the number of problems found per test user.
7.7 Potential unintended impacts

Most problems arise when an organization is implementing foreign solutions to current problems without looking at the organic circumstances of the situation causes unintended consequences. In order to tackle this problem projects must be aimed at facilitating participation with the community. When community members take upon the responsibility to actively participate and bring light to problems, the organization can seek indigenous support in finding solutions rather than impose predetermined solutions.

For the design of systems, the negative aspects must be taken into account. If the orphanages receive a large quantity of donation, the local vendor may begin to depend on the donation orders. The consequence of this scenario may be that the rice vendor does not sell his products to the local community and instead, cave it for the donation orders. He may even charge the local community higher because he thinks he will have business from abroad. Therefore the needs of the community are unmet and the vendor is dependent upon external aid.
8. Conclusion

India, home to the largest orphan population, lacks transparent donation systems and means for a more involved donor participation. Donors often times are unaware of how their money is used, by whom, and what outcome does it generate. For the means of designing a transparent donation system we took a close look at India’s orphan and orphanage situation to better understand what information needs to be communicated to donors from the realities orphans face along with donor motivation factors. Chapter 2 was fully dedicated to the background of the orphan pandemic while Chapter 3 discussed how to approach, motivate, and influence donor participation in order to incentivize more involvement. Important findings for donor motivation mostly stemmed from communicating the orphan need
in a personal manner provide tools for donors to build a deep connection with the children they intend to help, give many options for participation, and emphasize the positive outcomes of donations. Studies on donor demographic, psychology, behavior, and trends in donation also gave us insight on how to engage donors using technology.

In order to use technology as a potential solution, we looked closely at the importance of information and design in donor participation. The Norman group’s work allowed us to realize that an organization’s mission, work, and their donation use are the information donors care most about to create interest. Donation use and outcomes helped donors decide to donate while looking at local chapters motivated them to get involved locally. Design also played a key role in establishing credibility, easy navigation, and general understanding of relationships and processes. From numerous design studies we concluded that for a donation site to be effective, it must use visual hierarchy to establish a story, visual contrast to group related information, be aware of prominent reading styles, and accommodate the search styles of the two most common behaviors, search-dominant and navigation-dominant internet users.

Based on the research, we evaluated the 7 most used organizational donation sites based on how easy donors could find the organization’s mission, work, and donation use, the donation button, as well how well pages visual contrast to tell a clear story.

Although studies suggested that 23 and higher, Caucasian, middle to upper class, females with education higher that Bachelor’s degrees were the most likely to donate, no study had used transparency as a main variable. Therefore, we conducted a study on 600 individuals at the time of Haiti’s disaster to understand which demographic cares about transparency and are most likely to donate. As Haiti’s disaster provoked a very different kind of donation, we excluded the race and income variables and focused on gender, age, and education. Surprisingly, we also
discovered that women with Master's degrees care about transparency and donated at a much higher rate than any demographic. As our main method of recruitment was online social sites such as Facebook and Twitter, we received a majority response from 20–25 year old individuals and hence were unable to test for the age variable.

As our study had confirmed women with Master’s degrees were the ideal target population, we recruited from this population for our User study which tested the effectiveness of 4 layouts and 2 websites. Participants were given an hour to complete tasks and were evaluated based on error, time, and clicks. We discovered that transparent systems required more clicks as the donation process involved active decision making – what to donate, how, and at what quantity. Donors enjoyed the freedom to choose and had fewer mistakes when pages contained more visuals. From our findings we derived design recommendations which can be found in Chapter 6. Finally, in Chapter 7 we propose a transparent donation system which builds from the research on donor motivation and the orphan situation.

Through this thesis we were able to find which demographic cares most about transparency and what website layout and system promotes higher donor participation while creating a measurable impact for orphans and orphanages. The proposed transparent system will serve as a starting point to revolutionize how donors interact with orphans and orphanages, how orphanages communicate their needs, and how outcome of donations can be measured.

Further research is needed on how to implement transparent systems on ground, in orphanages, in India. As a next step I plan to do a 6 month fellowship in India and begin research on community participation and work on building partnerships with orphanages in India.
Survey Questions

SocialSeeds: Haiti Donation

Informed Consent

We invite you to participate in a SocialSeeds’ study for the University of Colorado, Computer Science department. SocialSeeds is an undergrad thesis focusing on increasing donor participation for online donations to orphanages. This specific study will learn about donor participation directed at Haiti.

Information

SocialSeeds is a vision of a not-for-profit organization that supports orphanages and their efforts in India. Through a need-based donation system we plan to increase transparency and communication between donors and orphanages, motivate donors to make informed decisions, increase donor involvement, and create a better financial environment for orphanages. The organization is currently at the development stage.

In order to better understand donor involvement, SocialSeeds is conducting a research on the disaster in Haiti and studying the donor reaction. In this survey we are asking participants to give information on their aid to Haiti. This study will help us better understand the motives behind donation, methods of donation, and information presented from aid organizations which will lead donors to participate again.

Benefits

SocialSeeds will have an opportunity to learn from your participation. That data gathered from your responses will shape our platform and hopefully aid orphanages in India.

Confidentiality

The subjects of this study will remain anonymous. No identifying information will be published or used. What will be asked are general demographics questions along with information on your participation in the outreach to Haiti.
Contact

Please direct all questions to the researcher, mary.am.pooyatabadi@colorado.edu or call 720-679-4299. We value your participation and will do our best to answer the questions you may have.

The Human Research Committee (HRC) at University of Colorado protects the rights of participants. During this study, if you feel your rights as a participant has not been honored according to the description of the project, please feel free to contact the HRC. The office can be reached at 303-735-3702.

Participation

Please note that participation in this study is voluntary. For any reason, you may choose to not participate without penalty. After beginning the participation, at anytime, you may also choose to withdraw from the study with out penalty.

The survey takes approximately 7 minutes.

We thank you for your time.

I have read and understood the consent form and choose to participate in the study: question 1 *

- Yes
- No

Continue >>
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* Required

### Age *
- 18-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-55
- 56-60
- 61-65
- 66-70
- 71-75
- 76-80
- 81-85
- 86-90

### Gender *
- Female
- Male

### Education *
- Some high school
- High school
- Some college Undergrad
- College Undergrad
- Masters
- PhD

### Have you donated to Haiti *
- Yes
- Planning to
- No
# SocialSeeds: Haiti Donation

* (required)

## Haiti **YES**

What factors influenced your decision to Donate to Haiti?*  
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly influenced</th>
<th>Influenced</th>
<th>Did not influence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage, images, and stories</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connections to Haiti actions</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti campaigns</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal involvement</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need</td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy, online donation process</td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations on the ground</td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What factors influenced your decision to Donate to a specific organization?*  
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly influenced</th>
<th>Influenced</th>
<th>Did not influence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name recognition</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations helping in the region</td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations mission and work</td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated before</td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations effectiveness (results)</td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How donation was used (percentage of money going to actions)</td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If PREVIOUS donor, how generous were you in this donation?  
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

- Much higher than previous donations (more than twice)
- Higher than previous donations
- Same as previous donations
- Lower than previous donations
- Much lower than previous donations (less than half)
- Other

I know *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Have some information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image57" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How satisfied are you with *  
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image60" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your relationship with the organization after your donation</td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates from the impact of your donation</td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you donate? *

- Online
- Initial request
- Text Message
- In-person at an event
- Through phone
- Other

If YES to ONLINE donation: On your online donation, did you find:

Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, immediately</th>
<th>Yes, after searching</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No, briefly mentioned</th>
<th>Looked but could not find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image73" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate button</td>
<td><img src="image78" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image79" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image80" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image81" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and work of organization</td>
<td><img src="image82" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image83" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image84" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image85" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the money was used</td>
<td><img src="image86" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image87" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image88" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image89" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local chapters</td>
<td><img src="image90" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image91" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image92" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="image93" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was your donation used for orphans or orphanages? *

- Yes
- No

[Continue]
### SocialSeeds: Haiti Donation

**Haiti: MAYBE**

What is delaying your aid to Haiti? *

Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly influencing</th>
<th>Influencing</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Small role</th>
<th>Played no role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to reach victims directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid flow is high and you will donate when donations decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied with donation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information on donation use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelmed with campaigns, cannot decide where to donate to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unfamiliar with the organizations on the ground and their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**What factors influenced your decision to donate to Haiti?**

Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

- Media coverage, images, and stories
- Personal connections to Haiti victims
- Haiti campaigns
- Societal movement
- The need
- Easy, online donation process
- Organizations on the ground

---

**Are you planning to donate to orphans or orphanages?**

- Yes
- No

---
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* Required

Haiti NO

What is preventing you from donating to Haiti? *
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly influencing</th>
<th>Influencing</th>
<th>Did not influence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to reach victims directly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid-flow is high and you will donate when donations decrease</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied with donation systems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information on donation use</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelmed with campaigns (cannot decide where to donate to)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unfamiliar with the organizations on the ground and their work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you donate to orphanages? *
Given that all your criteria for donation was met (information, finance, etc.)

☐ Yes
☐ No
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* Required

Orphanage Influence

What would influence your decision to donate to orphans and orphanages? *

Have you donated to another cause before? *

- Yes
- No

« Back  Continue »

Powered by Google Docs

Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Additional Terms
**SocialSeeds: Haiti Donation**

* Required

**orphanage yes**

**How did you hear about the orphanages? * **
- Media
- Personal connection
- Word of mouth
- Personal Search
- Other: 

**Are you aware of * **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Have some information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work of the orphanage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of your donation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the children will benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(food, shelter, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have you donated to another cause before? * **

- Yes
- No

« Back  Continue »
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* Required

## Previous donors

**What factors influenced your decision to Donate to the cause?***
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media coverage, images, and stories</th>
<th>Highly influenced</th>
<th>Influenced</th>
<th>Did not influence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal connections to victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people's involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extreme need on the Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy, online donation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations on the ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What factors influences your decision to Donate to that specific organization***
Neutral indicates you did not particularly care about finding the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name recognition</th>
<th>Highly influenced</th>
<th>Influenced</th>
<th>Did not influence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations history in the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations mission and work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's effectiveness (results)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Donation was used (percentage of money going to victims)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Would you like to submit your answers?***

- Yes
- No
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* Required

Thank you for your time

Is there a comment you would like to add about your donation experience *

- Yes
- No
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* Required

Comment

Please leave your comment here *

Would you like to submit your answers *

- Yes
- No

« Back  Continue »
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Thank you for your time and participation!
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Layout 1
Layout 3
User Study Questions

SocialSeeds User Study Protocol

Our prototype is a low fidelity prototype made in power point. We implemented hyperlinks within the presentation in order to simulate the real SocialSeeds’ donation interface.

The participant will be seated in front of a computer and be asked to initially take a survey. The survey will ask basic demographics questions which will be used in aggregate form. I then explain the procedure:

“What you see on the monitor is a 1 of 4 mock-ups for a donation website. I will ask you to perform certain tasks. Feel free to ask for clarification. I will be taking note of your interaction with the mock-up. Please walk me through your thoughts. (give example) When you “think out loud” I get a better understanding of what you think about the mock-up. Once you have completed a task, you can simply say “completed.” After you have completed a task, depending on which page you are on, I will ask you certain questions regarding the page layout. You can ask questions at any time. The study will take no longer than one hour “

I then choose a random mock-up from the 4 available. I also randomize the tasks. I will take note of actions, “think out loud” thoughts, and responses to questions the participant will give.

Pre-study Questions:

1. What would motivate you to donate to any cause?
2. What are the top 5 pieces of information do you want to know from a donation website?
3. Which ones are the most relevant?

Tasks

1. Show me the primary way to search within the site (the upper tabs)
2. Show me the secondary way to search within the site (the search bar)
3. Find how many ways you can give money to an orphanage (Donate/Orphanage)
4. Find out how donors have recently helped (stories)
5. Find how many organizations SocialSeeds works with us in India. (partners)
6. Identify the education background of one of the founders of SocialSeeds (who we are)
7. Find information on how donations helped orphanages (impact)
8. Find how SocialSeeds reaches small orphanages on the ground in India. (partners)
9. Point to where you could read about what a donor should expect when they donate. (how)
10. Give a month worth of rice from a farm to the St. Joseph orphanage in Chennai. (orphanages/donate)
11. Search for the step in which you are aware that 100% of your donations went to the orphanage? (how)
12. From previous donations by others, choose the one that you would also be interested in. (impact)
13. Show me the information which you find the most important about SocialSeeds (home)
14. Find what donation was given on Jan 20? (stories)
15. Choose the on-ground work of an NGO you like the best (Project)
16. Show the pieces of information that establishes trust for the donor. (how)
17. Find out how much of your money goes to what you intended. (home)
18. Identify which city is the headquarters of SocialSeeds. (local presence)
19. Point to a piece of information which in your mind gives SocialSeeds Credibility. (sponsors)
20. Where can you find information about when the founder began SocialSeeds. (about us)
21. Find out how ‘Clothes of Color’ project impacts orphanages (projects)
22. SocialSeeds works with some organizations in India. Find where they are located. (partners)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Show me the information which you find the most important about SocialSeeds | mission | Most people thought that that was the most important because “it’s the first displayed”. Additionally, it helped people understand what SocialSeeds strives for. However, the main critiques were of the following:  
- The description was vague  
- There was not a clear differentiation between SocialSeeds and other organizations  
- It wasn’t clear what type of establishment we were (NGO, Government programs, …)  
- The region of work was not clear  
- The ‘work’ of the organization was not clear  
In conclusion: the description did not bring interest to the participants |
| Find what donation was given on Jan 30 | Impact (clicked on a couple of impacts) then when to use of donations | Most participants thought it would be under projects. Then under use of donation. Points:  
- There were too many potential solutions  
- There needs to be a main category about donation information which is then respectively divided into categories |
| Find out how much of your money goes | Use of donations | This was very easy for participants to find. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify which city is the headquarters of SocialSees</th>
<th>Local presence</th>
<th>Easy to find.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point to a piece of information which, in your mind, gives SocialSeeds Credibility.</td>
<td>Top picks:</td>
<td>There were some pieces of information that the participants really enjoyed. Main points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of Donations</td>
<td>- most exciting: clear information on how money was used and how much of it was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stories</td>
<td>- Negative comments: participants did not like the fact that the information was so scattered. Most of the participants pointed at more than one piece of information and thought they related (mainly the 3 top categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What information can you find on the first page?
   a. What is the work of SocialSeeds?
      i. Is it clear as what the exact work is?
   b. Is local presence important to you? How would it make a difference?
   c. Is the presence of sponsor useful to establish credibility?
   d. How much detail would you like when learning about how we use donations?
   e. Are stories useful to create a sense of empathy?
2. Can you locate the donation button?
   a. Is it useful to have the donation button on every page?
3. Which page would you like to view next?
4. What do you like about this layout?
About us:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where can you find information about when the founder began SocialSeeds</td>
<td>Who we are</td>
<td>This was easy to find.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- “who we are” did not have information on SocialSeeds. Participants cared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more about gathering information about the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants said they would care if they started using the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the education background of one of the founders of SocialSeeds</td>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td>Took some reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants did not want to read the paragraph to find the answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is the important information you want to know about the founders?
6. How much detail would you like to know?
7. How does information about founders help in your decision to donate?
8. What do you like about this layout?

Impact/Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find information on how donations helped orphanages</td>
<td>Orphanages</td>
<td>A recurring problem with completing tasks related to information on donation use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to impact, click around and see what it says.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find out how ‘Clothes of Color’ project impacts orphanages</td>
<td>Impact, click around, projects, clicks on clothes right away</td>
<td>The page layouts were confusing. On the impact page, participants were not sure if they were looking at impact category or project category. Also they were not sure what the difference was and how they, as donors,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose the on-ground work of a group you like the best. Orphanages, impacts and projects, what group? This was a very difficult task. Participants were not sure what the word “group” was referring to. Again, as first time donors, they were unsure what their role was.

9. What do you want to know about the impact of an organization?
10. Is having a list of tangible impact helpful?
11. What are some other ways we can present information to you?
12. Having a list for projects is intended to show the different areas of impact. Does the list serve the purpose?
13. What do you like about this layout?

Orphanage/Donate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What’s the quickest way you can contribute</td>
<td>Donate.</td>
<td>This was an easy task for participants. Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Most participants enjoyed the process of donating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- They were not pleased with the list of cities and wanted a map and filters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(hunger, education, ...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Some participants wanted the option to “just donate”: the standard way of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>giving money to the organization and not be involved in the entire process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give a month worth of rice from a farm to the St. Joseph orphanage in Chennai.</td>
<td>Donate.</td>
<td>This was fairly straightforward. Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants did not know what to select first, need or an orphanage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- All participants enjoyed the process and thought it should be emphasized more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What are some criteria you would like to use to find orphanages?
15. Would a map or other visual input be useful?  
   a. How so?  
16. What do you like about this layout?  

**Partners:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find how SocialSeeds reaches small orphanages on the ground in India.</td>
<td>Impact.</td>
<td>This was a very difficult task. Most participants did not understand the organization of information and were therefore unable to find the appropriate place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orphanages</td>
<td>- The difference between partners, groups, organizations, and orphanages was unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact,</td>
<td>- The relationship between partner and themselves was unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who we are,</td>
<td>- The relationship between all the users was unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home (use of donation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find how many organizations work with us in India.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocialSeeds works with some organizations in India. Find where they are located.</td>
<td>Orphanages: the areas there.</td>
<td>Same comment as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. When you hear about an organization’s partner, what comes to your mind?  
18. How much detail would you like to know about the partner organization?  
19. Should SocialSeeds have a profile for the partner or should we redirect you to the partner’s site?  
20. What do you like about this layout?  

**How:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Think Out Loud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point to where you could read about what a donor should expect when they donate.</td>
<td>Takes some time. Starts clicking through random parts.</td>
<td>This was a difficult task for the previous reasons of information grouping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Search for the step in which you are aware that 100% of your donations went to the orphanage? | How donations are used | Comments:  
- Most participants remembered seeing the information but couldn’t remember. Again, same difficulty as information grouping.  
- In the ‘How’ section, most participants didn’t read through the steps even though it was a short paragraph. |

21. How much detail would you like to know about the steps?  
22. Do you think being able to click on the steps to be taken to where the step shows, is useful? (step one is about searching, would you want to be able to click on step one and be taken to the search page?)  
23. What do you like about this layout?
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Links to Websites Visited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Date Accessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>