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Abstract

Purpose – The growth in the number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) worldwide has led to increased competition for donations. A stronger NGO brand equity will make donors more attracted to an organization, compelling them to increase both their donations and their commitment. The goal of this study is to propose a novel donor-based brand equity model. The present study takes into consideration the special characteristics that donors confer to NGOs—specific examples of nonprofit organizations (NPOs) that demand higher moral capital. The suggested framework considers the donor’s perspective of NGO brand equity and identifies new dimensions: familiarity (recall, brand strength and brand identification), associations (authenticity, reputation and differentiation) and commitment (attitudinal, emotional) by building on previous NPOs and consumer-based brand equity models.

Design/methodology/approach – Based on the analysis of the literature, the authors propose an NGO donor-based brand equity model, which the authors test with a convenience sample of 137 individuals through partial least squares structural equation modeling.

Findings – The results of this study demonstrate the positive effects of brand reputation, brand differentiation, brand identification and brand commitment on donor-based brand equity.

Practical implications – The novel proposed model will help NGO managers better understand the sources of brand equity from the donor’s perspective and more efficiently manage their resources and activities to strengthen their NGO’s brand equity.

Originality/value – This paper provides a novel, multidimensional NGO donor-based brand equity model that is oriented to the specific characteristics of NGOs; this orientation distinguishes it from previous NPOs and commercial brand equity models.
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1. Introduction

Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are a key element in today’s society. Their relevance is reflected in the number of these organizations, their millions of beneficiaries worldwide, the employment they generate and the volunteers they mobilize. According to nonprofitaction.org, there are 10 million nonprofit organizations (NPOs) and NGOs globally. The yearbook of International Organizations 2020/2021 suggests that approximately 1,200 new NGOs are added each year. This steady growth in the number of NGOs makes fundraising the main stumbling block in their survival and development (Ha et al., 2022). With this objective in mind, a growing number of NGOs are developing a more strategic approach to build their brands to create a greater social impact (Kylander and Stone, 2012) because a stronger NGO brand will make donors feel more captivated, causing them to increase their donations and their loyalty to the organization. Napoli (2006) validated that...
brand-oriented organizations perform better because they are more sensitive to their stakeholders’ needs, which influences people’s attitudes toward charity and donation.

In the growing “NGO market”, attracting and maintaining donors is an ongoing, critical concern for NGOs (Michel and Rieunier, 2012). NGOs need to differentiate themselves from other NGOs and strengthen their bonds with donors by facilitating their identification with the organization’s social objective and, therefore, triggering their intention to donate (Sargeant et al., 2008; Gregory et al., 2020; Wymer et al., 2021). However, the literature on NGO brand management is sparse. One reason for this scarcity is that researchers tend to use the term NPO as an umbrella label for any nonprofit organization, including NGOs. However, we contend that the sources of NGO and NPO brand equity may differ.

An NPO is based on the premise that no net profits from donations or other income from business activities or membership fees will benefit any individual within it. This is common for all NPOs, including NGOs, as well as other NPOs, such as clubs or cultural associations, whose nature differs significantly from that of an NGO. For example, organizations such as the National Academy of Fine Arts, Finnish Defense Forces (FDF) Military Driving School, Red Cross, Save the Children or World Vision are all categorized as NPOs; thus, no distinction on their sources of brand equity has been made in the literature (Venable et al., 2005; Voeth and Herbst, 2008; Ladill-Kylander and Simonin, 2009; Juntunen et al., 2013; Boenigk and Becker, 2016; Gregory et al., 2020). However, superficially, one can easily observe the difference in the nature of the FDF Military Driving School NPO and the NGO Save the Children, for example. Vakil (1997) describes NGOs as self-governing, private, not-for-profit organizations that are geared toward improving the quality of life of disadvantaged people. This definition is based on Salamon and Anheier (1992) NPO taxonomy, where they indicate that NGOs are a subgroup of NPOs whose most relevant differentiating elements are the type of causes that they address. NGOs are value-based organizations (Stride, 2006) that address social causes such as equality, environmental and animal protection, human rights and empowerment, in turn, influencing socially responsible behaviors in firms (Martínez et al., 2016; Wenqi et al., 2022).

Therefore, NGOs can be described as prosocial organizations known for promoting different moral objectives, such as humanitarian aid and welfare causes or freedom, justice and equal rights. This definition provides NGOs with some characteristics that separate them from other NPOs from a donor’s perspective. The most relevant distinction is that donors demand higher moral capital and social legitimacy from NGOs (Kane, 2001) than from NPOs that are focused on other, nonmoral objectives, such as preserving art or maintaining private schools or sport clubs.

According to Kane (2001, p. 10), moral capital is “a resource that can be employed for legitimating some persons, positions, and offices and for delegitimizing others, for mobilizing support and for disarming opposition, for creating and exploiting political opportunities that otherwise would not exist.” Since moral capital is core in NGO activity, the management of an NGO brand should be conducted accordingly (Jones et al., 2007). NGO donors must identify with the organizational values represented by an NGO’s brand to provide donations (Keller et al., 2009), as the congruence between an individual’s moral values and emotions and an NGO’s moral objectives influence a donor’s support for the NGO (Wymer et al., 2021; Goenka and van Osselaer, 2019).

Taking these considerations into account, we have reviewed the NPO literature through the lens of the most popularly accepted valid and comprehensive brand equity model (Aaker, 1991, 1996; Keller, 1993; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Having identified the currently studied dimensions of the NPO brand equity model, we propose a new brand equity model for NGOs based on certain particularities.

Our research thus makes two important contributions to the literature. First, it contributes to the NPO literature by filling a gap in NGO brand equity research and proposing a new,
specific brand equity model. Second, our results can help NGO managers better understand their sources of brand equity from a donor’s perspective and thus more efficiently manage their resources and activities to strengthen their brand equity.

This paper is structured as follows: First, we present the conceptual background of our study and a narrative review of the NPO brand equity dimensions that have been tested in the literature to provide a reference for the development of our model. Second, we present our NGO donor-based brand equity model and hypothesis. Third, we describe our research method and results. Finally, we discuss our findings and present our conclusions, as well as some future research opportunities.

2. Conceptual background
The brand equity models used in the NPO literature are rooted in consumer-based brand equity models and in the dimensions of brand awareness, brand personality and brand image (Faircloth, 2005; Juntunen et al., 2013; Kashif et al., 2018). However, important dimensions of consumer-based equity models such as perceived quality and loyalty are rarely discussed in the context of NPOs and donor-based brand equity models.

Faircloth (2005) was the first author to develop an NPO brand equity model from volunteers’ and donors’ perspectives. He proposed a nonprofit brand equity model on the dimensions of brand personality, brand image and brand awareness (recall and recognition). Interestingly, and in contrast to his expectations, he found a negative effect of brand awareness on the brand equity construct, suggesting that recall and recognition of an NPO is not enough to build brand equity, i.e. if the NPO has a negative image, the impact of brand awareness on its brand equity will be negative. Therefore, there is a need to enhance the measurement of brand awareness to properly reflect brand context (Romaniuk et al., 2017).

Concerning the varying spectrum of internal and external NPO stakeholders, Juntunen et al. (2013) examined brand equity cocreation in the Finnish Defense Forces (FDF) military driving school, a representation of a nonprofit organization. They measured the impact of brand image and brand awareness on cocreated nonprofit brand equity. Their results validated their positive effect.

In a novel attempt to expand NPO brand equity dimensions, Boenigk and Becker (2016) conceptualized a nonprofit brand equity index from a stakeholder-based perspective with three dimensions: brand awareness, brand trust and brand commitment. Based on this model, they developed a brand equity index for 40 select German NPOs. However, this study did not consider how overall brand equity influences donor intention. Kashif et al. (2018) is the only study to adopt a more holistic approach to a donor brand equity model, investigating the moderating effect of brand credibility on the brand equity dimensions; however, albeit in a very specific cultural context, i.e. Islamic religion in Pakistan, they find mixed results.

In summary, the literature on NPO brand equity is sparse and inconclusive, as it presents some controversies and limitations in its empirical results. Moreover, the extant research models omit dimensions that have been shown in the consumer literature to impact brand equity, such as the dimensions of loyalty or perceived quality (Aaker, 1991; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Nor do the dimensions included in these constructs consider the influence that an NGO’s moral objectives may have on the construction of its brand equity.

Therefore, we propose a theoretical model of donor-based brand equity based on the particularities that NGOs present by discussing the classical consumer-based brand equity model and proposing several hypotheses to adapt it to the NGO donor context.

2.1 Brand awareness
Most brand equity models include brand awareness as an antecedent of brand equity, measuring the recall or recognition necessary for brand consideration in consumer
Keller (1993) suggested that brand awareness is related to the strength of a brand node or trace in memory, reflected in consumers’ ability to identify a brand under different conditions.

The importance of brand awareness stems from mere recognition and signal theory (Erdem and Swait, 1998), which posits that brand awareness might be sufficient for triggering consumer choice, either as an impulse or simply as a signal of quality. In the NPO literature, most authors support this view, and thus recall and recognition are the most common approaches to a brand awareness construct.

However, we contend that conceptualizations that define brand awareness as solely brand recall/recognition have limited applicability in the NGO/NPO domain; mere brand recognition is not enough for donors. It is therefore necessary to consider a broader dimension of the traditional brand awareness concept, such as the concept of brand familiarity, to incorporate a facet of knowledge magnitude (Keller, 2003) and to determine brand prominence in donor memory (Wymer et al., 2016; Gregory et al., 2020).

The concept of familiarity has been very broadly defined in the literature. While Paço et al. (2014) found no significant relationship between NPO familiarity and the intention to donate; Dogan et al. (2021) found that familiarity has a positive effect on the intention to donate. This difference may stem from what is included in their measurements of brand familiarity, i.e. whether it is just perceived general knowledge or is closely related to NPO performance.

Therefore, we contend that for an NGO, it is necessary for a donor to exhibit a deeper knowledge of its objectives. Hence, we propose a new brand familiarity construct that includes whether NGO donors recognize a brand, to what extent they know what the brand does and whether they recognize and approve of the NGO’s moral mission. Thus, our brand familiarity construct includes a recall and recognition dimension (Aaker, 1991; Boenigk and Becker, 2016; Yoo et al., 2000), a brand strength dimension and a brand identification dimension (Wymer et al., 2016; Gregory et al., 2020), allowing us to determine not only whether an NGO’s brand is recognized but also to what extent a donor is familiar with its purpose (Sargeant and Lee, 2002; Wymer et al., 2016).

Thus, we postulate the following hypothesis.

H1. There is a positive relationship between NGO brand familiarity and donor-based brand equity.

2.2 Brand associations
Brand associations are perceptions that are linked in memory to a brand and are broadly clustered by product, organization, symbol and personality associations (Aaker, 1991) or as the brand attributes, brand benefits and brand attitudes that form the brand’s image (Keller, 1993).

Brand associations are relevant for an NGO because they allow donors to distinguish its brand from those of other NGOs and to establish a donation preference (Venable et al., 2005; Voeth and Herbst, 2008). For NGOs, as they are value-based organizations (Stride, 2006), their brand associations serve as figurative lenses that facilitate their differentiation through their identity and moral objectives, which, in turn, influence donor attitudes. Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) state that people often choose to donate to organizations that represent how they would like to see themselves, allowing them to improve their identity via donation, as it helps demonstrate—both to themselves and their community—that they are connected to certain values. Accordingly, NGO donors must morally identify with an NGO’s brand values to commit to this organization and provide donations (Keller et al., 2009).

Thus, for an NGO, the relevant elements of brand association concern the connection that a donor establishes with the moral objectives of the NGO and the image that the donor projects by being associated with it.
Therefore, we posit that for an NGO, specific associations are necessary to establish its degree of differentiation and to reflect the connection that a donor establishes with its moral objectives. Thus, we propose three dimensions: brand authenticity, brand differentiation and brand reputation.

Brand authenticity (Akbar and Wymer, 2017) measures the degree to which an organization is perceived as the archetypal example of its category and stands out from similar organizations for its original value. Brand differentiation (Wymer et al., 2016) validates whether a donor recognizes the personality or distinctive characteristics of an NGO that allow its differentiation from its competitors. Finally, brand reputation implies a value assessment of the organization, i.e. what the organization does and how it acts over time (Balmer, 1998; Bennett and Gabriel, 2003); thus, it is clearly related to the evaluation of an NGO’s values and moral objectives.

Hence, in contrast to other NPO brand associations, for an NGO, we focus on the associations related to core values and how they impact a donor’s identification with the NGOs’ moral objectives. By doing so, we overcome the limitation of existing discrete associations in the literature concerning specific organizations, which are difficult to validate in organizations other than the one for which they were designed.

As a result, we posit the following hypothesis.

H2. There is a positive relationship between brand associations (authenticity, differentiation and reputation) and donor-based brand equity.

2.3 Brand commitment

Despite the relevance of brand loyalty to consumer-based brand equity (Aaker, 1991; Oliver, 1997; Yoo and Donthu, 2001), few studies have addressed the issue of brand loyalty in the context of NPOs. One reason for this might be that since donors can simultaneously donate to many NPOs/NGOs, the behavioral measure of loyalty might not be relevant in the NPO context. In addition, donors can donate to an NGO out of a sense of urgency in humanitarian situations without feeling attached to its long-term objective(s) or cause(s) (Gregory et al., 2020). Therefore, the attitudinal dimension of the loyalty construct seems more salient than the behavioral dimension in the context of NPOs or NGOs.

In the NPO literature, we have identified the concept of brand “commitment” in lieu of “loyalty” (Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007; Boenigk and Becker, 2016). Brand commitment reflects a person’s attitudes and behaviors toward an organization that are based on a strong belief and acceptance of the organization’s goals. Similarly, Sargeant and Lee (2004) believe that when stakeholders become emotionally attached to an NPO brand, they form a relationship with it and develop a sense of commitment that could be assimilated into brand loyalty. A high level of psychological involvement with an NGO will make a donor consider his or her support of the organization a highly vital activity. In the same way, donors who show a low sense of involvement with an NPO are more likely to switch organizations (Bennett, 2009).

When people support NGOs, they do so to act in accordance with their own values and to be true to their own image (Wymer and Akbar, 2019). If the moral objectives an NGO advocates fit a donor’s values, he or she will consider donating. If a donor does not have an affinity with the cause(s) and moral values that an organization supports, regardless of its importance in society, it is likely that he or she will not make a donation, except in sporadic emergency situations (Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007; Gregory et al., 2020; Wymer et al., 2021). Therefore, brand commitment appears to be a more accurate dimension than brand loyalty concerning both NPOs and NGOs. Hence, we propose a brand commitment construct, replacing Aaker’s (1991) loyalty dimension by measuring a donor’s attitudinal commitment (Boenigk and Becker, 2016) and emotional commitment to an NGO, which implies the donor’s greater identification with the NGO (Boenigk and Helming, 2013). Therefore, we posit the following:
3. Methodology

3.1 Research approach and sample
We developed a questionnaire to be distributed online in a random convenience sample. It started with a filter question to check if respondents worked for an NGO to prevent response bias. The first part of the questionnaire aimed to measure the different dimensions of the donor-brand equity model we proposed. The scales used to assess the constructs were adapted from multi-item scales validated in previous research and measured on a five-point Likert scale (5 = “strongly agree”, 1 = “strongly disagree”). Table 2 presents these items by construct and the sources of the scales. The last part of the questionnaire included sociodemographic questions (age, gender, education and professional situation). The questionnaire concerned NGOs dedicated to a childhood cause, and the respondents had to answer the questions while considering the organization they were the most familiar with.

Accordingly, our data were collected through an online survey distributed through social media and e-mail. The survey was activated in May 2022 and received 137 responses. The final sample was composed of 131 respondents, as questionnaires with invalid answers were excluded. Table 1 includes a description of the sample’s characteristics.

3.2 Measurement of variables
All the scales used in our study demonstrated excellent statistical validity. Table 2 shows the measurement scales and questions used in the study and included in the questionnaire. We followed the double translation protocol: the original scales (in English) were translated into Spanish and then back into English to report their results.

4. Results

4.1 Individual reliability of the indicators
Before carrying out our evaluation of the reliability and validity of the measurement model, we analyzed the individual reliability of each of the items included in the scales to eliminate
those indicators that did not represent the same construct or were redundant. We used the criterion proposed by Hair et al. (2012), i.e. to accept an indicator as part of a construct, and it must have a factorial load equal to or greater than 0.7. This indicates that more than 50% of the variance in the observed variable (item communality) is shared by the latent construct. After eliminating low-loadings items, we analyzed the correlations of the indicators with their respective constructs and with the rest of the constructs. We performed factorial analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28.0 to assign the items according to the statistical methods and verified each of them in the context of the study and the dimensions we wanted to measure. Next, the brand familiarity construct was formed with five items belonging to recall and recognition (RR3) and brand strength (BS1, BS2, BS3 and BS4). The items related to brand identification were grouped under the construct of brand association, composed of nine items related to brand reputation and differentiation (BI1, BI2, BD1, BD4, BD5, BR1, BR2, BR3, and BR4). Any authenticity items were eliminated as redundant. For the brand commitment dimension, only BCE2 and BCE5 were removed due to low loadings. Our final donor-based brand equity measurement model is shown in Figure 2.

### 4.2 Construct reliability and validity

To assess the unidimensionality of the reflective scales of the constructs, we used Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, which provide an estimate of reliability based on indicator correlations. As shown in Table 3, the coefficients of all the measurement constructs were greater than 0.7, as suggested by Nunnally (1978). We also evaluated composite reliability (CR) with the criterion that this coefficient must be greater than 0.7 (Werts et al., 1974). CR is considered the best indicator to test the measure of the latent unidimensionality of a scale, especially in works that use partial least squares (PLS). As we verified, the CR values of the four proposed scales were greater than 0.8.

To evaluate the measurement model, we followed Hair et al. (2019), assessing convergent validity, discriminant validity and construct reliability. For the reliability of the measurements, we followed Fornell and Larcker (1981), i.e. both the Cronbach’s alpha and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, working for others</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, working as freelancer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other situations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Sample characterization

NGO brand equity
Constructs, items and sources

Brand Familiarity
Recall and Recognition (based on Yoo et al. (2000) based on Rossiter and Percy, 1987)
RR1 I recognize the NGO brand as soon as I see it
RR2 I consider that the NGO is well known
RR3 I know what the NGO does

Brand Strength (based on Wymer et al., 2016)
BS1 I am well informed about the NGO activities
BS2 I am knowledgeable about the work that the NGO does in its projects
BS3 I understand the purpose of the NGO
BS4 I could describe the NGO activities to others

Brand Identification (based on Wymer et al., 2016)
BI1 I like the NGO
BI2 I have a positive impression when I think of NGO
BI3 I feel that the NGO represents values that are important to me
BI4 I identify with the values of the NGO

Brand Associations
Brand authenticity (based on Akbar and Wymer, 2017)
BAU1 NGO is unique
BAU2 NGO is true to itself
BAU3 NGO stands out from other organizations devoted to the same cause
BAU4 NGO is the best of all those dedicated to the same cause

Brand differentiation (based on Wymer et al., 2016)
BD1 The work that NGO does in its cause is impressive
BD2 No organization is as good as NGO in the cause it addresses
BD3 NGO is extraordinary compared with other NGOs working for the same cause
BD4 NGO has a genuine personality
BD5 The work that the NGO does for its cause is interesting to me

Brand Reputation (based on Bennett and Gabriel, 2003)
BR1 NGO is highly recognized
BR2 NGO has great achievements at work for its cause
BR3 NGO has a good reputation
BR4 I admire NGO

Brand Commitment
Attitudinal (based on Boenigk and Becher (2016) based on Sargeant and Lee, 2004)
BCA1 I feel committed to the NGO
BCA2 My intention is to maintain my relationship with the NGO indefinitely
BCA3 I feel satisfied with the relationship I have with the NGO
BCA4 I like to maintain a relationship with the NGO

Emotional (based on Boenigk and Helming (2013) based on Mael and Blake (1992)
BCE1 When someone criticizes NGO, I feel it as something personal
BCE2 I am interested in what others think about NGO
BCE3 I consider myself part of the NGO
BCE4 I am pleased to hear praise about the NGO
BCE5 I would be ashamed if bad practices were published about the work of the NGO

Brand Equity
Intention to donate (based on Hou et al. (2009) based on Sampath and Henley (2007) and Yoo et al. (2000)
ID1 I definitively will donate to the NGO
ID2 It is likely that I donate to the NGO instead of other NGOs that are devoted to the same cause
ID3 It is likely that I will donate to the NGO in the future
ID4 I will recommend family and friends to donate to the NGO
ID5 It is likely that I will continue donating to the NGO in the future
ID6 It is likely that I recommend the NGO instead of other NGOs that are dedicated to the same cause
ID7 For me it makes more sense to donate to the NGO than to other NGOs that are dedicated to the same cause

Table 2.
Measurement scales
ID7 For me it makes more sense to donate to the NGO than to other NGOs that are dedicated to the same cause
composite reliability (see Table 3) values needed to be larger than 0.7. Concerning convergent validity, we used two measures to assess it: average variance extracted (AVE) and the correlation of each indicator with its construct. The coefficients of the AVE of each of the measurement constructs were larger than 0.5, entailing high convergent validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). To check the correlation of each of the indicators with its construct, we used factor loadings. All of them were greater than 0.7, indicating that each set of indicators represented the same underlying construct (see Table 4).

To assess the discriminant validity, we followed Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) criterion (see Table 5) and the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio criterion (see Table 6). Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggest using the AVE as a criterion for convergent validity, i.e. a latent variable should share more variance with its assigned indicators than any other latent...
variable. According to Henseler et al. (2015), all HTMTs should be below 0.90 to establish discriminant validity. The results we obtained for these indicators thus confirmed the discriminant validity of the measurement scales we proposed.

To evaluate the multicollinearity of the indicators, we calculated their variance inflation factor (VIF). All VIF values (Familiarity, 2.186; Associations, 1.902; Commitment, 1.745) were below 3 (Hair et al., 2019), proving that there is no multicollinearity in this study.

4.3 Assessing the structural model
To estimate the relationships in our structural model, we applied the partial least squares method of structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 3.3.9 software. PLS works efficiently for exploratory purposes and is adequate for relatively small samples and complex models (Hair et al., 2012). This multivariate analysis technique has been used in previous research on NPOs, which we have previously cited in this article (e.g. Boenigk and Helming, 2013; Boenigk and Becker, 2016; Kashif et al., 2018).

Figure 3 exhibits our structural model, the inner model path coefficients are marked together with the outer model loadings and the $R^2$ adjusted values for the dependent variable.

We assessed our structural model by analyzing the determination coefficient indicator $R^2$ and the standardized path coefficients of each of the constructs to examine the significance of the constructs and their direct and indirect effects. $R^2$ values of 0.67, 0.33 or 0.19 for endogenous latent variables in the inner path model are described as substantial, moderate or...
weak by Chin (1998, p. 323). In our model, the $R^2$ value was 0.567, indicating an acceptable substantial level of exploratory power.

PLS estimates the path model for each bootstrap sample. Bootstrapping analysis with a resampling of 5,000 interactions was used to calculate the $t$ values to assess the effects of the relationships among the hypotheses. Additionally, the PLS results for all bootstrap samples
provided the mean value and standard error for each path model coefficient. A $t$ value $> 1.96$ and $p$ value $< 0.05$ means that the relationship between these 2 variables is significant and has acceptable statistical significance (Chin, 1998). Table 7 presents these results.

Based on the results of our empirical study, our proposed donor-based brand equity construct is statistically valid. The path coefficients, $t$ values and $p$ values have allowed us to accept two of our three hypotheses. Table 8 exhibits a summary of our hypotheses testing.

According to our results, the brand association construct has a robust relationship with brand equity ($\text{path coefficient} = 0.418$, $t$ value $= 6.473$, $p$ value $= 0.000$); thus, $H2$ is confirmed. Similarly, a strong relationship between brand commitment and brand equity was observed ($\text{path coefficient} = 0.484$, $t$ value $= 6.374$ and $p$ value $= 0.000$), confirming $H3$. However, our brand familiarity results did not confirm its influence on brand equity; therefore, $H1$ is not supported.
5. Discussion
In this study, we have proposed and tested a novel donor-based brand equity model. Our proposal takes into consideration the special characteristics that donors confer to NGOs—specific examples of NPOs that demand higher moral capital. Our suggested framework includes a donor’s perspective of NGO brand equity and identifies new dimensions, building on previously defined NPO and consumer-based brand equity dimensions.

Our results show the positive effects on donor-based brand equity of two dimensions—brand associations related to reputation, differentiation and identification and brand commitment—via the attitudinal and emotional dimensions.

For brand familiarity, the relationship we found was negative, although not significant; therefore, our hypothesis was not supported. This result, however, is similar to those of Faircloth (2005) and Paço et al. (2014). As in those studies, NGO familiarity apparently has no influence on donor intention. Faircloth (2005) has suggested that recall and recognition have no influence on a donor; rather, the (positive) degree of knowledge that the donor has of the organization is the main influence. Therefore, we suggest that brand familiarity might exert a necessary although insufficient condition to build brand equity and to activate donor intention.

The strong relationship among the differentiation, identification and reputation variables included under the association construct (path coefficient 0.418) suggests that for an NGO, the values and consistency of the NGO’s activities as well as a donor’s identification with the brand are the most important factors triggering donations, which extends the findings of Michaelidou et al. (2015) and Wymer et al. (2016) on the perception of NPOs’ moral principles and individual values. Similarly, our results show that a donor’s attitudinal and emotional commitment to an NGO—feeling part of the organization and identifying its values as his or her own—have an important influence on the intention to donate. Since Boenigk and Helming (2013) underline that self-identification has a dynamic character, we suggest that strong emotional and attitudinal commitment may protect an NGO’s brand from the spillover effects of any scandals or any other brand image problems.

6. Conclusions, limitations and future lines of research
Despite some similarities between NPOs and NGOs, there are important differences, such as moral capital, that significantly affect how NGOs operate and how their brands are built. This is the first study to provide a holistic brand equity model for NGOs from the perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original sample (O)</th>
<th>Sample mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard deviation (STDEV)</th>
<th>T statistics ([O/STDEV])</th>
<th>p values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>−0.060</td>
<td>−0.056</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>6.473</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>6.374</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Structural model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Path value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>−0.060</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>6.473</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment &gt; Brand equity</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>6.374</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Summary of hypothesis testing
of donors, building on previous NPO and commercial brand literature. The present research provides a number of theoretical contributions. First, our research has progressed the NGO literature by presenting a donor-based brand equity model comprising novel dimensions that reinforce the importance of considering a donor’s evaluation of an NGO’s reputation, differentiation and emotional and attitudinal commitment to its values, underscoring the relevance of an NGO’s moral capital for attracting donors.

Regarding the dimensions included in the proposed model, we advance the literature on brand association, mostly via our analysis of brand personality and brand image, providing a general dimension that can be generalized to all types of NGOs. Thus, we avoid specific references to the image or personality of a brand and focus on the importance that the moral capital of an NGO has for donors. In this way, our construct assesses donor evaluation via the values and moral objectives of NGOs that are important. Additionally, we extend the conceptualization of the classical brand loyalty dimension in the context of NGOs, proposing a dimension of brand commitment by including not only a behavioral dimension but also an emotional dimension that suggests a deeper level of donor engagement with an NGO and thus true loyalty to it. In a highly competitive context where a donor has several donation options and could support different NGOs, the donor’s commitment to an NGO’s cause and values will strongly influence his or her present and future support.

The results of our study have relevant managerial and practical implications. Our novel donor-based brand equity model may help NGO managers better understand the sources of brand equity from a donor’s perspective and more efficiently manage their resources and activities to strengthen the brand equity of their NGO. In addition, the results of our study have important practical implications that may inform NGO managers on several aspects of NGO brand management.

First, our results indicate that brand familiarity is not an objective to be achieved at any cost since familiarity alone is not a strong source of donor-based brand equity. Therefore, from a management perspective, NGOs should focus on disseminating their values and activities as opposed to relying only on word-of-mouth publicity since the latter will have no effect without the former. Consequently, NGOs should offer targeted communications explaining their values while building their reputation, as these are the pillars of brand equity. Accordingly, any advertising efforts of an NGO's brand should consider this.

Second, our results suggest the importance of an appropriate segmentation strategy since a donor’s identification with the moral values of an organization is critical. Therefore, a practical implication is that a specific communication approach for each target group is likely to be more effective than a one-size-fits-all approach. Finally, the importance of emotional commitment in our model may suggest the opportunity to build stronger relationships with donors, i.e. engaging with them to ensure a more recurring flow of donations. NGO managers should also consider this in fundraising campaigns.

6.1 Limitations and future lines of research
As with any study, our research is not exempt from limitations, which open future avenues of research. We tested our proposed brand equity model on NGOs devoted to childhood in Spain. Thus, it would be interesting to replicate our study with NGOs that address different causes in different countries, as cultural factors may affect the results. Given the importance of values and moral perceptions in NGO assessment, future investigations may target cross-cultural representative samples to validate our model and reveal any possible cultural differences.

Regarding the data, we used a convenience sample to test the model. Future research should use a representative sample to generate new insights based on sociodemographic groups. In this model, we did not consider possible moderating effects such as NGO cause, NGO size or whether an NGO is local or international. Since these elements may impact
donor identification with an NGO brand and NGO brand equity, additional studies on those
effects are recommended.
Further investigation of the role of brand familiarity in NGO brand equity is recommended
as there has yet to be any conclusive results in the literature. We consider that additional
research investigating the influence of NGO cause awareness on the formation of NGO brand
familiarity is needed. Additionally, we observe a lack of studies on the impact of time and the
various available marketing tools on NPO and NGO brand equity. Understanding how
advertising, media, promotion and NGO availability affect the formation of brand equity over
time is a very promising research avenue. Finally, considering the importance of reputation
for NGO brand equity, new lines of research could deepen knowledge of its sources, such as
NGO transparency and accountability.
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