Abstract
The present study examines the effects of different donation motivations on anonymous giving behavior. The study evaluates the relative effects of four donation motivations: empathy, religiosity, conspicuousness, and social impact, on anonymous giving behavior. Data were collected with the purposive sampling method from 672 donors who preferred giving to charities. According to the research results, conspicuousness, empathy, altruism, and intrapersonal religiosity have significant effects on anonymous giving behavior. Conspicuousness negatively affects anonymous giving behavior. Empathy, altruism, and intrapersonal religiosity positively affect anonymous giving behavior. The findings confirm that altruistic motivations are more effective in anonymous giving behavior.
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Introduction
Studies on donation behavior showed that individuals’ donation behavior may be affected by different motivations. These giving motivations may vary in different donation behaviors. For example, in various cultures, individual donations that are visible to others are not appropriate. In this case, the question of which motivations explain individuals’ anonymous giving behavior becomes significant. Although a limited number of studies have addressed this issue (Cicerchi & Weskerna, 1991; Smith & Johnson, 1991), individual anonymous giving behavior is the least researched topic in charitable giving behavior (Schervish, 1994).

Different studies examined the motivations behind individuals willing to remain anonymous in the donation process, and these studies were generally conducted in North America (Cicerchi & Weskerna, 1991; Schervish, 1994; Smith & Johnson, 1991). An extensive literature search showed no study on anonymous giving behavior has been conducted outside Western cultures. Charitable giving is evaluated as a symbolic consumption process. How can we interpret charitable giving in terms of consumers who live in culturally diverse societies and in emerging markets (Kravets & Sandikci, 2014)? The present study focused on the effects of donation motivations for anonymous giving behavior in a society that is Muslim and influenced by Western practices.

Theoretical Background
In the marketing and fundraising literature, intrinsic motivations drive individuals to donate to others and charities. Intrinsic donation motivations are critical dimensions that explain the individual donation process. Intrinsic motivations for giving are the underlying determinants for electing to give to others or charities (Kottasz, 2004; Sargeant, 1999). Motivations such as empathy and altruism (Burks et al., 2012), religiosity (Sargeant & Jay, 2004, p. 97), memory of a
loved one (Sargeant, 1999), conspicuousness (Grace & Griffin, 2006; Sargeant et al., 2006), materialism (Mathur, 2013), and social impact (Drollinger, 1997) affect individuals’ donation decisions.

Studies on the individual donation process in the marketing literature focused on individuals’ non-profit giving behavior (Bendapudi et al., 1996; Sargeant, 1999, 2006). Worldwide, the majority of donations are given anonymously, and a significant portion of donors do not want to disclose their identity (Anderson, 2013). Reasons for giving anonymously can vary in terms of individual preference. Individuals’ high commitment to religious values, desire to live their private life in secret, feelings of shame regarding their wealth, and charitable actions can be taken into account (Cicerchi & Weskerna, 1991).

Anonymous giving is based on altruistic reasons, and individuals donate only to help the needy without any other concern or to provide support for an event (Anderson, 2013). The empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, 1991) suggests that individuals are motivated to give because of altruistic determinants. This theory can provide a meaningful framework for individuals who want to give anonymously. Donors who wish to understand the situation of the needy and whose goal is to act for others’ benefit prefer to remain anonymous.

The first phase of the research was designed to find which motivations were related to anonymous giving behavior. We conducted semi-structured interviews with 18 donors. We found that egoistic and altruistic motivations were related to anonymous giving. These motivations are empathy, altruism, religiosity, conspicuousness, and social impact. The literature on donation behavior has shown that these motivations predict nonprofit giving behavior (Burks et al., 2012; Drollinger, 1997; Grace & Griffin, 2006; Sargeant et al., 2006; Sargeant & Jay, 2004, p. 97), but few empirical studies have addressed the role of motivation in anonymous giving behavior. Cicerchi and Weskerna (1991) provided empirical evidence in the United States. In the present study, the effect of conspicuousness, social impact, altruism, empathy, and religiosity motivations on anonymous giving behavior was evaluated. The following were hypothesized:

\[ H_1 \]: Conspicuousness negatively affects anonymous giving.

\[ H_2 \]: Social impact negatively affects anonymous giving.

\[ H_3 \]: Altruism positively affects charitable giving.

\[ H_4 \]: Empathy positively affects charitable giving.

\[ H_5 \]: Religiosity positively affects charitable giving.

\[ H_{5a} \]: Intrapersonal religiosity positively affects charitable giving.

\[ H_{5b} \]: Interpersonal religiosity positively affects charitable giving.

**Research Method**

The study used the purposeful sampling method. Data were obtained via a web-based survey. Questionnaires were sent to charities’ list of donors in Turkey. The sample consisted of Turkish donors who had given monetary donations to charities within the previous 3 months. A total of 672 out of 708 people responded to the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Studies Benefited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grace &amp; Griffin (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green &amp; Webb (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathur (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sargeant et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Green &amp; Webb (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bennett &amp; Choudhury (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schlegelmilch et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity (Intrapersonal &amp; Interpersonal)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Worthington et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data on the participants’ opinions and thoughts were collected with a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The scale was tested for validity using a translation-back-translation method and expert opinion, and the final version of the scale was completed following a pilot application. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient tested the reliability of the scales, and all were above the minimum level of 0.70 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). For convergent validity, factor analysis was performed using the principal component method, followed by a varimax rotation.

Findings, Discussion and Further Research

The majority of the sample consisted of male individuals who have graduate degrees. The participants’ age varied from 16 to 74. All participants gave different amounts to charities, and the donors’ annual incomes varied from $60 to $17,300.

Linear regression analysis was applied to test the research hypotheses. According to regression analysis, altruism, empathy, and interpersonal religiosity have a positive effect on anonymous giving behavior. For this sample, social impact and intrapersonal religiosity had no significant effect on anonymous giving behavior. Conspicuousness had a negative effect on anonymous giving behavior. Altruism, empathy, and interpersonal religiosity explained 26% of the total variance in anonymous giving behavior. Empathy further explained anonymous giving behavior. Nevertheless, altruism and intrapersonal religiosity also influenced anonymous giving behavior. In this case, hypotheses H1, H3, and H5 were supported, and hypotheses H2 and H5b were rejected.

The results indicate that intrapersonal religiosity, altruism, and empathy have a positive effect on anonymous giving behavior. These motivations are called altruistic motivations in the donation literature and affect individuals’ charitable giving behavior.

In contrast, social impact and conspicuous giving motivations were evaluated as egoistic donation motivations in the literature, and these motivations show that individuals donate for their self-interest. In some cases, egoistic motivations were shaped by others’ expectations.

The person who gives anonymously focuses on the person in need, and charitable actions are carried out in an altruistic manner. In the exploratory phase of this research, informants stated that it is important to give anonymously in a Muslim society and attention should focus on the person in need. The conspicuous donation motivation negatively affects anonymous giving behavior. In this sample, social impact motivation had no significant effect on anonymous giving.

According to the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, 1991), people who act with empathic concern in the donation process can understand the needy.
and improve their quality of life. These actions are driven by altruistic motivations, and in this process, empathy and altruism motivations have a close relationship. In the context of this hypothesis, Burks et al. (2012) reported similar results. The present study also confirmed this type of relationship between empathy and altruism. In anonymous giving behavior, individual actions with altruistic motivations rather than egoistic motivations. The study findings are also important for charities to reach donors who want to give anonymously and increase charities' fundraising.

Future studies might examine such differences among different donor groups (volunteers, blood donors, etc.). There is also a need to replicate our study in other cultural contexts. In this study, we considered a limited number of motivations for predicting anonymous giving behavior. Further research could incorporate other determinants of charitable giving behavior such as extrinsic and intrinsic motivations (Sargeant et al., 2006; Verhaert & Van den Poel, 2011).
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