

## Semantics as Persuasive Cues in Donation-Based Crowdfunding Campaigns: The Moderating Role of Donation Category

Ting-Yu Hsu<sup>1</sup>  
Yin-Chi Tsai<sup>2</sup>  
Yu-chen Hung<sup>3,\*</sup>  
Wenting Liu<sup>4</sup>  
Jing Ren<sup>5</sup>  
Ding Ding<sup>6</sup>  
Jorng-Tzong Horng<sup>7</sup>

\*Corresponding author

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Central University, Taoyuan, Taiwan, rye10140210@g.ncu.edu.tw

<sup>2</sup> Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Central University, Taoyuan, Taiwan, gigi20020404@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Singapore University of Social Sciences, Singapore, ychung@suss.edu.sg

<sup>4</sup> Singapore University of Social Sciences, Singapore, wentingliu@suss.edu.sg

<sup>5</sup> Singapore University of Social Sciences, Singapore, jingren@suss.edu.sg

<sup>6</sup> Singapore University of Social Sciences, Singapore, dingding@suss.edu.sg

<sup>7</sup> Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Central University, Taoyuan, Taiwan, horng@db.csie.ncu.edu.tw

### ABSTRACT

This study investigates the role of semantics as persuasive cues in donation-based crowdfunding campaigns across donation categories. Semantics have been shown to affect donation as part of narration technique. Drawing from the research on framing effect and schematic association of category, the study proposes that the persuasiveness of semantic cues depends on its consistency with categorical expectation. The consistency (vs. inconsistency) between semantic cues confirming to categorical expectation is to strengthen (vs. weaken) willingness to donate. The text analysis by LIWC showed that other-focused description increases willingness to donate, while self-focused description decreases willingness to donate. These findings suggest a sympathetic response towards descriptions on the occurrence of grave events happening to individuals; their needs for funds to travel for medical treatment are perceived highly worthy. The sympathetic feelings were ill afforded when the psychological process triggered by semantics are in conflict with categorical expectations. When words triggering cognition processes were present in the highly emotional category (such as funeral), they weakened donation. The results provide guidance for campaigners and crowdfunding platforms in communication strategies on appeal content within specific donation categories.

*Keywords:* donation-based crowdfunding, LIWC, content analysis, trust, empathy.

### INTRODUCTION

The rise of crowdfunding sites has empowered individuals to fundraise for people and causes they care about. With an effort to communicate about a worthy cause on the donation-based crowdfunding site (DCF) website, individuals can voice for worthy causes important to them personally. Unlike charitable organizations, individual fundraisers often do not have an official website, a well-established reputation, or a history of charitable activities to persuade donors. Due to the lack of credibility, campaign-specific information is critical to persuade donors for individual fundraisers (Berliner & Kenworthy, 2017; Kim et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016). Thus, the study investigates content features in effective copy writing to appeal to individual donors by individual fundraisers on DCF.

The study on content features has largely been conducted on nonprofits as promoters for DCF campaigns (Salido-Andres et al., 2021). Campaign contents are shown to mitigate the trust issues as campaign details reduce information asymmetry between the organizer and the donor. However, Salido-Andres et al., (2022) show that detailed disclosure does not always be an effective predictor of donation. These mixed findings suggest that only the campaign detail that affords persuasive cues can effectively motivate potential donors to act. Hence, the study examined semantics as persuasive cues to donation campaign. Semantics have been shown to affect donation as part of storytelling technique (Rodiady et al. 2021). Drawing from the research on framing effect (Body & Breeze, 2016; Chung & Moriuchi, 2016) and schematic association of category (Hung and Guan, 2020), the study proposes that the persuasiveness of semantic cues depends on its consistency with categorical expectation. The consistency

(vs. inconsistency) between semantic cues confirming to categorical expectation is to strengthen (vs. weaken) willingness to donate. Taken together, the study answers the following questions:

- RQ1: What semantics constitute persuasive cues on donation-based crowdfunding?
- RQ2: How the persuasiveness of the semantic cues varies according to donation category?

Our studies analyzed over 7,000 cases on a well-established crowdfunding website, GoFundMe. The first study examined the role of semantics on donation by the text analysis software, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) (Pennebaker et al., 2001). The results identified that positive cues and negative cues across all donation categories. First-person singular pronoun (“I”) is found to reduce donation in both donated amounts, whereas third person plural pronoun (“they”) increased enhanced donation amount. Our finding revealed that self-focused campaign is likely to decrease trust, while other-focused campaign is likely to enhance trust. These findings were in contradictory with the findings that the use of I as a “direct story telling technique” (“John said, ‘I’m happy’”) is more effect than the use of third person perspective as an indirect story telling technique” (“John said that he is happy”) by Rodiady et al (2021) in the childhood disease category. Our findings suggest that Rodiady et al (2021) finding applies to the children disease category, where the campaign is to benefit vulnerable children. The categorical expectation is other-focused, thus alleviating the barrier to trust. Under this context, the use of the right storytelling technique has a positive effect. Their finding supports that categorical expectation is critical. The second study continued to examine the varying effects of the semantics by donation category.

The identification of the two content features, semantics and donation category, in donation appeal offers theoretical advancement and managerial relevance. Firstly, text choice in movie synopsis has shown to bear significantly financial outcomes, such as to movie box office performance (Hung and Guan, 2020). However, donation is distinctive from transactional behavior, since psychological benefits are the major outcomes of the prosocial behavior. Benefiting other people, rather than benefiting self, is the major driver. With the distinctive antecedents and consequences, it is important to understand the role of semantics in persuasion. Our study also contributes to the growing research using text analysis on moral appeals (Hansen et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2021). Moreover, our results confirm that campaign category moderates the persuasiveness of semantic cues on donation. Campaign category has not been studied as a strategic option, despite that few studies have stressed the importance of cause framing (Body & Breeze, 2016; Chung & Moriuchi, 2016). This is surprising as most DCF sites show donation categories on the landing page to help donors identify causes resonating with them. Donation category is also the first step that a promoter needs to identify when listing their campaign, before uploading their supporting materials. Our results support that donation category shall be considered a strategic choice when more than one category is applicable to a case. Furthermore, our studies suggest that trust is a critical underlying the matching between semantics and donation category.

In practice, our study highlights how crowdsourcing websites can harvest its data to help their campaign promoter. Most DCF sites offer tips to its users, such as providing photos, updating progress, and writing a good story. DCF sites can suggest to replace detrimental words to beneficiary words that fit into a chosen category in view of attracting donation. Digital platforms may also provide plug-ins such as generative AI to users. They can suggest to words as prompts to generate more appealing content. The better data-based insights and services can help the platforms to raise their popularity. The services based on content analysis can be used to a platform strategy strengthen both direct and indirect network effects to win competitions among DCF sites.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Donation-based Crowdfunding

Crowdfunding refers to an open call to the public to provide funding via the internet where donations are made or an exchange of funds or notional rewards is carried out (Belleflamme et al., 2014). Crowdfunding campaigns solicit contributions towards various such as technology, science, creative arts, business, and culture, artistic or social goals. Distinctive from other forms of crowdfunding where donors may receive material rewards, donation-based crowdfunding (DCF) campaigns involve a request for contributions without receiving material rewards. DCF has garnered interests from practitioners and academics alike, as it is an alternative fundraising strategy for a wide range of initiatives suitable for nonprofits and individuals pursuing socially beneficial causes.

The various parties involved in DCF campaigns include those who promote them (i.e., the promoter), those who donate to them (i.e., the donor), and those who may ultimately benefit from them (i.e., the beneficiary). Promoters can be traditional charitable organizations, or individuals who are in need, or who care about a person or an issue. Due to their expertise, charity organizations are more successful at soliciting donations than individuals. They view DCF as one of their routes for reaching a larger group of potential donors. Individuals, on the other hand, have few, if any, other ways to appeal to the public. In view of its significance to individual promoters, our research focuses on the campaign initiated by individual promoters on DCF.

### Enablers for Donation

In account for philanthropic giving, individual psychographics such as prosocial orientation and empathetic concern are important predisposition for donors (Neumayr and Handy 2017). Demographic factors also play a role. For example, older women are not only more likely to give (Carpenter, Connolly & Myer, 2009) but give larger accounts (Smith, 2012). Individuals

that are highly educated, practicing religion actively, in professional and managerial roles, middle aged, living in the least deprived parts of the county, well settled in a neighborhood are also more likely to donate.

However, individual characteristics are not sufficient to convert a donor prospect into a real donor. Trust is the primary enabler of sympathetic deeds. Owing to information asymmetry, a promoter needs to build trust by conveying perception of trustworthiness. Charitable organizations have shown to influence donors due to their trustworthiness if they can show reliability and credibility through past campaigns (Tremblay-Boire & Prakash, 2017). Their trustworthiness relies on honest behaviors, effective performance and transparency regarding financing uses. More information on promoters and their previous projects are requirements for success in DCF because of the aforementioned information asymmetry between a charity cause and contributors. As a result, the amount of information shared on the promoters greatly influences the level of donor support. In comparison to nonprofit organizations, individual promoters lack the credibility that comes from earlier works. Therefore, potential contributors will heavily rely on campaign content to determine its trustworthiness.

Research has documented other motivational factors to donation on crowdsourcing platforms, including psychological involvement, perceived impact and identification. Techniques facilitative of greater involvement, identification and impact are more persuasive. Specifically, vivid description increases psychological involvement (Berliner and Kenworthy 2017; Kim et al. 2016b). Affectionate storytelling style are effective persuasive techniques (Rodiady et al., 2021). Perceived impact and identification to the fund raising group also enhances donation intention (Wang et al., 2019). Taken together, semantics associated with vivid description, affective-rich storytelling, impactful outcome and identification are likely to enhance trustworthiness and become persuasive cues.

### ***Semantics as Persuasive Cues***

The choice of words is a linguist strategy to include linguistic cues to convey meaning in order to persuade readers (Hung & Guan, 2020). Linguistic cues consist of syntactic cues and semantic cues. Syntactic information is the linguistic nature of a word within a sentence structure – such as a verb, an adjective, a preposition, a count noun, or a mass noun. Semantic cues offer the meaning of a word provided. The study focuses on semantic cues in donation appeal of DCF, as semantics convey meanings that may activate or deactivate sympathy toward the beneficiary. Ample evidence suggest that semantics act as persuasive cues to enhance motivation for donation, such as the use of appropriate language (Kim et al. 2016a), describing beneficiaries' merits in visual vividness (Berliner and Kenworthy 2017; Kim et al. 2016b), affectionate narration, and effective framing of causes (Body & Breeze, 2016; Chung & Moriuchi, 2016). These persuasive cues are likely to determine the campaign's perceived credibility and raise its chances of success (Berliner & Kenworthy, 2017; Kim et al., 2016a; Kim et al., 2016b). Therefore, campaigns encompassing persuasive cues are likely to be successful.

H1: Semantics serve as persuasive cues to impact on willingness to donate.

An altruistic motive is more likely to gain trust. This is because Donors are motivated by the warm glow from altruistic deeds (Gleasure & Feller 2016). Donors prefer beneficiaries whose needs arise from little fault of their own, or free from culpability (Fenton, Golding & Radley, 1993). When one person is soliciting donation for oneself, it may trigger attribution of failure to self, such as mismanagement of own finance, or ill consideration. On the contrary, soliciting donation for self is likely to trigger more deliberation, entailing suspicion for self-gain or greediness (Feng et al., 2022). From this perspective, we might expect that self-focused description decreases willingness to donate, whereas other focused description decreased willingness to donate. This, in turn, lead to the prediction that the presence of semantics suggestive of a self-focus, such as “I” will weaken the trust, whereas the presence of semantics associated with other-focus, such as third person singulars or plurals, will strengthen trust.

H1a: other-focused description increases willingness to donate

H1b: self-focused description decreases willingness to donate

However, recent findings suggest alternative perspective. Rodiady et al. (2021) found that the use of I as a “direct story telling technique” (“John said, ‘I’m happy’”) is more effect than the use of third person perspective as indirect story telling technique” (“John said that he is happy”) in the childhood disease category. One reason is that Rodiady et al (2021) finding pertains to the “children disease” category, in which the beneficiary is unambiguously vulnerable children. The categorical expectation is for the benefits of others. This other-focused category serves to alleviate the barrier to trust. The presence of “I” as a storytelling technique has a positive effect, due to a stronger affective feeling.

Their study suggests two things. Firstly, donation category is critical as it actives a certain set of expectations and associations. Secondly, donation category may serve to filter “whether to donate” prior to deciding on “how much to donate” (Xu and Wyer 2008). Most previous studies on semantics as persuasive cues attempt to answer how much to donate, or the magnitude of donation. For example, a higher involvement, identification, and perceive impact enhances donation intention. Corroboratively, descriptions generating affective feelings trigger valuation by feeling, whilst affect-poor content is likely triggers more cognitive deliberation, or valuation by calculation (Hsee & Rottenstreich, 2004). However, they neglect that the fit of semantics to categorical expectation may play a role on deciding to “whether to donate” in the first place. That is, donation category sets the background to determine the affordance of semantics as persuasive cues in accordance to categorical expectations and

associations. There, we discuss the role of donation category to moderate the relationship between semantics and donation in the next session.

### **Donation Category**

The affordance of semantics as persuasive cues shall depend on the donation category in which they appear. Donation category is likely to serve as a schema that activates different sets of social norms and associations. Two streams of literature offer corroborative evidence. Firstly, Hung & Guan (2020) establish that movie category (i.e., genre) is a schema that activates distinctive knowledge and expectation to guide movie choices. A synopsis comprising words consistent to categorical expectation enhances movie box office performance. Secondly, Clark (1997) offers the notion of the construction of sympathy, which describes that individuals give sympathy only under the conditions where social norms permeates as “deserving”. As a result, the framing of donation causes widely affect donor’s sympathy (Body & Breeze, 2016; Chung & Moriuchi, 2016). For example, a campaign cause on supporting an inmate’s children and families can focus on children, including an image of happy children, followed by short films highlighting how to donation helps to bond the child and their inmate parents. A framing on helping an innocent child helps to determine the case is “worthy” of one’s sympathy. Donation category is likely to activate schematic associations to circumscribe the nature of the needs. When the framing makes an appeal more relevant to self, it is likely to trigger involvement.

H2: The relationship between semantic cues and donation is affected by donation category.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **STUDY 1**

#### **Data Collection**

The source of our research data is the GoFundMe website (<http://www.gofundme.com/>). A total of 7,750 cases in English were collected from the website. After filtering out charitable organizations as project initiators, the final dataset contained 7,069 cases. Each case came with project name, project category, descriptions, funding goal, project launch date, project organizers, the number of donors, the total amount raised as of the retrieval date, and the number of comments on the projects by donors. The total amount of donation was divided by the active days to form average daily donation (ADD). The dataset contained 15 donation categories that was self-indicated by the project promoter, including “Funerals & Memorials” (n=871), “Emergencies” (n=833), “Events” (n=487), “Travel”(n=486), “Rent, Food & Monthly Bills“ (n=481) , “Wishes”(n=477), “Animals”(n=442), “Faith”(n=402), “Medical”(n=389), “Sports“ (n=376), “Volunteer” (n=323), “Business”(n=314), “Environments” (n=300) and “Other (n=373)”.

#### **Data Analysis**

Average daily donation (ADD) was regressed on the campaign description analyzed by the well-established text analysis software, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) (Pennebaker et al., 2001). Five pronoun categories under the linguistic dimensions and twelve main categories underpinning psychological processes were included. The five pronoun categories are first-person singular pronouns, first-person plural pronouns, second-person pronouns, third-person singular pronouns, and third-person plural pronouns. The twelve main categories include drives, cognition, affect, social processes, culture, lifestyle, physical, states, motives, perception, time orientation, and conversational. The categorical descriptive are provided in table 1. Three control variables were entered in the regression: number of donors, funding goal and word count. After analyzing ADD, the study also regressed number of donors on the LIWC outputs, controlling for fundraising goal, days since launch and word count.

The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) test was conducted prior to the regression analysis to gauge the multicollinearity. The results of this multicollinearity test are provided in Appendix A. From the outcomes displayed in the appendix, it is evident that, with the exception of "Drive" and "Social," all other variables exhibit VIF values below 10. Furthermore, in accordance with findings from The Development and Psychometric Properties of LIWC-22, these two variables, "Drive" and "Social," are determined to be independent of each other, thereby ruling out the issue of multicollinearity.

Table 1: The descriptive table of variables based on LIWC

	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
i	3.57	3.79	0.00	0.00	2.42	5.77	22.22
we	2.00	2.52	0.00	0.00	1.15	3.01	25.00
you	1.41	1.47	0.00	0.00	1.13	2.13	16.67
shehe	2.33	2.97	0.00	0.00	0.72	4.35	19.23
they	0.79	1.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	11.63
Drives	8.23	4.19	0.00	5.38	7.58	10.34	50.00
Cognition	9.45	4.05	0.00	6.67	9.19	11.93	34.78
Affect	7.71	3.34	0.00	5.41	7.32	9.52	37.50
Social	17.17	6.27	0.00	12.96	16.90	20.98	66.67
Culture	0.43	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	11.54
Lifestyle	5.52	3.45	0.00	3.12	4.92	7.32	40.00
Physical	2.52	2.68	0.00	0.00	1.78	3.89	33.33
States 1_need	0.77	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.22	14.29
States 2_want	0.38	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.67	11.11
States 3_acquire	0.77	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.51	1.25	14.29
States 4_lack	0.20	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.04
States 5_fulfill	0.14	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26
States 6_fatigue	0.01	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.45
Motives 1_reward	0.32	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.95
Motives 2_risk	0.29	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.27	12.50
Motives 3_curiosity	0.21	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.45
Motives 4_allure	6.95	3.09	0.00	4.85	6.72	8.77	42.86
Perception	7.58	3.36	0.00	5.36	7.37	9.60	30.43
TO 1_time	3.89	2.47	0.00	2.13	3.68	5.34	22.22
TO 2_focuspast	2.95	2.42	0.00	1.11	2.56	4.32	16.28
TO 3_focuspresent	5.40	2.57	0.00	3.66	5.22	6.93	28.57
TO 4_focusfuture	1.83	1.69	0.00	0.61	1.55	2.68	33.33
Conversation	0.21	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11
Goal	14478.67	106292.97	1.00	1500.00	4000.00	10000.00	600000.00
Days since launch	65.52	42.10	6.00	39.00	59.00	85.00	392.00
WC	117.62	64.55	3.00	76.00	111.00	148.00	946.00
Current donors	81.17	351.80	1.00	13.00	27.00	64.00	16500.00
Support number	4.21	17.70	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	740.00
Daily donation	138.81	511.26	0.04	9.67	28.89	107.14	18180.57

## RESULTS

The regression analysis on ADD showed semantics affected average daily donation, in support of H1. Specifically, four sets of semantics significantly increased ADD, including third-person plural pronouns ( $\beta_{they} = 19.21, p < .001$ ), "risk" ( $\beta_{risk} = 17.57, p = .002$ ), past-oriented words ( $\beta_{focus\ past} = 6.90, p = .003$ ), future-oriented words ( $\beta_{focus\ future} = 5.96, p = .04$ ). On the contrary, three sets of semantics significantly decreased ADD, including first-person pronoun ( $\beta_I = -7.27, p < .001$ ), "cognition" ( $\beta_{cog} = -4.58, p < .001$ ), "acquire" ( $\beta_{acq} = -14.41, p < .01$ ). Among the three control variables, more donors led to higher ADD ( $\beta_{donors} = 0.80, p < .001$ ) and more words also increased donation amount ( $\beta_{WC} = 0.90, p < .001$ ). The funding goal did not have a significant effect on the funding outcome ( $\beta_{goal} < 0.001, p = .82$ ). The results suggest that use of third-person plural pronouns ("they") increased the perception that the promoter is altruistic and making an effort to benefiting others, rather than self ("I"). The altruistic motive, with an emphasis on the risk that a beneficiary is exposed to, conveyed in a clear time line (from past to future) is most convincing. Conversely, a self-focused campaign to gain resources with semantics that trigger thinking was proven ineffective in soliciting sympatric response.

Furthermore, we examined the number of donors. Four sets of semantics significantly increased number of donors, including second-person plural pronouns ( $\beta_{we} = 5.16, p = .04$ ), "affect" ( $\beta_{affect} = 3.91, p < .01$ ), past-oriented words ( $\beta_{focus\ past} = 4.31, p = .03$ ), future-oriented words ( $\beta_{focus\ future} = 5.71, p = .02$ ). On the contrary, three sets of semantics significantly donor number, including first-person pronoun ( $\beta_I = -3.39, p = .001$ ), "cognition" ( $\beta_{cog} = -3.91, p = .001$ ), "drives" ( $\beta_{drive} = -3.91, p = .01$ ). Among the three control variables, more words also increased donor number ( $\beta_{WC} = 0.12, p = .04$ ). Taken together, past and future words not only increased donation amount, but also donor number. On the contrary, the self-centered cause with words that triggered more cognitive response decreased donors and their donation amount.

## STUDY 2

To further investigate the divergent results of text characteristics on donation across donation categories, we identified the keywords in different categories. We then discuss the divergent effects in relations to the enabler of sympathy as suggested in the literature.

### Data Analysis

Study 2 conducted regression analysis on average daily donation and donor number within each of the donation category. H2 posits that the persuasiveness of linguistics cues varies according to category. We expect that the semantics strengthen donation intention when they are indicative of the worthiness of beneficiary in accordance with categorical expectation, whereas the semantics weaken the feeling of sympathy when they are associated with personal gain.

### Results

Words associated “risk” perception such as danger, concerns and things to avoid significantly increased ADD under funerals and memorial ( $\beta_{risk\_MF} = 15.80, p = .03$ ) and travel ( $\beta_{risk\_travel} = 3.84, p = .04$ ). Past orientation, including past-tense verbs and references to past events/times also increased ADD ( $\beta_{past\_medical} = 14.70, p = .02$ ). These findings suggest a sympathetic response towards descriptions on the occurrence of grave events happened to individuals; their need for funds to travel for medical treatment are perceived highly worthy. Corroboratively, vivid description using “physical” expressions for such travel ( $\beta_{physical\_avel} = 0.83, p = .001$ ) also strengthened the response. Hence, the sympathetic feelings are sufficiently afforded by the presence of persuasive cues in the rightful donation category. Furthermore, donors can be motivated by a positive feeling of making an impact such as alleviating worthy beneficiaries from a miserable situation to a better future. Thus, a future orientation increased donation for funeral ( $\beta_{future\_funeral} = 8.64, p = .01$ ), animal rescue ( $\beta_{future\_animal} = 34.1, p = .04$ ), medical causes ( $\beta_{future\_medical} = 25.00, p < .01$ ) and volunteering acts ( $\beta_{future\_volunteer} = 5.76, p = .02$ ).

In contrast, words suggestive of self-focus, “I”, lowered ADD under the events ( $\beta_{I\_event} = -0.93, p = .03$ ), rent, food & monthly bill ( $\beta_{I\_bill} = -9.94, p = .02$ ), faith ( $\beta_{I\_faith} = -1.64.94, p < .01$ ), family ( $\beta_{I\_family} = -16.20, p = .02$ ), and medical ( $\beta_{I\_bill} = -16.00, p < .001$ ). Since these categories do not suggest urgency, asking for fund is perceived to be for personal gain. The lack of urgency in these categories weaken sympathetic feelings as individuals are perceived to be culpable of mismanaging own finance. Similar responses are seen in words associated with “acquire”, such as get and take, for the family and medical causes ( $\beta_{acquire\_family} = -38.7, p = .03$ ;  $\beta_{acquire\_medical} = -41.20, p < .001$ ). The sympathetic feelings are ill afforded; cognitive responses occurred to critically evaluate the worthiness of such appeals. The same cognitive responses occur when words triggering cognition processes, such as causation (because, why), differentiations (but, if, or) were present in the highly emotional category, such as funeral ( $\beta_{cog\_funeral} = -5.16, p < .001$ ). The sympathetic feelings were ill afforded when the psychological process triggered by semantics are in conflict with categorical expectations.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The research conducted analysis of the description of crowdfunding projects on the GoFundMe website, aiming to identify the relationship between semantic cues and donation with the well-established text analysis method of Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC). The research found that the language used in the description of crowdfunding projects indeed has an impact on the amount of funds raised. Moreover, the effect language differs across fundraising projects under distinctive categories.

In two studies, our results provide concrete guideline for fundraisers to effectively select keywords in accordance with thematic categorization so as to maximize the persuasiveness.

This study is limited to only one crowdsourcing website. Moreover, the progression of donation over a period of time is unobserved in our dataset. Other unobservable variables include donor profiles (demographics and psychographics), and history on the crowdsourcing site. In addition, our analysis was only limited to the text without considering the inputs from image. Future studies shall examine the interaction effects between image and text as both are important content features.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The respective contributions from the author team are the following. Dr. Hung has contributed to project idealization, theoretical conceptualization, and manuscript preparation. Ting-Yu Hsu & Yin-Chi Tsai collected the data, conducted the analysis and reported the analysis results. Dr. Ren & Dr. Liu have provided detailed guidance on methodology analysis. Prof Horng provides valuable feedback on conceptualization, methodology, and resourcing during all phases of the research.

## REFERENCES

- Berliner, L. S., & Kenworthy, N. J. (2017). Producing a worthy illness: Personal crowdfunding amidst financial crisis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 187, 233-242. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.02.008>
- Body, A., & Breeze, B. (2016). What are ‘unpopular causes’ and how can they achieve fundraising success? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21(1), 57-70. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1547>
- Chung, C., & Moriuchi, E. (2016). The effectiveness of donation advertising: An experimental study for felt ethnicity and messages on in-groups and out-groups. In *Celebrating America’s Pastimes: Baseball, Hot Dogs, Apple Pie and Marketing? Proceedings of the 2015 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) Annual Conference* (pp. 745-746). Springer

International Publishing..

- Diep-Nguyen, H., & Yang, J. (2021). Trust in Crowdfunding: Experimental Evidence from a Fundraising Campaign. Available at SSRN 3972418.
- Einolf, C. J. (2012). Is cognitive empathy more important than affective empathy? A response to “who helps natural-disaster victims?”. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 12(1), 268-271.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Francis, M. E., & Pennebaker, J. W. (1992). Putting stress into words: The impact of writing on physiological, absentee, and self-reported emotional well-being measures. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 6(4), 280-287.
- Gleasure, R., & Feller, J. (2016). Does heart or head rule donor behaviors in charitable crowdfunding markets?. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 20(4), 499-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2016.1171975>
- Goering, E., Connor, U. M., Nagelhout, E., & Steinberg, R. (2011). Persuasion in fundraising letters: An interdisciplinary study. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 40(2), 228-246.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Francis, M. E., & Booth, R. J. (2001). Linguistic inquiry and word count: LIWC 2001. *Mahway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*, 71(2001), 2001.
- Hansen, S. L., Eisner, M. I., Pfaller, L., & Schick Tanz, S. (2018). “Are you in or are you out?!” Moral appeals to the public in organ donation poster campaigns: A multimodal and ethical analysis. *Health Communication*, 33(8), 1020-1034.
- Hung, Y.-C., & Guan, C. (2020). Winning box office with the right movie synopsis. *European Journal of Marketing*.
- Kim, J. G., Kong, H. K., Karahalios, K., Fu, W.-T., & Hong, H. (2016). The Power of Collective Endorsements: Credibility Factors in Medical Crowdfunding Campaigns, *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, San Jose, California, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858289>
- Kim, P. H., Buffart, M., & Croidieu, G. (2016). TMI: Signaling Credible Claims in Crowdfunding Campaign Narratives. *Group & Organization Management*, 41(6), 717-750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116651181>
- Ordanini, A., Miceli, L., Pizzetti, M., & Parasuraman, A. (2011). Crowd-funding: transforming customers into investors through innovative service platforms. *Journal of service management*.
- Salido-Andres, N., Rey-Garcia, M., Alvarez- Gonzalez, L. I., & Vazquez-Casielles, R. (2021). Mapping the field of donation-based crowdfunding for charitable causes: systematic review and conceptual framework. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, 288-302.
- Tremblay-Boire, J., & Prakash, A. (2017). Will you trust me?: How individual American donors respond to informational signals regarding local and global humanitarian charities. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28, 621-647.
- Zhang, Z., Jin, J., Luo, C., & Chen, A. (2022). Excavating the social representations and perceived barriers of organ donation in China over the past decade: A hybrid text analysis approach. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 998737.

## APPENDIX A: VIF Table of Variables

Variables	VIF	Variables	VIF
i	3.09	States 6_fatigue	1.02
we	3.89	Motives 1_reward	1.42
you	2.91	Motives 2_risk	1.27
shehe	3.99	Motives 3_curiosity	1.15
they	1.83	Motives 4_allure	7.12
Drives	12.86	Perception	5.77
Cognition	7.54	TO 1_time	3.77
Affect	8.96	TO 2_focuspast	3.34
Social	27.35	TO 3_focuspresent	6.2
Culture	1.24	TO 4_focusfuture	2.29
Lifestyle	3.73	Conversation	1.16
Physical	2.11	Goal	1.01
States 1_need	1.61	Days since launch	3.19
States 2_want	1.44	WC	3.87
States 3_acquire	1.67	Current donors	2.53
States 4_lack	1.16	Support number	2.54
States 5_fulfill	1.15		