Innovations

Story And Visual Strategies of Medical Crowd Funding Campaigns On Facebook And TheCovid-19 Pandemic

Mark Joseph R. Zuñiga[1], ChryslAvegeil N. Vallejo[2], Marife R. De Torres[3],Danilo S. Vargas[4]

Central Luzon State University, Philippines

Abstract

This study generally aims is to evaluate the attitude of Central Luzon State University students towards the story strategies and visual strategies of medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook, and the COVID-19 pandemic, about their intention to donate.Using multistage sampling, a total of 98 students from Central Luzon State University were chosen as respondents to this study. The researcher utilized Google Forms to acquire the quantitative data. In terms of interpreting the data gathered, a discussion of the tables containing the frequencies of answers was executed. Additionally, Pearson's Correlation Coefficient statistical test was used to identify existing correlations. Various story and visual strategies used in medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook differ in effectiveness when it comes to affecting the attitude and thus, intention to donate of CLSU students. Interestingly, the COVID-19 pandemic doesn't affect their intention to donate to medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook; they engage with COVID-19-focused medical crowdfunding campaigns the same as other types of medical crowdfunding campaigns. A notable discovery is that, for CLSU students, for the most part, these strategies and the COVID-19 pandemic do not persuade them to donate strongly, nor do these factors persuade them to strongly not donate. The researcher found a lack of strong motivation in the attitude of CLSU students towards donating to medical crowdfunding campaigns on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords:*1.medical crowdfunding; 2.story strategies; 3.visual strategies, 4.COVID-19 pandemic*

Introduction

The emergence of various social media had made communicating with the whole globe possible and achievable to the ordinary person — more possibly if they know how to make a compelling post that can gain a lot of attention and/or popularity. Nowadays, social media isn't only used for leisure purposes but for practical uses as well. One of these practical uses is what is now known as 'crowdfunding', which, according to Hossain &Oparaocha (2015), is an Internet-based funding procedure for the financing of a certain project through contributions or pledges of a small amount of money coming from a large group of people which have their particular interests and expectations in helping. These donors are part of a network most commonly the Internet wherein they are connected with other people or organizations.

Simply speaking, crowdfunding is the act of raising money online for a given venture. People like businessstarters or artists utilize crowdfunding to get their projects going. To achieve their goals, non-profit organizations rely on the monetary contribution of the general public (Guy and Patton, 1989). Today, a relatively new phenomenon has emerged using crowdfunding for medical purposes too; thus the term 'medical crowdfunding'.

Crowdfunding in the Philippines has yet to gain more recognition than it has for other countries especially First World ones (Vergara, R, 2015). There are four local crowdfunding platforms in the country: PhilAmTHropy, Social Project PH, The Spark Project, and ArtisteConnennone of which focuses primarily on medical crowdfunding, thus, social media like Facebook or Twitter has become the go-to platforms for Filipino medical crowdfunding campaigners.

There are four types of crowdfunding: donation-based, reward-based, debt-based, and equity-based (De Buysere et al., 2012) and medical crowdfunding belong donation-based since it is founded upon collecting funds from people, not giving rewards of any sort. Thus, donors in medical crowdfunding campaigns are mostly motivated by empathy, altruism, and social participation (Gerber, Hui, &Kuo, 2012). It has been found that emotions inspire people into action more than cognition (Sudhir, Roy, & Cherian, 2016). While according to Berliner and Kenworthy (2017), media literacy is a big factor in the donation behavior of people and the spread of the campaign to many networks.

Reimink (2014) identified 8 factors that may explain people's intention to donate to a crowdfunding campaign: quality of the project, amount of money, rewards, geography, network involvement, shared values, trust, and duration. The majority of the studies on medical crowdfunding mostly revolve around crowdfunding websites and not on social media. Medical crowdfunding studies done on Facebook mostly evaluated the 'Fundraiser' option offered by social media and not the posts on the Facebook profile of

the campaigners themselves. Also, the focus of the studies is on medical crowdfunding campaigns created by non-profit organizations.

Objectives of the Study

1) What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of, age, gender, citizenship, year, and course?
2) What are the respondents' Facebook usage and past donation behavior in medical crowdfunding campaigns?
3) How do story strategies used in a medical crowdfunding campaign posted on Facebook related to the intention to donate to CLSU students? Specifically, how do the Point of View, Identifiable Victim Effects, Goal Framing, Goal Attainment, Interactivity of the Campaigner, Urgency of Situation, and Call to Action related to their intention to donate?
4) How do visual strategies used in a medical crowdfunding campaign posted on Facebook related to the intention to donate to CLSU students? Specifically, how do Vivid Beneficiary and Vivid Situation relate to their intention to donate?
5) How do COVID-19-focused medical crowdfunding campaigns engage CLSU students compared to other types of medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook?
6) How does the present period of the COVID-19 pandemic relate to CLSU students' intention to donate to medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook?
7) What are the significant relationships between the socio-demographic profile, Facebook usage, and past donation behavior of the CLSU students and their intention to donate to medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook?

Review of Related Literature

Crowdfunding Methodology

According to the paper, 'Crowdfunding. A new option for funding health projects' by Otero, P. (2015), the methodology of crowdfunding goes like this: someone will post a campaign and advertise it to acquire the money needed for the initiative. Three chief parties play key roles in the success of a crowdfunding campaign: the individual who needs help and has started the project/campaign, a funder, and the platform that lets them communicate with each other. These platforms provide instruments or tools to assist in donation transactions, payments on credit cards or money transfers are done digitally. Once the campaign has been posted, promotion of it is at hand. Social media is utilized for this stage of spreading the campaign to the highest amount of people possible.

Communication Styles

Alvernia (2018) defines communication style as the method by which people show or send information and interact with others in the process of communication. When it comes to the success of a medical crowdfunding campaign, it is of utmost significance. According to Borst et al., (2017), communication style in crowdfunding can be grouped into two dimensions. The first dimension is the description of the project and the updates. The second dimension, on the other hand, is the interaction between the campaigner and the funder.

In the arena of social media, Mollick (2014) recognized indicators to anticipate the success of crowdfunding campaigns. Among them are: having numerous updates, having many friends or followers, using a video instead of an image to depict the situation and fewer grammatical errors. More compelling campaigns can pull people's attention and therefore have a higher chance of acquiring more donations. The research concluded that communication styles influence others (Charlton et al., 2018).

Visual Strategies

Communication styles in medical crowdfunding campaigns include visual strategies, which are the techniques applied in the use of image or photo that usually comes hand in hand with the story. According to Shneor and Vik (2020), with the various literature they have reviewed, the addition of an image or a video can lead to more success in any crowdfunding. In medical crowdfunding, this is the case as well. Once again, in Kisun, K.'s study above, two visual strategies are identified that are applied by campaigners on their medical crowdfunding campaigns on the Fundraiser page on Facebook. They are vivid images of identifiable victims (Vivid Beneficiary) and an image that represents the situation (Vivid Situation). The first one refers to images that depict the beneficiary of the campaign, while the second one refers to an image that shows the situation of the beneficiary and not some unrelated or far-fetched image.

Intention to Donate

According to Rhodes &Ewoldsen (2013), it is difficult for researchers to study or evaluate actual behaviors because of constraints in the laboratory settings and the common lack of time and money even though behaviors are essential results of persuasion. This is why instead of studying actual behaviors in crowdfunding, researchers have focused on the intention to donate using most primarily report studies. However, as apparent as it is, the intention to donate doesn't exactly equate to donation behavior. Still, the intention to donate is an accurate basis of data when trying to examine the persuasive characteristics of strategies used in crowdfunding campaigns.

Research Methodology

The researcher conducts a descriptive quantitative approach. The respondents of this study were undergraduate students of Central Luzon State University who are eighteen (18) years old and above, of any gender, who are Filipino citizens, and who reside in the Philippines. Their total number was 98. Multistage sampling techniques were used in selecting the samples.Since it was descriptive research. The researcher creates a Google Forms that contains the questionnaires to gather data.

Results and Discussions

Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1,shows that (60.2%) or the majority of the respondents are females. In terms of age, the highest number of respondents is 21 years old (40.5 %). All respondents are Filipino citizens. The highest number (13.27%) among CLSU students are from the course BS in Development Communication. In line with the 28 students who chose not to include their year, the majority of the respondents are fourth-year students (35.7%). Concerning monthly family income, most of the respondents have a monthly income between Php 8,001.00 and Php 20,000.00 (43.9 %). With 77.6 % of the respondents, the majority of them don't have a job or source of income.

Facebook Usage and Past Donation Behavior

Findings in Table 2, show that the highest number of the respondents have been using Facebook for 7 to 9 years (45.9 %). When it comes to Facebook usage in a week, the majority of the respondents spend time using Facebook everyday (80.6%). In hours a day, most of the respondents use Facebook for 3 to 5 hours (24.5 %).

Frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns on Facebook during this period of the COVID-19 pandemic

Figures in Table 3,indicated that 39.8% or most of the respondents have seen medical crowdfunding campaigns on Facebook during this period of the COVID-19 pandemic 3 to 4 times.

Past donation behavior

The majority of the respondents haven't donated to any medical crowdfunding campaign before (61.2 %) as indicated in Table 4.

Story and Visual Strategies

Point of View

The resultsshow in Table 5, that, if the story is written in the first-person perspective, the highest number of the respondents agree (42.9%) that it relates to their intention to donate. On the other hand, if the story is written in the third-person perspective, the majority of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (57.1%) that it relates to their intention to donate.

Identifiable Victim Effects

Table 6,revealed that, if the story does not contain any personal information about the beneficiary, the majority of the respondents disagree (43.9 %) that it relates to their intention to donate.Meanwhile, in Statement number 5,most of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (51 %) that it relates to their intention to donate. On the other hand, Statement number 6, has the highest number of respondents also neither agree nor disagree (33.7 %).Finally, in Statement number 7, the majority of the respondents agree (44.9 %) that it relates to their intention to donate.

Goal Framing

As shown in Table 7, revealed that if the story utilizes negative framing (loss), more than half of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (54.1 %). Meanwhile, statement number 9, has the most number of respondents agreeing (49 %).Finally, in statement number 10, the majority of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (57.1 %) and these all relate to their intention to donate.

Goal Attainment

Table 8,shows that if the story does not explain the likelihood of goal attainment, the majority of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (41.8%) that it relates to their intention to donate. If the story does not include goal attainment, most of the respondents, again, neither agree nor disagree (46.9%). While, statement number 13, has the highest number of respondents who agree (46.9%) that it relates to their intention to donate. On the other hand statement number 14, close to half of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (41.8%).Lastly, in statement number 15, most of the respondents agree (36.7%) that it relates to their intention to donate.

The interactivity of the Campaigner

The finding in Table 9, shows that if the campaigner updates the story, the majority of the respondents agree (46.9%) that it relates to their intention to donate. While statement

number 17 has the mostnumber of respondentswho agree (43.9%). Meanwhile, statement number 18, has the highest number of respondents who agree (41.8%) as well that it relates to their intention to donate.

Urgency of Situation

Table 10, revealed the story explains the urgency of the situation, the majority of the respondents agree (48%) that it relates to their intention to donate, and those who disagree and strongly disagree (each accumulated 2%).

Call to Action

As presented in Table 11,results revealed that if the story includes a call to action, the highest number of the respondents agree (55.1%) that it relates to their intention to donate. While (1%) of the respondentsdisagree.

Visual Strategies

Seeing from Table 12shows that statement number 21 has the majority of the respondents agree (48%) that it relates to their intention to donate. On the other hand, statement number 22 has more than half of the respondents, again, agree (50%) that it relates to their intention to donate.

COVID-19 Pandemic

Table 13, shows that statement number 23 almost half of the respondents neither agree nor disagree (45.9%) that it relates to their intention to donate. On the other hand, statement number 24 has (42.9%) or most respondents neither agree nor disagree.

Correlation between,socio-demographic,requency of years spent on Facebook, frequency of using Facebook in a week, frequency of hours spent on Facebook in a day, frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic, past donation behavior, the total amount of past donation and story and visual strategiesof the respondents (Table 14 &15)

Story Strategy: Point of View. Age, frequency of using Facebook in a week, and the total amount of donation are related to Statement 2 which is if the story is written in the third-person perspective. Age is negatively correlated with Statement 2, while frequency and total donations are positively correlated with Statement 2.

Story Strategy: Identifiable Victim Effects. The total amount of donation is related to Statement 3. It is positively correlated with Statement 3 which is if the story does not contain any personal information about the beneficiary.

Meanwhile, the frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic is related to Statement 5.

Age is related to Statement 6 which is if the beneficiary is identifiable and the story contains implicit personal information and situation.

Also, the age and frequency of the hours spent on Facebook in a day are related to Statement 7 which is if the beneficiary is identifiable and the story contains explicit personal information. They are both negatively correlated with Statement 7.

Story Strategy: Goal Framing. Age is related to Statement 9 which is if the story utilizes positive framing (gain). It is negatively correlated with Statement 9. Therefore, as age increases, the respondents tend to disagree with Statement 9.

Story Strategy: Goal Attainment. Sex is related to Statement 11. It is positively correlated with Statement 11, therefore, as the number of male or female students increases, agreement with Statement 11 increases.

The frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic is related to Statement 15 which is if the story contains explicit goal attainment with a detailed breakdown of specific parts and how much money each part needs. It is positively correlated with Statement 15.

Story Strategy: Interactivity of the Campaigner. The frequency of the hours spent on Facebook in a day is related to Statement 16 which is if the campaigner updates the story. It is negatively correlated with Statement 16.

Age is related to Statement 17 which is if the campaigner updates the visuals. It is negatively correlated with Statement 17. Also, statement 18 is if the campaigner updates both the story and the visuals. It is negatively correlated with Statement 18.

Story Strategy: Call to Action. Age is related to Statement 20 which is if the story includes a call to action.It is negatively correlated with Statement 20.

Visual Strategy: Vivid Beneficiary. Age is related to Statement 21 which is if the image depicts the beneficiary. It is negatively correlated with Statement 21. Therefore, as age increases, the respondents tend to disagree with Statement 21.

Visual Strategy: Vivid Situation. Age and frequency of the hours spent on Facebook in a day are related to Statement 22 which is if the image depicts a vivid situation in which the beneficiary is struggling. They are both negatively correlated with Statement 22.

COVID-19 Pandemic. Age, donation behavior, and the total amount of donation are related to Statement 23 which is if they are likely to donate to any medical

crowdfunding campaign posted on Facebook. While donation behavior and the total amount of donation are positively correlated with Statement 23.

On the other hand, the total amount of donation is related to Statement 24 which is if they are more likely to donate in COVID-19-focused medical crowdfunding campaigns than other types.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the socio-demographic profile of the respondents was recorded which includes their age, sex, citizenship, course, and year. Additionally, their Facebook usage and past donation behavior in medical crowdfunding campaigns were recorded. Various story and visual strategies used in medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook differ in effectiveness when it comes to affecting the attitude and thus, intention to donate of CLSU students. Interestingly, the COVID-19 pandemic doesn't affect their intention to donate to medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook; they engage with COVID-19-focused medical crowdfunding campaigns the same as other types of medical crowdfunding campaigns. The strategy of Urgency of Situation included in a medical crowdfunding campaign doesn't have a significant relationship with their socio-demographic profile, Facebook usage, and past donation behavior. However, all other categories do have at least one or more significant relationships. A notable discovery is that, for CLSU students, for the most part, these strategies and the COVID-19 pandemic do not persuade them to donate strongly, nor do these factors persuade them to strongly not donate. This is proven by the lack of any 'Strongly Disagree' or 'Strongly Agree' answer. The majority of the answers borders between 'Neither Agree nor Disagree' and 'Agree'. With this in mind, there is a lack of strong motivation in the attitude of CLSU students towards donating to medical crowdfunding campaigns on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic.

Recommendations

As a recommendation, the researcher proposes the identification of other story and/or visual strategies used in medical crowdfunding campaigns to be used in future studies. Additionally, the assessment of a video instead of an image added in a medical crowdfunding campaign might prove to be relevant to study since videos are more compelling in a way; even more in the now. CLSU students, as respondents of this study, are interesting as a population but examination of other groups of people — other universities perhaps — can be a significant addition to the body of knowledge regarding medical crowdfunding in the Philippines. Another age group, as well, and not just Gen Z. Other social media websites besides Facebook as the focus of study regarding medical crowdfunding is also recommended lastly, further exploration into the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on medical crowdfunding in the Philippines can be a relevant and useful study to undertake.

References

1. *Hossain, M. &Oparaocha, G. O. (2017). Crowdfunding: motives, definitions, etymology and ethical challenges. Entrepreneurship Research Journal. Retrieved at: (www.researchgate.net)*

2. *Guy, B.S. & Patton, W.E. (1989). The Marketing of Altruistic Causes: Understanding Why People Help. The Journal of Consumer Marketing (6:1), pp. 19-30. Retrieved from: (www.emerald.com).*

3. *Burtch, G., Ghose, A., &Wattal, S. (2013). An empirical examination of the antecedents and consequences of contribution patterns in crowd-funded markets. Information Systems Research 24 (3): 499–519. Retrieved from: (pubsonline.informs.org)*

4. *Bassani, G., Marinelli, N., and Vismara, S. (2019). Crowdfunding in healthcare. Retrieved from: (econpapers.repec.org).*

5. *Berliner, L. S. & Kenworthy, N. J. (2017). Producing a worthy illness: Personal crowdfunding amidst the financial crisis.*

6. *Aleksina, A., Akulenka, S., &Lublóy, Á. (2019). Success factors of crowdfunding campaigns in medical research: perceptions and reality. Retrieved from: (ideas.repec.org)*

7. *De Buysere, K., Gajda, O., Kleverlaan, R., &Marom, D. (2012). A framework for European crowdfunding. Retrieved from (www.europecrowdfunding.org)*

8. *Gerber, E. M. & Hui, J. (2013). Crowdfunding: Motivations and deterrents for participation. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human*

9. *Sudhir, K., Roy, S., & Cherian, M. (2016). Do sympathy biases induce charitable giving? The effects of advertising content. Marketing Science, 35(6), 849-869. Retrieved from:(pubsonline.informs.org)*

10. *Charlton, C. R., Dearing, K. S., Berry, J. A., & Johnson, M. J. (2008). Nurse practitioners' communication styles and their impact on patient outcomes: an integrated literature review. Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 20(7), 382-388. Retrieved from: (pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).*

11. *Berliner, L. S., & Kenworthy, N. J. (2017). Producing a worthy illness: Personal crowdfunding amidst the financial crisis. Social Science & Medicine, 187, 233-242. Retrieved from: (pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)*

12. *Mollick, E. (2012). The dynamics of crowdfunding: Determinants of success and failure. Available at SSRN 2088298. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net)*

13. *Shneor, R. & Vik, A. A. (2020). Crowdfunding success: A systematic literature review 2010-2017. Baltic Journal of Management, 15(2), 149–182.*

14. *Momtazmanesh, S., Ochs, H.D., Uddin, L.Q., Perc, M., Routes, J.M., Vieira, D.N., Al-Herz, W., Baris, S., Prando, C., Rosivall, L.,et al. (2020). All together to Fight COVID-19. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 2020, 102, 1181–1183. Retrieved from: (pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)*

15. *Rhodes, N. &Ewoldsen, D. R. (2013). Outcomes of persuasion. The SAGE handbook of persuasion, pp. 53-66. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net).*

16. *Reimink M (2014) Crowdfunding in Dutch small and medium enterprises: an empirical analysis of factors influencing the intention to invest in a crowdfunding initiative. Retrieved from: (essay.utwente.nl).*

17. *Otero, P. (2015). Crowdfunding. A new option for funding health projects. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net).*

18. *Kenworthy, A.J. (2019). Crowdfunding and global health disparities: an exploratory conceptual and empirical analysis. Retrieved from: (pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)*

19. *Yang, K. (2020). The Shortfalls of Health Care Crowdfunding in Addressing the Needs of the Underserved. Retrieved from:(repository.upenn.edu.)*

20. *Borst, I., Ferguson, J., & Moser, C. (2017). From friendfunding to crowdfunding: relevance of relationships, social media, and platform activities to crowdfunding performance. New media & society SagePub, 1-19. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net).*

21. *Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., Highberger,*

22. *Shneor, R. & Vik, A.A. (2017). Crowdfunding Success: A Systematic Literature Review 2010-2017. Retrieved from:(www.researchgate.net).*

23. *Rhodes, N. &Ewoldsen, D/ (2012). Outcomes of Persuasion: Behavioral, cognitive, and social. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net).*

24. *Zuradzki, T. (2015). The Preference Toward Identified Victims and Rescue Duties. Retrieved from: (philarchive.org).*

25. *Nikolajeva, M. (2014). The memory of the Present: Empathy and Identity in Young Adult Fiction. Retrieved from: (journals.lib.unb.ca)*

26. *Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. Retrieved from: (www.researchgate.net).*

27. *Igra, M. (2021). Crowdfunding as a response to COVID-19: Increasing inequities at a time of crisis. Retrieved from:(www.sciencedirect.com).*

TABLES

Table 1. **Socio-Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Socio-Demographic		Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Female	59	60.2
	Male	39	39.8
Age	18 years old	2	2
	19 years old	13	13.3
	20 years old	19	19.4
	21 years old	40	40.8
	22 years old	19	19.4
	23 years old	3	3.1
	24 years old	1	1
	25 years old	1	1
Filipino Citizenship	Yes	98	100
	No	0	0
Course	BAFil	1	1
	BCAed	1	1
	BEED	1	1
	BSAc	2	2
	BSABE	12	12.2
	BSA	5	5.1
	BSBio	4	4.1
	BSBA	7	7.1
	BSChem	1	1

	BSCE	3	3.1
	BSDC	13	13.3
	BSES	1	1
	BSF	1	1
	BSHM	1	1
	BALit	1	1
	BSMath	2	2
	BSMet	2	2
	BSPsych	4	4.1
	BSTM	6	6.1
	BSEd	9	9.2
	DVM	1	1
	No answer	20	20.4
Year	First-year	4	2.1
	Second-year	11	11.2
	Third-year	24	24.5
	Fourth-year	35	35.7
	Fifth-year	1	1
	No answer	28	28.6
Monthly Family Income	Lower than Php 8,000.00	35	35.7
	Php 8,001.00 – Php 20,000.00	43	43.9
	Php 20,001.00 - Php 50,000.00	18	18.4
	Higher than Php 50,000.00	2	2
Job/Source of Income	Yes	22	22.4
	No	76	77.6

Table 2.Facebook Usage

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
In Years		
1 – 3 years	1	1
4 – 6 years	13	13.3
7 – 9 years	45	45.9
10 – 12 years	36	36.7
13 – 15 years	3	3.1

Days In a Week		
Once or twice a week	2	2

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
Never	1	1
1-2 times	21	21.4
3-4 times	39	39.8
5-6 times	19	19.4
3-4 times a week	10	10.2
5-6 times a week	7	7.1
Everyday	79	80.6
Hours In a Day		
0 – 2 hours	20	20.4
3 – 5 hours	24	24.5
6 – 8 hours	11	11.2
9 – 11 hours	7	7.1
12 – 14 hours	2	2
15 – 17 hours	0	0
18 – 20 hours	1	1
No answer	33	33.7

Table 3. Frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns on Facebook during this period of the COVID-19 pandemic

Table 4. Past donation behavior

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
Yes	38	38.8
No	60	61.2

Table 5. Point of View

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.1: ***If the story is written in the first-person perspective***		
Strongly Disagree	5	5.1
Disagree	3	3.1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	33	33.7
Agree	42	42.9

Strongly Agree	15	15.3
S.2: ***If the story is written in the third-person perspective***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	10	10.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	56	57.1
Agree	23	23.5
Strongly Agree	6	6.1

Table 6. Identifiable Victim Effects

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.3: ***If the story does not contain any personal information about the beneficiary***		
Strongly Disagree	16	16.3
Disagree	43	43.9
Neither Agree nor Disagree	30	30.6
Agree	8	8.2
Strongly Agree	1	1
S.4: ***If the beneficiary is unidentifiable and the story contains implicit personal information and situation***		
Strongly Disagree	16	16.3
Disagree	38	38.8
Neither Agree nor Disagree	30	30.6
Agree	11	11.2
Strongly Agree	3	3.1
S.5: ***If the beneficiary is unidentifiable but the story contains explicit detailed information***		
Strongly Disagree	9	9.2
Disagree	23	23.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree	50	51
Agree	15	15.3
Strongly Agree	1	1
S.6: ***If the beneficiary is identifiable and the story contains implicit personal information and situation***		
Strongly Disagree	6	6.1
Disagree	15	15.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	33	33.7
Agree	31	31.6
Strongly Agree	13	13.3
S.7: ***If the beneficiary is identifiable and the story contains explicit personal***		

information, such as name, age, family, job, and characteristics, as well as the situation in detail		
Strongly Disagree	4	4.1
Disagree	0	0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	21	21.4
Agree	44	44.9
Strongly Agree	29	29.6

Table 7. Goal Framing

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.8: ***If the story utilizes negative framing (loss).***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	15	15.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	53	54.1
Agree	21	21.4
Strongly Agree	6	6.1
S.9: ***If the story utilizes positive framing (gain)***		
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	2	2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	26	26.5
Agree	48	49
Strongly Agree	20	20.4
S.10: ***If the story does not utilize either negative or positive framing***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	15	15.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	56	57.1
Agree	20	20.4
Strongly Agree	4	4.1

Table 8. Goal Attainment

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.11: ***If the story does not explain the likelihood of goal attainment***		
Strongly Disagree	4	4.1
Disagree	29	29.6
Neither Agree nor Disagree	41	41.8

Agree	24	24.5
Strongly Agree	0	0
S.12: ***If the story does not include goal attainment***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	34	34.7
Neither Agree nor Disagree	46	46.9
Agree	15	15.3
Strongly Agree	0	0
S.13: ***If the story contains the implicit goal of attainment***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	8	8.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	33	33.7
Agree	46	46.9
Strongly Agree	8	8.2
S.14: ***If the story contains the explicit goal of attainment with a specified amount of money***		
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	10	10.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	41	41.8
Agree	37	37.8
Strongly Agree	8	8.2
S.15: ***If the story contains explicit goal attainment with a detailed breakdown of specific parts and how much money each part needs***		
Strongly Disagree	4	4.1
Disagree	6	6.1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	33	33.7
Agree	36	36.7
Strongly Agree	19	19.4

Table 9. The interactivity of the Campaigner

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.16: ***If the campaigner updates the story***		
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	1	1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15	15.3
Agree	46	46.9
Strongly Agree	34	34.8
S.17: ***If the campaigner updates the visuals***		
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	1	1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24	24.5

Agree	43	43.9
Strongly Agree	28	28.6
S.18: ***If the campaigner updates both the story and the visuals***		
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	1	1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16	16.3
Agree	41	41.8
Strongly Agree	38	38.8

Table 10. Urgency of Situation

S.19: ***If the story explains the urgency of the situation***		
Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	2	2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28	28.6
Agree	47	48
Strongly Agree	19	19.4

Table 11. Call to Action

S.20: ***If the story includes a call to action***		
Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
Strongly Disagree	2	2
Disagree	1	1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	19	19.4
Agree	54	55.1
Strongly Agree	22	22.4

Table 12. Visual Strategies

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.21: ***If the image depicts the beneficiary (Vivid Beneficiary)***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	0	0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28	28.6

Agree	47	48
Strongly Agree	20	20.4
S.22: ***If the image depicts a vivid situation in which the beneficiary is struggling (Vivid Situation)***		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	1	1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28	28.6
Agree	49	50
Strongly Agree	17	17.3

Table 13.COVID-19 Pandemic

Levels	Frequency (n=98)	Percentage (%)
S.23: ***More likely to donate to COVID-19-focused medical crowdfunding campaigns than other types posted on Facebook.***		
Strongly Disagree	5	5.1
Disagree	22	22.4
Neither Agree nor Disagree	45	45.9
Agree	19	19.4
Strongly Agree	7	7.1
S.24: ***More likely to donate to any medical crowdfunding campaign posted on Facebook due to the hard times brought by the current COVID-19 pandemic***		
Strongly Disagree	4	4.1
Disagree	6	6.1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	42	42.9
Agree	41	41.8
Strongly Agree	5	5.1

Table 14. Correlation between socio-demographic,frequency of years spent on Facebook,and story and visual strategies of the respondents

	Sex	Age	Monthly Family Income	Job/Source of Income	Frequency of Years Spent on Facebook
Point of View					

S1	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.183	-0.002	-0.083	-0.035
	p-value	-0.076	0.072	0.981	0.416	0.735
S2	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.211*	0.024	-0.038	0.109
	p-value	-0.076	0.037	0.811	0.711	0.284
Identifiable Victim Effects						
S3	Pearson's r	-0.076	0.033	-0.129	-0.095	-0.051
	p-value	-0.076	0.748	0.207	0.354	0.617
S4	Pearson's r	-0.076	0.075	-0.067	-0.151	-0.112
	p-value	-0.076	0.464	0.515	0.139	0.272
S5	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.145	0.012	-0.046	-0.017
	p-value	-0.076	0.154	0.903	0.653	0.869
S6	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.342*	-0.147	0.006	-0.064
	p-value	-0.076	< .001	0.149	0.953	0.53
S7	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.307*	0.147	-0.003	0.011
	p-value	-0.076	0.002	0.149	0.979	0.915
Goal Framing						
S8	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.197	0.117	-0.049	-0.143
	p-value	-0.076	0.052	0.25	0.633	0.159
S9	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.264*	0.045	-0.041	-0.096
	p-value	-0.076	0.009	0.661	0.689	0.349
S10	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.071	-0.05	-0.109	-0.065
	p-value	-0.076	0.489	0.622	0.284	0.525
Goal Attainment						
S11	Pearson's r	-0.076*	-0.005	-0.011	0.057	-0.025
	p-value	-0.076	0.958	0.911	0.58	0.803
S12	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.146	-0.129	-0.144	-0.19

	p-value	-0.076	0.151	0.207	0.158	0.061
S13	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.172	-0.055	-0.05	-0.071
	p-value	-0.076	0.089	0.593	0.626	0.488
S14	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.134	0.095	0.064	0.015
	p-value	-0.076	0.189	0.353	0.529	0.883
S15	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.003	0.026	0.062	0.115
	p-value	-0.076	0.976	0.801	0.543	0.259
The interactivity of the Campaigner						
S16	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.18	-0.117	-0.014	0.028
	p-value	-0.076	0.076	0.25	0.894	0.784
S17	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.262*	-0.129	-0.003	0.018
	p-value	-0.076	0.009	0.206	0.978	0.864
S18	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.228*	-0.063	-0.004	0.032
	p-value	-0.076	0.024	0.541	0.969	0.758
Urgency of Situation						
S19	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.047	0.163	0.066	0.038
	p-value	-0.076	0.644	0.108	0.519	0.709
Call to Action						
S20	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.233*	-0.011	0.004	0.036
	p-value	-0.076	0.021	0.915	0.971	0.722
Visual Strategies						
S21	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.211*	0.073	-0.062	-0.03
	p-value	-0.076	0.037	0.477	0.542	0.766
S22	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.202*	0.078	-0.059	-0.091
	p-value	-0.076	0.046	0.443	0.563	0.372

COVID-19 Pandemic						
S23	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.312*	0.155	-0.009	0.067
	p-value	-0.076	0.002	0.128	0.931	0.515
S24	Pearson's r	-0.076	-0.079	0.043	0.046	0.118
	p-value	-0.076	0.442	0.673	0.656	0.248

Table 15. Correlation between, the frequency of using Facebook in a week, frequency of hours spent on Facebook in a day, frequency of seeing medical crowdfunding campaigns posted on Facebook during this COVID-19 pandemic, past donation behavior, the total amount of past donations and stories, and visual strategies of the respondents

		Frequency of Using Facebook In a Week	Frequency of Hours Spent on Facebook In a Day	Frequency of Seeing Medical Crowdfunding Campaigns Posted on Facebook During this COVID-19 Pandemic	Past Donation Behavior	Total Amount of Past Donation
Point of View						
S1	Pearson's r	0.027	-0.09	0.049	0.09	0.135
	p-value	0.793	0.38	0.635	0.376	0.439
S2	Pearson's r	0.209*	0.07	-0.058	0.093	0.367*
	p-value	0.039	0.495	0.57	0.361	0.03
Identifiable Victim Effects						
S3	Pearson's r	0.049	-0.16	0.078	-0.043	0.345*
	p-value	0.634	0.117	0.445	0.676	0.042
S4	Pearson's r	-0.026	-0.013	-0.103	-0.031	0.107
	p-value	0.802	0.896	0.311	0.765	0.541

S5	Pearson's r	0.063	-0.098	-0.266*	0.007	0.08
	p-value	0.539	0.342	0.008	0.942	0.65
S6	Pearson's r	-0.14	0.038	-0.023	0.007	0.213
	p-value	0.17	0.708	0.823	0.944	0.22
S7	Pearson's r	-0.167	-0.248*	0.052	0.124	0.269
	p-value	0.101	0.015	0.614	0.223	0.118
Goal Framing						
S8	Pearson's r	0.033	-0.081	0.092	0.083	-0.139
	p-value	0.746	0.429	0.368	0.419	0.426
S9	Pearson's r	-0.104	-0.136	0.019	0.08	0.062
	p-value	0.306	0.184	0.851	0.435	0.722
S10	Pearson's r	0.075	0.055	-0.173	-0.019	0.012
	p-value	0.462	0.593	0.088	0.855	0.944
Goal Attainment						
S11	Pearson's r	0.11	0.006	-0.168	0.102	0.019
	p-value	0.281	0.955	0.097	0.317	0.916
S12	Pearson's r	0.103	-0.05	-0.16	0.132	0.059
	p-value	0.313	0.629	0.116	0.196	0.736
S13	Pearson's r	0.066	-0.095	0.027	0.009	0.158
	p-value	0.52	0.355	0.792	0.927	0.366
S14	Pearson's r	-0.111	-0.084	0.076	0.095	0.064
	p-value	0.278	0.415	0.456	0.352	0.715
S15	Pearson's r	0.127	-0.051	0.26*	0.184	0.03
	p-value	0.212	0.622	0.01	0.07	0.864

The interactivity of the Campaigner						
S16	Pearson's r	-0.135	-0.204*	0.151	0.093	0.032
	p-value	0.184	0.046	0.137	0.364	0.854
S17	Pearson's r	-0.148	-0.15	0.033	0.013	-0.004
	p-value	0.145	0.143	0.747	0.897	0.98
S18	Pearson's r	-0.115	-0.176	0.149	0.062	0.042
	p-value	0.258	0.084	0.144	0.544	0.809
Urgency of Situation						
S19	Pearson's r	-0.007	-0.192	0.158	0.134	-0.041
	p-value	0.949	0.059	0.121	0.19	0.815
Call to Action						
S20	Pearson's r	-0.012	-0.124	0.131	0.103	-0.041
	p-value	0.909	0.227	0.2	0.312	0.813
Visual Strategies						
S21	Pearson's r	-0.092	-0.146	0.115	0.063	0.072
	p-value	0.368	0.154	0.259	0.536	0.683
S22	Pearson's r	-0.039	-0.308*	0.023	0.111	-0.043
	p-value	0.704	0.002	0.82	0.275	0.808
COVID-19 Pandemic						
S23	Pearson's r	-0.091	-0.189	0.009	0.241*	0.348*
	p-value	0.374	0.064	0.933	0.017	0.041
S24	Pearson's r	0.005	-0.019	-0.087	0.035	-0.349*
	p-value	0.962	0.853	0.397	0.729	0.04

zuniga.mark@clsu2.edu.ph[1], canvallejo@clsu.edu.ph[2], marife.detorres@clsu2.edu.ph[3], dsvargas@clsu.edu.ph[4]