

Running head: SOCIAL MEDIA USE IN NONPROFIT PUBLIC RELATIONS

Profiting Public Relations: A Look at Social Media Use in Nonprofit Organizations

Lindley Curtis
Carrie Edwards
Elizabeth Elmore
Kristen Fraser
Sheryl Gudelsky
Jenny Holmquist
Kristin Thornton

University of Georgia

We assert that this report was produced within the guidelines and spirit of the UGA academic honesty code. This is original research and was carried out with the permission of the IRB (Project # 2008-10610-0) in adherence to their ethical standards for human subject research. We affirm that the materials, ideas, and research in this report was properly cited and not plagiarized or in any other way dishonest.

NOTE: Authors listed in alphabetical order.

Abstract

This study surveyed public relations practitioners (N=409) from four reputable directories of nonprofit organizations in the United States. Using the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), the differences in the adoption of social media and the credibility of social media tools were assessed based on gender. The survey examined whether the adoption of social media depends on the presence of a public relations department within the organization. Finally, a relationship between the UTAUT factors and credibility were explored. Findings indicated that women consider social media to be beneficial and interesting whereas men exhibit more confidence in actively utilizing social media tools within their organization. Additionally, organizations with specified public relations departments were more likely to adopt social media practices. Positive correlations between the UTAUT factors and credibility indicated that those who find social media credible were more likely to use it within their workplace.

Introduction

Social media offers numerous opportunities for public relations practitioners to interact with the public while adopting new forms of technology and integrating them into their everyday lives. These advances in technology have experienced widespread use among public relations practitioners (Sallot, Porter, & Acosta-Alzuru, 2004). As more forms of social media emerge, it is beneficial for public relations practitioners to understand how to use these tools as they relate to their jobs. In particular, practitioners working for nonprofit organizations can benefit from adopting social media due to their often-limited monetary resources (Dyer, Buell, Harrison, & Weber, 2002).

Social media includes participatory online media where news, photos, videos, and podcasts are made public via social media Web sites through submission by the user. These technologies are unique in that they transform people from content readers into content publishers (Kaye, 2005). Social media connects information in a collaborative manner and can take many different forms, including blogs, e-mail, instant messaging, Intranets, photosharing, podcasts, social networks, video sharing, and wikis (Lister, Dovey, & Giddings, 2003).

Due to the lack of existing research on the use of social media by nonprofit organizations, the researchers chose to investigate this area to further existing knowledge. The purpose of this study was to find out how nonprofit public relations practitioners are adopting social media tools and if they view them as credible. Through an online survey of nonprofit public relations practitioners, we employed the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) to examine the practitioners' use of social media and investigated their familiarity with social media, their level of participation in communication technologies, their behaviors concerning new media communication outlets, and their tendencies to adopt these tools.

Literature Review

While social media research has recently flourished in the public relations field (Sallot et al., 2004; Porter, Trammell, Chung, & Kim, 2007), very little research has studied the impact of social media on public relations practitioners in nonprofit organizations.

To understand usage behavior and intentions of nonprofit public relations practitioners regarding social media, this study employed the UTAUT theory (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003). The UTAUT evolved from the compilation of eight previous models: theory of reasoned action, technology acceptance model, motivational model, theory of planned behavior, diffusion of innovation theory, model of PC utilization, a combined theory of planned behavior/technology acceptance model, and social cognitive theory (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

The UTAUT has recently been used to study the acceptance of technology in various industries including medicine (Schaper, L. K. & Pervan, G. P., 2007) economics (Wymer & Regan, 2005), and telephone communication (Wu, Tao, & YangJ, 2007). With this study, we expanded the use of the UTAUT into the public relations field.

Previously, public relations practitioners have been labeled as laggards (Porter, Sallot, Cameron, & Shamp, 2001), the last of five categories regarding technology adoption (Rogers, 1995). Rogers' (1995) five categories of technology adoption are innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. Based on the diffusion of innovation theory, one's rate of adoption is most influenced by relative advantage (perceived need of technology), compatibility of technology, and complexity of technology (Bradford & Florin, 2003; Crum, Premkumar, & Ramamurthy, 1996).

To understand the delayed adoption of technology by public relations practitioners, researchers investigated the value they place on the World Wide Web as a communication tool.

According to Hill and White (2000), practitioners believed Web sites improve an organization's image, increase its sense of professionalism, and increase its level of competitiveness.

It is important to note that if an organization does not value social media as credible, then it will not adopt social media tools. According to Greer (2003), the amount of time online was the strongest predictor of whether an organization perceived emerging technology as credible. In a study comparing the credibility of traditional media and social media, Johnson and Kaye (2004) found that weblog users deemed blogs as more credible than traditional media.

A key benefit of adopting social media is its power to create *interactive* communication between an organization and its publics. Previous research affirms that social media, specifically blogs, has been effective in increasing the interactive capabilities of political campaign Web sites (Trammell, Williams, Postelnicu, & Landreville, 2006). Conversely, Kang and Norton (2004) found that although nonprofit public relations practitioners used the Web for organizational goals, such as connecting a variety of publics, the organizations were not successful in creating an environment for interactive communication with publics.

Interactive communication may be difficult to achieve because the role of the public relations practitioner is not well developed in many nonprofit organizations (Dyer et al., 2002). Dyer et al. (2002) also found that only one-third of the practitioners they interviewed described their position as dedicated solely to public relations. In most nonprofit organizations, all employees shared responsibility for the public relations of the organization due to limited money, time, and person-power for a communications department.

With this research, we hoped to gain a greater understanding of the acceptance, adoption, and credibility of social media as a public relations strategy, specifically in the nonprofit sector, through the application of UTAUT.

Methods

The purpose of this study was to explore the use of social media by public relations practitioners working for nonprofit organizations. This study was approved by the University of Georgia IRB (Project # 2008-10610-0, see Appendix A for IRB application). An online survey was employed to answer the research questions (see Appendix B). This survey was created in an attempt to gather data including basic demographic information, adoption and use of social media tools by the respondent and their organization, and perceived credibility of social media.

A survey was chosen over other research methods due to its ability to gather descriptive information about large populations easily (Lawrence, Friedman, Kreps, & Botan, 1990). The multi-page online survey proved to be the best method to deploy this survey, as it could be easily distributed in a timely manner. It required little effort by the respondents compared to a paper and pencil survey (Lawrence et al., 1990).

The drawbacks of using an online survey were similar to those of many other survey techniques. The research of Porter and Whitcomb (2003) indicated that the increasing amount of spammers and marketers online has caused a decrease in the response rate of online surveys. The use of technology also posed problems in the deployment of a survey, many e-mails were sent back due to delivery failure or duplicate e-mail addresses in the list. We attempted to compensate for this problem by finding an extensive list of contacts compiled from four national directories of nonprofit organizations.

The lack of a selector statement in our e-mail was another limitation of our survey. Porter and Whitcomb (2003) asserted that research response rates were higher when a statement was included indicating that e-mail recipients had been chosen from a select group to participate in the research.

Instrument

In the survey we employed the UTAUT to explain adoption and organizational use of social media. Behavioral intention and usage behavior were the main dependant factors of the theory (Venkatesh et. al., 2003). We wrote our survey using a five-point Likert scale and the nine UTAUT factors. These factors were directly determined by four key categories, including performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, and voluntariness of use. We also asked questions regarding attitudes toward using technology, as well as self-efficacy and anxiety associated with using social media

The survey also employed a credibility scale to determine how credible respondents feel toward social media. Respondents answered questions on a five-point Likert scale to describe degree of fairness, accuracy, and depth of social media. In addition to exploring the current use of social media, we were interested in whether public relations professionals find such tools reliable.

Johnson and Kaye (2004b) discussed credibility in their online survey, which investigated the credibility of blogs in comparison to traditional social media tools. Johnson and Kaye (2004b) defined media credibility as "worthiness of being believed," (p. 627). The study found that respondents consider weblogs more credible than other media sources.

Sample

To select survey participants, four lists of nonprofit organizations were identified. The first list was the 200 largest charities in the United States according to Forbes.com (http://www.forbes.com/lists/2005/14/Revenue_1.html). The second and third lists were the National Charity Seal Program (<http://www.give.org/seal/participants.asp>) and the Accredited Charity Directory (<http://us.bbb.org/WWWRoot/SitePage.aspx?site=113&id=4fce305d-7652->

45e3-8273-a3ee326a0e9d) through the Better Business Bureau. The fourth list was from Charity Navigator (<http://us.bbb.org/WWWRoot/SitePage.aspx?site=113&id=4fce305d-7652-45e3-8273-a3ee326a0e9d>), an independent charity evaluator online. (For a complete list of e-mail contacts, see Appendix C). These lists were used to search for Web sites for each organization. The Web sites were then browsed extensively to find all employees related to public relations. These contacts were usually found through a newsroom or pressroom, by scanning employee contact lists and directories, or reading press releases.

Although our target demographic included public relations practitioners working in nonprofit organizations in the United States, we sent the survey invitation to anyone in the identified organizations that were potentially responsible for public relations tasks. Depending on the organization, the public relations contact was often referred to by a different title. For example, we acknowledged that many organizations use the title “director of marketing” interchangeably with “director of public relations” or “director of communications.” Therefore, we contacted a wide variety of nonprofit practitioners. Some organizations did not list personal e-mail addresses for their contacts, so the organization’s general information e-mail address was used. An e-mail invitation was sent with the following:

“I am an undergraduate PR student at UGA and am doing a survey on nonprofits for a class project. Please help!

It takes about 12 minutes to complete this confidential, online survey. The survey asks basic questions about you and your media use for work. Only aggregate responses will be used. Nothing that identifies you with any of your responses will be linked to you.

You can take the survey at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx> until tomorrow at 5 p.m.”

This invitation was worded according to research by Porter and Whitcomb (2003) who found increases in response rates were likely when a deadline was included in the e-mail. The survey

remained open for four days from March 24, 2008 to March 27, 2008, and the e-mail stated that the practitioner would need to take the survey by 5 p.m. the following day.

The survey was sent to 2,164 people, but 126 were undeliverable. A reminder e-mail / second wave was sent on the third day the survey was open. We received responses from 527 practitioners, leading to a 25.8% response rate of practitioners over the age of 18.

The study itself consisted of four major research questions for which the survey was designed to answer. They were as follows:

RQ1a: Are there differences in the adoption of social media based on gender?

RQ1b: Are there differences in the perception of the credibility of social media based on gender?

RQ2: Does adoption of social media vary based on whether the organization has a public relations department?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the UTAUT factors and credibility?

Results

Demographics

For the survey, 20.0% responded ($N = 409$). Of the respondents, 404 indicated that they used some form of social media compared to only 5 who indicated that they did not use any of the 18 forms of social media that were specified in the survey. The average number of social media tools used by one practitioner was 4.99 ($SD = 2.82$). Of the 18 types of social media, the following frequencies were most reported: 97.8% ($n = 400$) used e-mail, 54.5% ($n = 223$) used social networks, 51.1% ($n = 209$) used video sharing, and 48.4% ($n = 198$) used blogs (see Table 1).

Of the participants who self-reported demographic information, 71.00% ($n = 245$) were female and 29.9% ($n = 100$) were male. The average age of participants in our study who indicated their age was 39.75 years old ($SD = 11.59$). When asked their highest level of education, 74.6% ($n = 305$) of respondents had a graduate degree or higher, 44.3% ($n = 181$) had a bachelor's degree, 98% ($n = 401$) had an associate's degree, and 98.5% ($n = 403$) had a high school degree. Refer to Tables 1 and 2 for more comprehensive demographic results.

-Table 1 About Here-

-Table 2 About Here-

Data Analysis

Consistent with previous uses of UTAUT, we conducted a factor analysis of the 34-item UTAUT scale. Traditionally, UTAUT yields nine factors. A principle axis components factor analysis (varimax rotation) resulted in eight factors in our study. We named our eight factors based on the UTAUT factor most present. The 8-factor solution explained 68.7% of the variance. Table 3 outlines the items and loadings within each factor.

The following is a description of each factor as it loaded in our factor analysis. The variables in our factors are then compared with the original variables outlined by Venkatesh et al. (2003). Each Cronbach's alpha correlation coefficient is reported and compared to the Internal Consistency Reliability (ICR) of Venkatesh et al.'s findings in Table 14a (2003).

Factor 1: Performance Expectancy and Attitude Toward Using Technology

Cronbach's alpha for the index was high ($\alpha = .84$), with no single item out of seven raising the alpha significantly if deleted. The following variables were included in Factor 1: PE3, PE2, A2, A3, A1, PE1, and PE4. Venkatesh et al.'s factors included the same variables as ours, with the exception of A4 being omitted here. In Venkatesh et al.'s study, performance

expectancy and attitude toward using technology factored separately. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .92 for performance expectancy and ICR = .84 for attitude toward using technology (2003).

Factor 2: Social Influence

Cronbach's alpha for the index was the second highest of the indices used ($\alpha = .89$), with no single item out of seven raising the alpha if deleted. The following variables were included in Factor 2: SI1, SI2, SI3, SI4, A4, V3, and ANX1. In the original UTAUT factors, A4, V3, and ANX1 were not included in this factor; therefore, in this study, they are considered outliers compared to the original findings. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .88 for social influence (2003).

Factor 3: Effort Expectancy

Cronbach's alpha for the index was high ($\alpha = .87$), with no single item out of four raising the alpha significantly if deleted. The following variables were included in Factor 3: EE3, EE2, EE4, and EE1. The variables included in this factor align with the original study. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .91 for effort expectancy (2003).

Factor 4: Behavioral Intentions

Cronbach's alpha for the index was highest out of the indices used ($\alpha = .96$), with no single item out of three raising the alpha if deleted. The following variables were included in Factor 4: BI1, BI2, and BI3. The variables included in this factor align with the original study. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .92 for behavioral intentions (2003).

Factor 5: Facilitating Conditions

Cronbach's alpha for the index was moderate ($\alpha = .72$), with no single item out of four raising the alpha significantly if deleted. The following variables were included in Factor 5: FC1,

FC2, FC4, and FC3. The variables included in this factor align with the original study.

Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .87 for facilitating conditions (2003).

Factor 6: Voluntariness of Use

Cronbach's alpha for the index was high ($\alpha = .82$), with no single item out of two raising the alpha if deleted. Venkatesh et al's study included voluntariness of use as an independent variable (2003). V3 should have factored with other variables of its kind; however, it materialized in Factor 2 instead. The following variables were included in Factor 6: V2 and V1.

Factor 7: Anxiety

Cronbach's alpha for the index was moderate ($\alpha = .70$), with no single item out of three raising the alpha significantly if deleted. Venkatesh et al's factors included the same variables as ours, with the exception of ANX1 being omitted here. The following variables were included in Factor 7: ANX3, ANX4, and ANX2. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .83 for anxiety (2003).

Factor 8: Self-Efficacy

Cronbach's alpha for the index was low ($\alpha = .65$), with no single item out of four raising the alpha if deleted. The variables included in this factor align with the original study. The following variables were included in Factor 8: SE4, SE2, SE3, and SE1. Venkatesh et al. reported ICR = .89 for self-efficacy (2003).

Credibility

Cronbach's alpha for the index was moderate ($\alpha = .75$), with no single item out of three significantly raising the alpha if deleted. The variables included were cr_acc, cr_fair, and cr_ind. They align with Johnson and Kaye's (2004b) original study, which reported a moderate Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .79$) in their weblog credibility index.

-Table 3 About Here-

RQ1a

RQ1a asked whether there were differences in adoption of social media based on gender. In order to test this, we performed a series of independent sample t-tests with each UTAUT factor comparing males and females. Three factors yielded statistically significant differences based on gender. In factor one, performance expectancy and attitudes, females ($\underline{M} = .11$, $SD = .94$) scored higher than males ($\underline{M} = -.24$, $SD = .82$), $t = .74$, $p \leq .01$. In contrast, in the next two factors the reverse was true regarding the adoption of social media. In factor two, social influence, females ($\underline{M} = -.07$, $SD = .96$) scored lower than males ($\underline{M} = .18$, $SD = .71$), $t = 8.67$, $p \leq .01$. In factor five, facilitating conditions, females ($\underline{M} = -.06$, $SD = .90$) scored lower than males ($\underline{M} = .18$, $SD = .74$) $t = 4.25$, $p \leq .05$.

RQ1b

RQ1b asked whether there were differences in adoption of social media based on gender and credibility. In order to test this, we performed an independent sample t-test with the 3-item credibility index comparing males and females. There was not a statistically significant difference.

RQ2

RQ2 asked whether there were differences in adoption of social media based on whether the organization has a public relations department. In order to test this, we performed a series of independent sample t-tests with each UTAUT factor comparing whether the organization has a public relations department. One factor yielded statistically significant differences. In factor five, facilitating conditions, organizations with public relations departments ($\underline{M} = .09$, $SD=.83$) were more likely to adopt social media practices than those without public relations departments ($\underline{M} = -.17$, $SD=.92$), $t = 3.64$, $p \leq .01$.

RQ3

RQ3 asked if there were relationships between the UTAUT factors and credibility. Correlations revealed several statistically significant relationships. Credibility and factor 1 had a moderate relationship, while credibility and factors 5, 6, and 8 had positive weak relationships. Credibility correlated with factor 1, performance expectancy and attitudes, ($r = .43, p \leq .001$); factor 5, facilitating conditions, ($r = .15, p \leq .01$); factor 6, voluntariness, ($r = .13, p \leq .01$); and, factor 8, self-efficacy, ($r = .15, p \leq .01$).

Discussion

Although there has been extensive research involving UTAUT and in the field of public relations, the two have never before been combined. Therefore, our research bridged the gap between the two. Not only have we applied UTAUT to an entirely new discipline, we have focused on how nonprofit practitioners adopt a specific type of technology—social media. This new, unique application of UTAUT, combined with credibility theory, revealed several interesting findings about how nonprofit practitioners adopt and perceive social media.

Overall, 98.7% of respondents used at least one form of social media. This is logical since nonprofit organizations usually have small budgets and, therefore, need as much free publicity as possible. Since social media is available to anyone and is free, it would behoove employees in nonprofit organizations to use at least one of these social media technologies. In addition, there were numerous organizations dedicated to fine arts who would likely benefit from social media technologies such as podcasts, video sharing, and photosharing to convey visual and audible examples of their organization's work. This high percentage also explains the geographic dispersion of nonprofit organizations' regional or state offices. In order to

communicate with employees elsewhere, e-mail, the most commonly cited social media technology on the survey, would likely be used.

RQ1a

In regard to our first research question, asking about differences in adoption of social media based on gender, we found that males scored higher on social influence and facilitating conditions while females scored higher on performance expectancy and attitudes. This could be explained by our findings that women consider using social media beneficial to their organization by improving productivity and efficiency as well as being interesting, fun, and enjoyable. On the other hand, men were more optimistic in thinking their organization had the knowledge and structure (facilitating conditions) to put social media to use. This could be due to a gender difference in how 'use' is defined. If men considered organizational goals to be a 'use' of social media, then the organizations may be seen as having a more facilitating structure.

Previous research regarding gender and technology adoption found that men and women view technology differently (Ryan, 2003). Ryan's (2003) research indicated that women adopt technology as rapidly as men and use computers more frequently than men to complete tasks. However, Porter et al. (2001) found that women in public relations use online databases less often than men.

RQ1b

When we investigated differences in the perception of credibility of social media based on gender, we found that there was no statistically significant difference. This was not exceptionally surprising, as there is conflicting research connecting demographics with perceptions of credibility. Johnson and Kaye (2004a) found that demographics were the best predictor of Web credibility, but that the influence of demographics on the perceived credibility

of the Internet was decreasing as web users changed from young, white, wealthy males to a more mainstream demographic. This research was also confirmed by Sallot et al. (2004) whose qualitative research study determined that Web use by males and females is now equal. Johnson and Kaye (2004a) noted that other studies found that young females of lower education found Web content more credible. Metzger, Flanagin, Eyal, Lemus, and McCann (2004) conducted research that concluded that men rated Web credibility higher than women. Due to the contradictory research relating Internet credibility to demographics, it would be interesting to complete further research in this area.

RQ2

After investigating if there was a difference in adoption of social media based on whether the organization had a public relations department, we found that organizations with dedicated public relations departments were more likely to adopt social media technologies than those without. We attribute this to the fact that organizations with specified public relations departments often have larger budgets that allow them to experiment with a variety of methods of public outreach. In addition, organizations are able to employ more knowledgeable practitioners who may be aware of social media options and how they can be applied to accomplish their objectives. Dyer et al. (2002) found that although most nonprofit organizations have employees who are responsible for handling the company's public relations tasks, only one-third were solely devoted to public relations. From this, it can be concluded that two-thirds of employees in nonprofit organizations are expected to handle multiple roles in addition to the traditional public relations duties. Employees in these multidimensional roles cannot be expected to implement as specialized public relations efforts or develop as in-depth methods to reach their publics as employees who only deal with public relations.

RQ3

We found several correlations between the UTAUT factors and credibility. There was a weak but significant correlation between credibility and facilitating conditions. If practitioners have access to the technology, resources, assistance, and knowledge to understand the purpose, message, and capabilities of social media techniques, they are more likely to view social media as credible. This rises from the basic human instinct to distrust things that are not understood as well as the fact that if a nonprofit organization cannot afford to purchase the necessary resources to utilize a specific social media, then they may not have the experience with that technology to find them credible.

There was a weak correlation between credibility and voluntariness. If a practitioner views social media as credible, he or she is more likely to voluntarily seek it out for information or to employ the technology. In addition, use of social media technologies that is not voluntary may affect credibility depending on who is forcing a practitioner to utilize that technique.

The third weak correlation we found was between credibility and self-efficacy. Practitioners who have a higher self-efficacy and believe they have a high ability to control the outcome of a task set before them may see social media as more credible because they have the self-awareness to discriminate and understand whether social media technologies are credible sources of information.

Our research yielded one moderate correlation between credibility and performance expectancy and attitudes. The reason for this moderate correlation could be because practitioners are more likely to put a social media technology to use if they believe that publics find them credible. This is supported by the research of Johnson and Kaye (2004b), which found that an organization's priorities are influenced by its perception of social media credibility. This is

logical because if publics find public relations tactics as credible, they are more likely to engage in dialogic communication as well as pay attention to the organization's message. Therefore, the practitioner would expect better performance from those tactics and would strive to utilize them in their campaigns.

Limitations

Similar to all research, there were certain limitations that we were unable to avoid. To begin, we ran into several issues specifically related to the use of a survey for research. There was no way for us to uncover dishonesty or laziness in people's responses since surveys are based on a self-report method of investigation (K.Sweetser, class lecture, February 12, 2008). A second limitation regarding the survey itself was the fact that respondents were not asked whether they use social media. In hindsight, the first question on our survey should have been *do you use social media in your professional capacity?* This would not only reveal the percentage of practitioners who did not use social media in any form, but would also remind them that *personal* use is different than *professional* use at their place of work. This can be related to another limitation – defining the world *use*. For example, when asked whether the respondent uses e-mail, this could be to simply communicate about meetings, etc. and not necessarily for public relations-related tasks. Our research was focused on practitioners' use of social media in public relations at work, not at home or for simple organizational tasks. Therefore, there may have been confusion about what *using* social media constituted.

Our data was limited by the fact that the four directories used to compile our contacts may not have included some recently developed or are extremely small organizations. Also, in trying to be brief in our opening e-mail statement, we used the abbreviation UGA for the

University of Georgia. This proved to be a limitation in the collection of our data, as many recipients of the survey were unsure of what the abbreviation represented.

Future Research

As with all research, the purpose is to create knowledge, but also to inspire others to build on that research to further the area being investigated. It is apparent that there are a number of ways future researchers could expand upon our study. One suggestion would be to investigate which specific social media services (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, etc.) are actually being used by nonprofit organizations as opposed to categories of social media (i.e., social networking). Future research could also delve into the specific ways that nonprofit organizations are reaching their publics specifically using social media and which targets are best reached using different social media tools. Finally, longitudinal research could investigate how adoption of social media technologies by publics and internal employees has changed since the organization first began utilizing social media tools.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that social media tools are becoming beneficial methods of communication for public relations practitioners in the nonprofit sector. Organizations with defined public relations departments are more likely to adopt social media technologies and use them to achieve their organizational goals. In addition, public relations practitioners are more likely to use social media tools if they find them credible. Social media techniques will become more abundant as public relations practitioners become mindful of their effectiveness in regards to reaching target audiences, promoting a specific cause, and further developing communication strategies.

Because UTAUT has not previously been applied to the use of social media in

public relations, this study lays the groundwork for future research in this area. It would be beneficial for practitioners to better understand the adoption of social media in major corporations' internal public relations departments and public relations agencies, which represent clients in the entertainment, sports, political, and tourism industries. As social media expands, it is essential for public relations practitioners to recognize the resourcefulness of these tools and take advantage of every available opportunity to effectively reach their publics.

References

- Bradford, M., & Florin, J. (2003). Examining the role of innovation diffusion factors on the implementation success of enterprise resource planning systems. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 4(3), 205-225.
- Crum, M. R., Premkumar, G., & Ramamurthy, K. (1996). An assessment of motor carrier adoption, use, and satisfaction with EDI. *Transportation Journal*, 35(4), 44-57.
- Dyer, S., Buell, T., Harrison, M., Weber, S. (2002). Managing public relations in nonprofit organizations. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47(4), 13- 17.
- Greer, J. D. (2003). Evaluating the credibility of online information: A test of source and advertising influence. *Mass Communication & Society*, 6, 11-28.
- Hill, L.N. & White, C. (2000). Public relations practitioners' perceptions of the World Wide Web as a communications tool. *Public Relations Review*, 26(1), 31–51.
- Johnson, T.J. & Kaye, B.K. (2002). Webbelievability: A Path Model Examining How Convenience and Reliance Predict Online Credibility. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(3). 619-642.
- Johnson, T.J. & Kaye, B. K. (2004a). For Whom the Web Toils: How Internet Experience Predicts Web Reliance and Credibility. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 12(1). 19-45.
- Johnson, T.J., & Kaye, B. K. (2004b). Wag the blog: How reliance on traditional media and the internet influence credibility perceptions of weblogs among blog users. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(3), 622-642.
- Kang, S. & Norton, H.E. (2004). Nonprofit organizations' use of the World Wide Web: Are they sufficiently fulfilling organizational goals? *Public Relations Review*, 30(3), 279-284.

- Kaye, B. K. (2005). It's a Blog, Blog, Blog, Blog World. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 13(2), 73-95.
- Lawrence, T., Friedman, P.G., Kreps, G.L., Botan, C.H.F. (1990). *Investigating Communication: An Introduction to Research Methods*, 179-202.
- Lister, M., Dovey, J., & Giddings, S. (2003). *New Media: A Critical Introduction*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge.
- Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D. R., McCann, R. (2003). Credibility for the 21st Century: Integrating Perspectives on Source, Message and Media Credibility in the Contemporary Media Environment. In P. J. Kalfleisch (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 27* (pp. 293-335). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Porter, L. V., Sallot, L. M., Cameron, G. T., & Shamp, S. (2001). New technologies and public relations: Exploring practitioners' use of online resources to earn a seat at the management table. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78, 172-190.
- Porter, L.V., Sweetser Trammell, K.D., Chung, D., Kim, E. (2007). Blog power: Examining the effects of practitioner blog use on power in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 33(1), 92-95.
- Porter, S. R. & Whitcomb, M. E. (2003). The Impact of Contact Type on Web Survey Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67(4), 579-588.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations*. 4th ed. New York: Free Press.
- Ryan, M. (2003). Public Relations and the Web: Organizational Problems, Gender, and Institutional Type. *Public Relations Review*, 27(3), 335-349.
- Sallot, L.M., Porter, L.V., Acosta-Alzuru, C. (2004). Practitioners' web use and perceptions of their own roles and power: A qualitative study. *Public Relations Review*, 30(3), 269-278.

- Schaper, L. K. & Pervan, G. P. (2007). ICT and OTs: A model of information and communication technology acceptance and utilisation by occupational therapists. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 76, S212-S221.
- Trammell, K. D., Williams, A. P., Postelnicu, M., & Landreville, K. D. (2006). Evolution of online campaigning: Increasing interactivity in candidate web sites and blogs through text and technical features. *Mass Communication and Society*, 9(1), 21-44.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425-478.
- Wu, Y. L., Tao, Y. H., & Yang, P. C. (2007). Using UTAUT to explore the behavior of 3G mobile communications users. *2007 IEEE International Conference Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*, 199-203.
- Wymer, S. A. & Regan, E. A. (2005). Factors Influencing e-commerce Adoption and User by Small and Medium Business. *Electronic Markets*, 15(4), 438-453.

Table 1. Demographic and Social Media Usage Self-Reported of Respondents in Sample

	N	%
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	100	29.0
Female	245	71.0
<i>Education Level of Practitioners</i>		
High School/GED	403	98.5
Associate's degree	401	98.0
Bachelor's degree	181	44.3
Graduate degree	305	74.6
<i>Type of Nonprofit Organization</i>		
Arts	362	88.5
Education	366	89.5
Entertainment	393	96.1
Environment	384	93.9
Healthcare/Hospitals	355	86.8
Human Services	322	78.7
Political Action/Non-government	353	86.3
Recreation	398	97.3
Religion	390	95.4
Tourism/Hospitality	399	97.6
Other	334	81.7
<i>Types of Social Media Tools Used</i>		
Blogs	198	48.4
E-mail	400	97.8
Events	154	37.7
Instant Messaging	55	13.4
Internet Hosted Video Games	13	3.2
Intranets	162	39.6
News Aggregation	56	13.7
PDA	58	14.2
Photosharing	111	27.1
Podcasts	112	27.4
Presence Applications	10	2.4
Second Life	15	3.7
Social Bookmarking	31	7.6
Social Networks	223	54.5
Text Messaging	51	12.5
Videoconferencing	110	26.9
Video Sharing	209	51.1
Wiki	74	18.1

Note. Category classifications do not add up to 100% for each variable due to missing data/respondent not providing information and some classifications allowed multiple responses within the questions.

Table 2. Demographic Information Self-Reported of Respondents in Sample

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Age	39.75	11.59
Number of PR practitioners in department	5.14*	13.45*
Years in nonprofit sector	9.26	8.30
Years at current job	4.45	5.09
Years as PR practitioner	9.55	8.82

Note. All categories are reported in years except number of PR practitioners in department.

Table 3. Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) Factor Loading

Factors	M	S.D.	Factor Loadings							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<i>Performance Expectancy and Attitude Toward Using Technology (Factor 1, $\alpha = .84$)</i>										
Using social media increases my organization's productivity.	3.49	.87	.74							
Using social media enables my organization to accomplish tasks more quickly.	3.53	.84	.69							
Social media makes work more interesting.	3.76	.87	.69							
Working with social media is fun.	3.76	.81	.62							
Using social media is a good idea.	4.18	.73	.58							
My organization would find social media useful.	4.21	.72	.58							
If my organization uses social media, it will increase my chances of getting a raise.	2.44	.89	.36							
<i>Social Influence (Factor 2, $\alpha = .89$)</i>										
People who influence my unit/department behavior think that we should use social media.	3.64	.95		.77						
People who are important to my unit/department think that we should use social media.	3.65	.91		.73						
The senior management of this business has been helpful in the use of social.	3.14	1.01		.59						
In general, my organization has supported the use of social media.	3.51	.93		.54						
My organization likes working with social media.	3.29	.85		.48						
My superiors expect us to use social media.	2.82	1.08		.48						
My organization feels apprehensive using social media.	3.02	1.08		.44						

<i>Effort Expectancy (Factor 3, $\alpha = .87$)</i>			
My organization would find social media easy to use.	3.15	.99	.76
It would be easy for my organization to become skillful at using social media.	3.13	1.06	.75
Learning to operate social media is easy for my organization.	3.02	.97	.73
My organization's interaction with social media would be clear and understandable.	3.42	.87	.46
<i>Behavioral Intention to Use Social Media (Factor 4, $\alpha = .96$)</i>			
My organization intends to use social media in the next twelve months.	3.93	.96	.86
I predict my organization will use social media in the next twelve months.	4.02	.96	.84
My organization plans to use social media in the next twelve months.	3.92	1.03	.80
<i>Facilitating Conditions (Factor 5, $\alpha = .72$)</i>			
My organization has the resources necessary to use social media.	3.27	1.08	.71
My organization has the knowledge necessary to use social media.	3.22	1.04	.66
A specific person (or group) is available for assistance with social media difficulties.	2.81	1.13	.50
Social media is not compatible with other technologies my organization uses.	3.69	.84	.34
<i>Voluntariness of Use (Factor 6, $\alpha = .82$)</i>			
Organizational leadership does not require us to use social media.	2.36	.91	.79
Although it might be helpful, using social media is certainly not compulsory in my organization.	2.37	.89	.73

Anxiety (Factor 7, $\alpha = .70$)										
My organization hesitates to use social media for fear of making mistakes we cannot correct.	3.67	.92							.83	
Social media is somewhat intimidating to my organization.	3.06	1.12							.55	
It scares me to think that my organization could lose a lot of information using social media by hitting the wrong key.	3.81	.92							.51	
Self-Efficacy (Factor 8, $\alpha = .65$)										
My organization could complete a job or task using social media if we had just online help for assistance.	3.35	.86							.58	
My organization could complete a job or task using social media if we could call someone for help if we got stuck.	3.66	.79							.54	
My organization could complete a job or task using social media if we had a lot of time to complete the job.	3.78	.75							.48	
My organization could complete a job or task using social media if there was no one around to tell us what to do as I go.	3.07	1.03							.44	
Eigenvalues			11.04	2.77	2.25	2.08	1.57	1.42	1.15	1.06
Percent of variance explained			31.51	7.03	5.46	5.22	3.57	2.77	2.22	1.93

Appendix A

Check One

New Application:
 Resubmission*: Revision (All changes must be highlighted)

**Human Subjects Office
 University of Georgia
 612 Boyd GSRC
 Athens, GA 30602-7411
 (706) 542-3199**

***NOTE: A new application is required every five years.**

IRB APPLICATION

MAIL 2 COPIES OF APPLICATION TO ABOVE ADDRESS

(Check One) Dr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input type="checkbox"/> (Check One) Faculty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate <input type="checkbox"/>	(Check One) Dr. <input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Check One) Faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Graduate <input type="checkbox"/>				
Dr. Kaye Sweetser 8101748200 _____ Principal Investigator UGA ID – last 10 digits only	Kristin Thornton 8101229500 _____ Co-Investigator UGA ID – last 10 digits				
Department Of Adpr, Grady College, 3018 _____ Department, Building and + Four (Include department even if living off campus or out of town)	Department Of ADPR, Grady College, 3018 _____ Department, Building and + Four				
Same As Above _____ Mailing Address (if you prefer not to receive mail in dept.)	Same As Above _____ Mailing Address (if you prefer not to receive mail in dept.)				
542-2409 sweetser@uga.edu _____ Phone Number (s) E-Mail (REQUIRED)	770-289-7872 kthorn@uga.edu _____ Phone Number (s) E-Mail				
**Signature of Principal Investigator UGA Faculty Advisor: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: none;">Name</td> <td style="border: none;">Department, Bldg+ Four</td> <td style="border: none;">E-Mail (REQUIRED)</td> <td style="border: none;">Phone No.</td> </tr> </table>	Name	Department, Bldg+ Four	E-Mail (REQUIRED)	Phone No.	Signature of Co-Investigator (use additional cover sheets for more than one Co-Investigator)
Name	Department, Bldg+ Four	E-Mail (REQUIRED)	Phone No.		
**Signature: _____ Date: _____ UGA ID – last 10 digits only _____					
**Your signature indicates that you have read the human subjects guidelines and accept responsibility for the research described in this application.					

If funded:

***Sponsored Programs Proposal#	Name of Funding Agency
---------------------------------	------------------------

***By listing a proposal number, you agree that this application matches the grant application and that you have disclosed all financial conflicts of interest (see Q6a)

TITLE OF RESEARCH:

Social Media Technology: The Use of Social Media by PR Practitioners

NOTE: SUBMIT 4-6 WEEKS PRIOR TO YOUR START DATE

APPROVAL IS GRANTED ONLY FOR 1 YEAR AT A TIME

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY:Investigational New Drug Exceptions to/waivers of Federal regulations *If yes to the above, provide details:*

Data Sets Existing Bodily Fluids/Tissues RP Pool Deception
 Illegal Activities Minors Moderate Exercise Audio/ Video taping
 MRI/EEG/ECG/NIRS/Ultrasound/ Blood Draw X-RAY/DEXA Pregnant
 Women/Prisoners

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH APPLICATION**INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. *Type responses to all 11 questions (all parts) listed below (12 pt. font only).*
2. *Do not answer any question with “see attachments” or “not applicable”.*
3. *Submit original plus one copy to the Human Subjects Office.*
4. *We will contact you via email if changes are required. Allow 4-6 weeks.*

IMPORTANT: Before completing this application, please determine if the project is a research project. Check the federal definition of research at <http://www.ovpr.uga.edu/faqs/hso.html#7> or call the Human Subjects office at 542-3199. The IRB only reviews research projects.

1. **PROBLEM ABSTRACT:** *State rationale and research question or hypothesis (why is this study important and what do you expect to learn?).*

As a result of the recent increase in the use and availability of various communication technologies and social media forms, public relations practitioners are facing enormous challenges in implementing these technologies in the public relations profession. The study proposed here will sample public relations practitioners. Participants will complete a questionnaire to evaluate their knowledge of social media technologies, how often they use social media technologies, how comfortable they are utilizing social media technologies, and how social media technologies impact their budget. The PR practitioners' perception of the credibility of social media technologies will also be evaluated. Additionally, demographic questions will be used to explore whether or not age, education level, training and/or experience influence social media use.

RQ1: Do PR practitioners have the knowledge or expertise to use social media technologies?

RQ2: What social media technologies are currently used by PR practitioners and to what extent do they use them?

RQ3: Do PR practitioners use social media as a means of furthering their budget?

RQ4: Do PR practitioners think social media is credible?

2. **RESEARCH DESIGN:** *Identify specific factors or variables, conditions or groups and any control conditions in your study. Indicate the number of research participants assigned to each condition or group, and describe plans for data analysis.*

During the Spring 2008 semester a random survey will be taken of public relations practitioners, adults age 18+ via e-mail. An initial e-mail will be sent to the participant. The survey will be conducted online through a Web page on a secure SSL server. The survey will consist of an initial participation consent request form. The practitioners will have the choice on the first page of

whether to participate. After reading the attached "Online Consent Form" the practitioners will select the box that says "I Agree" if they wish to participate in the survey. If they do not wish to participate in the survey then they will select the "I Do Not Agree" box, which will then not allow them to answer any questions. The survey (attached) will consist of sets of questions centered around our research questions. We will analyze the data to determine the usage and credibility of various social media technologies by public relations practitioners.

3. **RESEARCH SUBJECTS:**

a. ***List maximum number of subjects 2,000, targeted age group adults 18+ years old (this must be specified in years) and targeted gender M, F;***

b. ***Method of selection and recruitment - list inclusion and exclusion criteria. Describe the recruitment procedures (including all follow-ups).***

We will survey public relations practitioners nationwide. There is not an exclusion on race, gender sexual orientation or salary. There are no age restrictions (other than participant being an adult 18+ years old).

c. ***The activity described in this application involves another institution (e.g. school, university, hospital, etc.) and/or another country. Yes No***

If yes, provide the following details:

1) **Name of institution:**

2) **County and state:**

3) **Country:**

4) ***Written letter of authorization (on official letterhead only)/ IRB approval:***

Attached:

Pending:

d. ***Is there any working relationship between the researcher and the subjects? Yes No . If yes, explain.***

e. ***Describe any incentives (payment, gifts, extra credit).***

Extra credit cannot be offered unless there are equal non-research options available.

4. **PROCEDURES: State in chronological order what a subject is expected to do and what the researcher will do during the interaction. Indicate time commitment for each research activity. And detail any follow-up.**

This will be a survey that takes approximately 10-15 minutes. There is no requirement to take the survey. The names and e-mail addresses of those taking the survey will be held confidential and will not be used in the research. The steps of the survey are as listed: The participants will be asked whether or not they agree to participate. Those interested in participating will go to the survey by clicking a link from the e-mail. The first page of the survey will be the consent form. Those agreeing to this consent form will continue to the survey questions. Participants are allowed to skip questions without penalty. The last page of the survey will be a thank you page with an option to

receive a report in mid 2008, which will describe the findings of the study. All data with identifying information will be destroyed by October 2008.

Duration of participation in the study: online 10-15 minutes *Months*

No. of testing/training sessions: *Length of each session:* 10-15 minutes

Start Date: ASAP, we have a limited time frame due to the length of our semester

Only if your procedures include work with blood, bodily fluids or tissues, complete below:

Submit a MUA from Biosafety: Attached Pending

If you are exempted from obtaining a MUA by Biosafety, explain why?

Total amount of blood draw for study: *ml* **Blood draw for each session:** *ml*

5. **MATERIALS:** *Itemize all questionnaires/instruments/equipment and attach copies with the corresponding numbers written on them.*

Online consent form

Survey questionnaire

Check all other materials that apply and are attached:

Interview protocol Debriefing Statement Recruitment flyers or advertisements

Consent/Assent forms

If no consent documents are attached, justify omission under Q. 8

6. **RISK:** *Detail risks to a subject as a result of data collection and as a direct result of the research and your plans to minimize them and the availability and limits of treatment for sustained physical or emotional injuries.*

NOTE: REPORT INCIDENTS CAUSING DISCOMFORT, STRESS OR HARM TO THE IRB IMMEDIATELY!

- a. **CURRENT RISK:** *Describe any psychological, social, legal, economic or physical discomfort, stress or harm that might occur as a result of participation in research. How will these be held to the absolute minimum?*

Participating in the online survey poses no risk or harm of any kind to participants.

Is there a financial conflict of interest (see UGA COI policy)? Yes No

If yes, does this pose any risk to the subjects?

- b. **FUTURE RISK:** *How are research participants to be protected from potentially harmful future use of the data collected in this project? Describe your plans to maintain confidentiality, including removing identifiers, and state who will have access to the data and in what role. Justify retention of identifying information on any data or forms.*

DO NOT ANSWER THIS QUESTION WITH “NOT APPLICABLE”!

Anonymous Confidential Public **Check one only and explain below.**

Data will be collected on a secure SSL server. Then, electronic data with identifying information will be stored on a password-protected computer. By mid 2008 all identifying information will be destroyed completely. Potential respondents will be advised as to the non-secure nature of internet communication.

Audio-taping Video-taping

If taping, how will tapes be securely stored, who will have access to the tapes, will they be publicly disseminated and when will they be erased or destroyed? Justify retention.

7. **BENEFIT:** *State the benefits to individuals and humankind. Potential benefits of the research should outweigh risks associated with research participation.*

a. *Identify benefits of the research for participants, e.g. educational benefits:*

Participants may gain a better understanding of their current use of social media technologies as PR practitioners by participating in our online survey. The survey may educate them on unfamiliar and emerging media tools as well as offer innovative ways to use social media technologies to further their budget. A summary of the findings will be offered to any participant that inquires, via e-mail, about the findings of the study.

b. *Identify any potential benefits of this research for humankind in general, e.g. advance our knowledge of some phenomenon or help solve a practical problem.*

It is increasingly important for PR practitioners to better understand the numerous social media technologies available to them. It is also important for them to understand how those technologies can serve as beneficial resources to reach various publics that were once unreachable. The findings of this study will help communication researchers and practitioners understand the current level of use and credibility of social media technologies and to what extent those resources are being utilized.

8. **CONSENT PROCESS:**

a. *Detail how legally effective informed consent will be obtained from all research participants and, when applicable, from parent(s) or guardian(s).*

Will subjects sign a consent form? Yes No

If No, request for waiver of signed consent – Yes

Justify the request, including an assurance that risk to the participant will be minimal. Also submit the consent script or cover letter that will be used in lieu of a form.

This survey will be completed via Web page on a secure SSL server (Survey Monkey). Because this is a Web-based survey that participants can complete at their own leisure, no psychological, social, legal or economic harm is anticipated. The surveys will be collected and saved automatically and e-mail will be discarded and not connected with the completed survey. Even if the respondent requests a summary of findings, that will be a separate (from his/her completed survey) communication. Data connecting the respondent and the responses will be destroyed by October 2008.

b. **Deception** Yes No

If yes, describe the deception, why it is necessary, and how you will debrief them. The consent form should include the following statement: “In order to make this study a valid one, some information about my participation will be withheld until completion of the study.”

9. **VULNERABLE PARTICIPANTS:** Yes No
Minors Prisoners Pregnant women/fetuses Elderly
Immigrants/non-English speakers Mentally/Physically incapacitated Others *List below.*

Outline procedures to obtain their consent/assent to participate. Describe the procedures to be used to minimize risk to these vulnerable subjects.

10. **ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES:** Yes No
If yes, explain how subjects will be protected.

NOTE: Some ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES must be reported, e.g. child abuse.

11. **STUDENTS**

This application is being submitted for :

- Undergraduate Honors Thesis
Masters Applied Project, Thesis or Exit Exam Research
Doctoral Dissertation Research

Has the student's thesis/dissertation committee approved this research? Yes No

The IRB recommends submission for IRB review only after the appropriate committees have conducted the necessary scientific review and approved the research proposal.

Appendix B**Social Media Technology: The Use of Social Media by PR Practitioners**

Social media- Social media are participatory online media where news, photos, videos and podcasts are made public via social media Web sites through submission. Sometimes content is accompanied with a voting process to make media items become “popular.”

Social media democratize information, transforming people from content readers into content publishers. It is the shift from a broadcast mechanism to a many-to-many model, rooted in conversations between authors, people and peers.

Social media use the “wisdom of crowds” to connect information in a collaborative manner. Social media can take many different forms, including Internet forums, message boards, weblogs, wikis, podcasts, pictures and video. Technologies such as blogs, picture-sharing, vlogs, wall-postings, e-mail, instant messaging, music-sharing, group creation and voice over IP, to name a few. Examples of social media applications are Google (reference, social networking), Wikipedia (reference), MySpace (social networking), Facebook (social networking), Last.fm (personal music), YouTube (social networking and video sharing), Second Life (virtual reality) and Flickr (photo sharing).

Types of Social Media

Please check all types of social media that your organization has used.

Blogs
 E-mail
 Events (Upcoming.org)
 Instant Messaging
 Internet Hosted Video Games (World of Warcraft, etc.)
 Intranets
 News Aggregation (Digg, Reddit, Stumbleupon)
 PDA
 Photosharing (Flickr, Zoomer)
 Podcast
 Presence Applications (Twitter)
 Second Life (or another virtual world)
 Social Bookmarking (del.icio.us)
 Social Networks (MySpace, Facebook, etc.)
 Text Messaging
 Videoconferencing
 Video Sharing (YouTube, Vimeo, etc.)
 Wiki

UTAUT

Indicate your agreement with the following statements, ranging from one to five.

(1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neutral (4) Agree (5) Strongly Agree

Performance Expectancy:

My organization would find social media useful.

Using social media enables my organization to accomplish tasks more quickly.

Using social media increases my organization's productivity.

If my organization uses social media, it will increase my chances of getting a raise.

Effort Expectancy:

My organization's interaction with social media would be clear and understandable.

It would be easy for my organization to become skillful at using social media.

My organization would find social media easy to use.

Learning to operate social media is easy for my organization.

Attitude toward using Technology:

Using social media is a good idea.

Social media makes work more interesting.

Working with social media is fun.

My organization likes working with social media.

Social Influence:

People who influence my unit/department behavior think that we should use social media.

People who are important to my unit/department think that we should use social media.

The senior management of this business has been helpful in the use of social media.

In general, my organization has supported the use of social media.

Facilitating Conditions:

My organization has the resources necessary to use social media.

My organization has the knowledge necessary to use social media.

Social media is not compatible with other technologies my organization uses.

A specific person (or group) is available for assistance with social media difficulties.

Self-Efficacy:

My organization could complete a job or task using social media...

if there was no one around to tell us what to do as I go.

if we could call someone for help if we got stuck.

if we had a lot of time to complete the job.

if we had just online help for assistance.

Anxiety:

My organization feels apprehensive about using social media.

It scares me to think that my organization could lose a lot of information using social media by hitting the wrong key.

My organization hesitates to use social media for fear of making mistakes we cannot correct.

Social media is somewhat intimidating to my organization.

Behavioral Intention to use Social Media:

My organization intends to use social media in the next twelve months.

I predict my organization will use social media in the next twelve months.

My organization plans to use social media in the next twelve months.

Degree of Voluntary Use:

Although it might be helpful, using social media is certainly not compulsory in my organization.

Organizational leadership does not require us to use social media.

My superiors expect us to use social media.

The use of social media would be voluntary (as opposed to required by superiors/job).

Anticipated Use of Future Social Media:

My organization will find social media useful in the next twelve months.

Using social media will increase my organization's productivity in the next twelve months.

My organization will like working with social media in the next twelve months.

In general, my organization will continue to support the use of social media in the next twelve months.

Credibility

Indicate your agreement with the following statements, ranging from one to five.

(1) Not at all (2) Not very (3) Somewhat (4) Moderately (5) Very

Social media is accurate.

Social media is believable.

Social media is fair.

Social media is in-depth.

Demographic questions

1. Gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. What year were you born? (free response)
3. What company do you work for? (free response)
4. What would you categorize your company as?
 - a. Arts (Dance, Theatre, Visual Arts)
 - b. Education
 - c. Entertainment (Sports, Music)
 - d. Environment
 - e. Healthcare/Hospitals
 - f. Human Services
 - g. Political Action/Non-government organization
 - h. Recreation
 - i. Religion
 - j. Tourism/Hospitality
 - k. Other: _____
5. What is your job title? (free response)
6. In a few words, please tell us a little about what you do (i.e., job description). (free response)
7. Does your company have a designated public relations department?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
8. How many people work in your organization's public relations department? (free response)
9. How many years have you been working as a public relations practitioner? (free response)
10. How many years have you been working in the non-profit sector? (free response)
11. How many years have you been working at your current job? (free response)
12. What is the highest level of education you have obtained?
 - a. High school or GED
 - b. Associate's degree
 - c. Bachelor's degree
 - d. Graduate degree (master's, PhD)
13. If you hold a college degree, what was your major? (free response)
14. What is your company's Web site address? (free response)
15. What is the annual budget for the public relations department of your company? (free response)
16. Which of these types of social media are you familiar with? (check all that apply)
 - a. Blogs
 - b. E-mails
 - c. Events (Upcoming.org)
 - d. Instant Messaging
 - e. Internet Hosted Video Games (World of Warcraft, etc.)

- f. Intranets
- g. News Aggregations (Digg, Reddit, StumbleUpon)
- h. PDA
- i. Photosharing (Flickr, Zoomer)
- j. Podcast
- k. Presence Applications (Twitter)
- l. Second Life (or another virtual world)
- m. Social Bookmaking (del.icio.us)
- n. Social Networks (MySpace, Facebook)
- o. Text Messaging
- p. Videoconferencing
- q. Video Sharing (YouTube, Vimeo)
- r. Wikis

Please use the space below to provide additional comments on your use of social media.

Thank you for taking the time to complete and submit this survey. Your insight and information are very valuable to us.

Should you have any further questions or concerns about this survey or any of its questions, please contact Kristin Thornton at kthorn@uga.edu.

Would you like to receive an executive summary of this study's results, which will be ready in May 2008 and distributed via e-mail?

- a. Yes: (e-mail) _____
- b. No

Appendix C

Organization

Make-A-Wish Foundation

E-Mail

March of Dimes

Marine Toys for Tots
Maryknoll Fathers
& Brothers

Matthew 25: Ministries
Mayo Clinic

Memorial-Sloan Kettering
Cancer Center
Mental Health America

Mercy Corps

Metropolitan Museum of Art
Minnesota Public Radio

Mission to the World

Moody Bible Institute

Mount Sinai
Muscular Dystrophy Assn.

Museum of Fine Arts,
Boston

Museum of Fine Arts,
Museum of Modern Art

of Industrial Resources
National Audubon Society

National Kidney Foundation

Society

National Public Radio

National Wildlife Federation
Council

Nature Conservancy

Nevada Cancer Institute

Hospital

Medical Teams International

Institute of International Education

Interchurch Medical Assistance
International Aid

International Fellowship of Christians and
Jews
International Medical Corps
International Rescue Committee
Jewish Community Federation of
Cleveland

Jewish Community Federation of San
Francisco

Jewish Community Federation of
Metropolitan Chicago
JA Worldwide

Kids in Distressed Situations
Kingsway Charities (formerly King
Benevolent Fund)

KQED

Leukemia & Lymphoma Society

Life Outreach International Association
of Churches

Local Initiatives for Support Corporation
Academy for Educational Development

Adventist Development and Relief
Agency Intl
Alzheimer's Association
American Cancer Society

American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation
American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Joint Distribution
Committee

American Red Cross

American SPCA
The Arc of the United States
Asia Foundation

Aspen Institute

Big Brothers Big Sisters of American
Boys & Girls Clubs of America

Teach for America

Trinity Broadcasting Network
Trust for Public Land

Union Rescue Mission
United Cerebral Palsy Association

UJA Federation of New York

United Negro College Fund

United States Fund for UNICEF

United Way

Veterans of Foreign Wars

Voice of the Martyrs

Volunteers of America
WETA

WGBH Educational Foundation

Wildlife Conservation Society

World Vision

World Wildlife Fund

Young Life

YMCA

YWCA

Operation Blessing International Relief

Operation Smile

Oregon Food Bank

Paralyzed Veterans of America

PEF Israel Endowment Fund
Philadelphia Museum of Art

Planned Parenthood

Project Hope

Public Broadcasting Service
Robin Hood Foundation

Rotary Foundation of Rotary
International

St. Jude Children's Research Hospital
St Mary's/Westside Food Bank Alliance

Samaritan's Purse

San Francisco Opera Association

Save the Children Federation

Scripps Research Institute
Shriners Hospitals for Children
Smithsonian Institution

Special Olympics

Susan G. Komen for the Cure

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

Direct Relief International
Disabled American Veterans

Doctors Without Borders USA

Ducks Unlimited

Ducks Unlimited Great Plains Regional
Office
Ducks Unlimited Great Lakes Atlantic
Regional Office
Easter Seals

Educational Broadcasting Corp (WNET)
- AKA Thirteen

Educational Media Foundation
Environmental Defense

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home (AKA:
Boys Town)

Focus on the Family

Food Bank for New York City / Food for
Survival

Food for the Poor
Gifts in Kind International

Girl Scouts of the USA

Girls Inc.
Greater Chicago Food Depository

Habitat for Humanity International
Hadassah, the Women's Zionist
Organization of America

Heart to Heart International
Heifer Project International

Hope for the City

Houston Food Bank

Humane Society of the United States

Huntington Library and Art Gallery

The Cable Center
California Center for the Arts
California Community Foundation
California Institute of Technology

California Police Activities League
California Science Center Foundation

California State Parks Association
California Waterfowl Association
California-Hawaii Elks Major Project
Californians for Population Stabilization

Calvin College
Camp Alandale

Camp Courageous of Iowa
Camp Fire USA

Camp For All
Camp Smile-A-Mile
Camp Summit

Camp Sunshine
Campus Crusade for Christ
Cancer Research Institute
CancerCare

Canine Assistants
CAPA of New Haven
Capital Area Food Bank of Texas
Capital Area United Way
C.A.R.
Caramoor

CARE USA

Care and Share Food Bank

Caribbean Conservation Corporation
CaringBridge
Carnegie Institution of Washington

Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh

Carpenter's Shelter
Carter Center

Cary Christian Center
Casa de Amparo
Catholic Charities USA
Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New Orleans

Catholic Charities of Los Angeles

Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County

Catholic Charities of Saint Paul and Minneapolis

Catholic Charities of St. Louis
Catholic Charities of DC
Catholic Charities
Catholic Charities Spokane
Catholic Legal Immigration Network
Catholic Medical Mission Board
Catholic Relief Services

Catholics for a Free Choice
Cato Institute

CDC Foundation

Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

Center for a New American Dream
Center for Arms Control
Center for Arts Educations
Center for Asian American Media

Center for Biological Diversity

Center for Community Change
Center for Economic and Policy Research

Center for Excellence in Education
Center for Health, Environment and
Justice
Center for Law and Social Policy
Center for National Policy

Center for Policy Alternatives

Center for Responsive Politics
Center for Science in the Public Interest
Center for Strategic and International
Studies
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

CENTERSTAGE

Center Stage
Champions for Life

Channel One Food Bank
Charlotte Rescue Mission
Chattanooga Area Food Bank
Chesapeake Bay Foundation

Chesapeake Bay Trust
Chicago Anti-Hunger Federation
Chicago Botanic Garden

Chicago Cares

Chicago Youth Centers

Child Abuse Prevention Foundation
Child Advocates
Child Welfare League of America
Childhaven

Childreach/Plan USA
Children International
Children of the Night
Childcare Worldwide
Children's Aid Society

Children's Cancer Center
Children's Cancer Research Fund
Children's Cancer Society
Children's Defense Fund
Children's Health Fund
Children's Heartlink
Children's Home Society
Children's Hope Chest
Children's Hospital Association
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

Children's Hospital of Orange County

Children's Hunger Fund
Children's Medical Research Initiative
Children's Memorial Hospital

Children's Museum of Manhattan
Children's Museum of Richmond
Children's National Medical Center

Children's Organ Transplant Association
Children's Rights
Children's Wish Foundation
Christian Children's Fund

Christian Foundation for Children and
Aging

Christian Reformed World Relief
Committee
Christopher and Dana Reeve Foundation
Cincinnati Parks Foundations
Cincinnati Symphony
City Harvest Inc.
City of Hope

City Parks Foundation
Civic Ventures

Cleveland Clinic Foundation

Community Food Bank of New Jersey
Community Television of S California
(KCET)

Compassion International
Conservation Fund
Covenant House
CREATE Foundation
CRISTA Ministries
Crohn's & Colitis Foundation of America
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation
I Have A Dream Foundation
International Planned Parenthood
Federation/Western Hemisphere Region
Jane Goodall Institute

Jewish National Fund
KaBOOM!
Lupus Foundation of America
I Have a Dream Foundation
The Sulzbacher Center for the Homeless
The Iacocca Foundation
Ida Cason Callaway Foundation

Idaho Conservation League

IDEX
I.H.S.
IMA World Health
Imagine Children's Museum

Imagine It! Children's Museum of Atlanta
Immune Deficiency Foundation
Immunization Action Coalition
In Defense of Animals
In Touch Mission International
Indiana Historical Society

Indiana State Museum Foundation
Indianapolis Museum of Art

Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra
Indianapolis Zoo
Infant Crisis Services
Infant Welfare Society of Chicago
INFORM

Initiative Foundation

INMED Partnerships for Children
Inner-City Scholarship Fund
InnVision the Way Home
IN-SIGHT

Inspiration Corporation

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy

Institute for American Values
Institute for Community Economics
Institute for Educational Advancement
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

Institute for Global Engagement

Institute for Humane Studies

Institute for Justice

Institute for Policy Studies
Institute for Student Achievement

Institute for Transportation &
Developmental Policy

Institute for Women's Policy Research

The Institute of Contemporary Art

Institute of Ecosystem Studies

Institute of Noetic Science

Institute of the Americas
Institute on Taxation & Economic Policy
InterAct Ministries
InterAction

Inter-American Dialogue

Intercessors for America

Intercollegiate Studies Institute

The Interfaith Alliance Foundation
The Interfaith Center of New York
Interfaith Community Services

Interfaith Housing Coalition
Interfaith Ministries for Greater Houston
Interfaith Outreach & Community
Partners
Interlochen Center for the Arts
International AIDS Vaccine Initiative

International Bible Society
International Bible Society Foundation
International Board of Jewish Missions
International Campaign for Tibet
International Center for Journalists

International Center for Research on
Women
International Center of Photography

International Child Care
International Children's Care
International Children's Fund
International Children's Heart Foundation
International Christian Concern

International Christian Ministries
International Disaster Emergency Service
International Eye Foundation

International Fibrodysplasia Ossificans
Progressiva Association
International Foundation of Hope
International Fund for Animal Welfare

International Game Fish Association
International Gay and Lesbian Human

Rights Commission

International House

International Institute for Christian
Studies

International Institute of Rural
Reconstruction, U.S. Office

International Justice Mission

International League for Human Rights

International Longevity Center-USA

International Mountain Biking
Association

International Museum of Women

International Myeloma Foundation

International Orthodox Christian
Charities

International Peace Academy (Institute)

International Physicians for the
Prevention of Nuclear War

International Primate Protection League

International Relief Teams

International Rivers

International Teams

International Women's Health Coalition

International Youth Foundation

Interplast

Interreligious Foundation for Community

Organization
InterServe USA

Interstitial Cystitis Assoc.
Intrepid Sea, Air & Space Museum
Iowa Citizens for Community
Improvement

Ipas

Irving Cares, Inc.
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
ISEF Foundation
Islamic Relief USA

Island Alliance
Island Institute
Island Press

IslandWood

ISOH/Impact
Israel Cancer Assoc. USA
Israel Cancer Research Fund
Israel Children's Centers
Israel Special Kids Fund
Izaak Walton League of America

Jack Van Impe Ministries International
Jackie Robinson Foundation
The Jackson Laboratory
Jacksonville Humane Society
Jacob Burns Film Center

Jacob's Pillow Dance

James A. Michener Art Museum

Jamestown Foundation
Jane Addams Peace Association

Japan Society

Japanese American National Museum
Japanese Cultural Center of Hawaii
Jazz Aspen Snowmass
Jazz at Lincoln Center

JBI International
JCC Assoc.

JCC MetroWest

Jeffco Action Center
Jeffrey Modell Foundation
Jerusalem Fellowship
The Jerusalem Foundation

Jewelers for Children
Jewish Center for Community Services
Jewish Communal Fund
Jewish Community Association of Austin

Jewish Community Center in Manhattan
Jewish Community Center of Mid-
Westchester
Jewish Community Center of San
Francisco
Jewish Community Center of Chicago
Jewish Community Federation of
Louisville

Jewish Family & Career Services of
Atlanta
Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles

Jewish Federation of Broward County
Jewish Federation of Central New Jersey
Jewish Federation of Cincinnati
JF. Greater Buffalo
JF. Of Greater Dallas
JF. Of Greater Hartford
JF. Of greater Indianapolis
JF. Of Greater Los Angeles
JF. Of Greater Middlesex County
JF. Of Greater Monmouth County
JF. Of Greater Phoenix

JF. Of Greater Seattle
JF. Of Orange County
JF. Of Rhode Island

JF. Of Southern Arizona
JF. Of St. Louis
JF. Of the Greater San Gabriel and
Pamona Valleys
Jewish Foundation for Group Homes
Jewish Foundation for the Righteous
Jewish Fund for Justice
Jewish Guild for the Blind
The Jewish museum
Jewish National Fund, US
Jewish United Fund of Metropolitan
Chicago
Jewish Voice Ministries International
JFL Media
Jimmie Hale Mission
John 3:16 Mission
John Ball Zoological Society
John F. Kennedy Library Foundation
John Kilpatrick Ministries
John Michael Kohler Arts Center
John Muir Health Foundation
John P. McGovern Museum of Health &
Medical Science
John Stott Ministries
John Wayne Cancer Institute
Jonathon's Place

Joni and Friends
Jonsson Cancer Center Foundation

Joshua Frase Foundation

Joslyn Art Museum

Joyce Theater Foundation

Judeo Christian Health Clinic

Judicial Watch

The Julian Center

Juliette Fowler Homes

Juma Ventures

Jumpstart

Junior Achievement of Central Florida

Junior Blind of America

Junior Police Academy

Just One Life/Nefesh Achat B'Yisrael

Kansas City Neighborhood Alliance

Kansas City Rescue Mission

Kansas City Starlight Theatre

Kansas City Symphony

Kansas Food Bank

Kansas Humane Society

Kappa Kappa Gamma Foundation

Kaufman Center

KCET

KCTS Television

KDUV

Keep America Beautiful

Keep Indianapolis Beautiful

Kempe Foudnation for the Prevention of
Child Abuse & Neglect

Kentucky Humane Society

Kenyon College

KERA

Keren-Or

KETC

Key Life Network

KICKSTART

Kickstart International
Kids Across America
Kids Alive International
Kids House of Seminole, Inc.
Kidspace Children's Museum
Kingdom Building Ministries
Kips Bay Boys & Girls Club
Knoxville Zoological Gardens
Koahnic Broadcast Corporation
KOCE-TV
Kokomo Rescue Mission

KUSP
L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center
La Jolla Playhouse

Lake Area United Way

Lalmba
Lamb & Lion Ministries
Lambda Legal

The Land Institute
Land Trust Alliance
Lankenau Institute for Medical Research
Latin American Association

Lauritzen Gardens
Lawrence Family Jewish Center
Leader Dogs for the Blind
Leadership Resources International
League for Animal Welfare
League for American Bicycalists

League to Save Lake Tahoe
Learning Leaders
Literacy Assistance Center

Literacy Chicago

Literacy, Inc.
Lithuanian Mercy Lift

Little Brothers Friends of the Elderly,
Chicago Chapter

Little League Baseball

Little Light House

Little Shelter Animal Rescue and
Adoption Center

Little Sisters of the Assumption Family
Health Service

Little Star Foundation

Living Beyond Breast Cancer

Living Water International

Liz Lerman Dance Exchange

Lloyd Center for Environmental Studies

Loaves and Fishes Center

Locks of Love

Loma Linda Univ

Lone Star Flight Museum

Long Beach Museum of Art

Long Island Alzheimer's Fdn.

Long Island Cares

Long Island Children's Museum

Long Wharf Theatre

Los Angeles Alliance for a New
Economy

The Los Angeles Conservancy

Los Angeles County Museum of Art

LA Free Clinic

LA Opera

LA Philharmonic

LA Regional Foodbank
Louisiana SPCA
Louisville Orchestra
Louisville Zoo Foundation
Love A Child, Inc.
Loving Grace Ministries
Lowcountry Food Bank

Lowell Lundstrom Ministries
Lowell Observatory
The LPGA Foundation
Luis Palau Assoc.
Lung Cancer Alliance
The Lustgarten Fdn. For Pancreatic
Cancer Research
Lutheran Bible Translators
Lutheran Community Fdn.
Lutheran Heritage Fdn.
Lydia Patterson Institute
Lydia's House
Lymphoma Research Fdn.
Lynn Sage Cancer Research Fdn.
Lyric Opera of Chicago

Meals on Wheels
Modest Needs Foundation
Multiple Myeloma Research
Myasthenia Gravis Foundat.
NARSAD
4-H Council
Nat. Alliance Mental Illness
Nat. Breast Cancer Coalition
Nat. Center for Family Literacy

Children

Nat. Childhood Cancer Found.
Nat. Credit Union Foundation
Nat. Disaster Search Dog Found.
Nat. Federation of the Blind

Nat. Foundation Cancer Research

Nat. Found. Teaching Entrepreneur.
Nat. Military Family Association
Nat. Osteoporosis Foundation

National Sleep Foundation
National Urban League

Natural Resources Defense Council

Nature Conservancy

Network For Good

Northwest Medical Teams Internat.

Maccabi USA/Sports for America

MacPhail Center for Learning

Madison's Children's Museum

Madison Square Boys and Girls Club

MADRE

Maine Audubon Society

Maine Community Foundation

Maine Initiatives

Maine Public Broadcasting Network

Maine Sea Coast Mission

Make the Road New York

MaliVai Washington Kids Found.

Mama's Kitchen

Manchester College

Manhattan Instit. For Policy Research

Manhattan Theater Club

MANNA FoodBank
Maoz Israel
Maranatha Volunteers International
Marcus Jewish Community Center
Marian House
Marijuana Policy Project Found.

The Marin Community Food Bank
Marine Biological Laboratory

Marine Corps Heritage Foundation

Marine Corps Scholarship Found.
Marine Mammal Center

Mario Murillo Ministries
Mark Morris Dance Group
Mark Twain House & Museum
Market Foundation
Market Street Mission
The Marrow Foundation
Martha O'Brian Center
Marwen
Maryland Food Bank

The Maryland Mentoring Partnership
Maryland Science Center
Maryland SPCA
Mary's Center for Maternal/Child Care

Masonic Home for Children
Masonic Hones of California
Masonic Medical Research Lab.
The Masorti Foundation

MASS MoCA
Mass. Audubon Society
Mass. Historical Society
Mass. Horticulture Society

MassINC
Maui Arts & Cultural Center
Mautner Project
Maxfund Animal Adoption

Maymont Foundation

MAZON-Jewish Response to Hunger

McCallie

McCallum Theatre

McCarter Theatre

McHenry County PADS

McNay

McWane Science Center

MEDA

Media Research Center

Medical College of Wisconsin

Medical Development for Israel

Medical Mission Sisters

Medical Missions for Children

Meet The Composer

Mel Trotter Ministries

Melwood

Memorian Hermann Foundation

Memphis Botanical Garden Found.

Memphis Zoo

Mentor St. Louis

MENTOR

Mercatus Center

Merce Cunningham Dance Co.

Mercy Flight Center

Mercy Flight Southeast

Mercy Housing

Mercy Ships

Merola Opera Program

Messenger International

Methodist Children's Home

Metro Ministries

Metropolitan Ministries

MALDEF

Miami City Ballet

Miami Lighthouse

Michigan Audubon Society

Michigan Opera Theater

Middle East Fellowship

Middle East Institute

Middlebury

Midnight Mission

Mid-Ohio Food Bank

Midwest Athletes Against Child Cancer

Mike Barber Ministries

Mile High United Way

Military Community Youth Ministries

Millionair Club Charities

Milton & Rose D. Friedman Found.

Milwaukee Art Museum

Milwaukee Ballet
Milwaukee Reperatory Theater
MIND Research Institute
The Minneapolis Foundation

The Minneapolis Institute of Art

Minneapolis Medical Research

Minnesota Advocates Human Rights

Minnesota Children's Museum
Minnesota Environmental Fund
Minnesota Historical Society

Minnesota International Center

Minnesota Medical Foundation

Minnesota Opera

Minnesota Orchestra
Minnesota Public Radio

The Mint Museums

Miracle Flights for Kids
Mississippi College

Missoula Food Bank

Missouri Historical Society

Monadnock Humane Society
Monell Chemical Senses Center
Moody Bible Institute
The Morgan Library

The Morton Arboretum
MOSI Museum
Mothers Against Drunk Driving

Motion Picture and Television Fund
Mount Holyoke College
Mount Sinai
The Mountain Institute

Mountain Lion Foundation

Mountain State Legal Foundation
Mountains to Sounds Greenway Trust

The Moyer Foundation

MPTV Friends
Mr. Holland's Opus Foundation
Ms. Foundation for Women

Museum of Arts and Science
Museum Contemporary Art San Diego

Museum Contemporary Art L.A.

Museum of Discovery and Science

The Museum of Flight

Museum of the Moving Image

Museum of the Shenandoah
Music Center

Music Conservatory of Westchester
Music Mission Kiev
MusiCares

MUST Ministries

Myositis Association
NAACP Legal Defense
NAFSA
Nasmith Memorial Basketball
NALEO Education Fund

NAMI

Naples Botanical Gardens
AARP

Adopt-A-Classroom
African Wildlife Foundation
Aidmatrix Foundation

Alpha-1 Foundation

Alzheimer's Foundation of America
American Autoimmune Related Diseases

Association
American Farmland Trust

American Forests

American Health Assistance Foundation

American Humane Association
American Indian College Fund
American Institute for Cancer Research
American Leprosy Missions

American Near East Refugee Aid
American Refugee Committee

amfAR, The Foundation for AIDS
Research

Animal Legal Defense Fund
Animal Protection Institute
Animal Rescue Foundation
Asthma and Allergy Foundation of
America

Believe in Tomorrow National Children's
Foundation
Big Cat Rescue Corp
A Contemporary Theatre
A Noise Within
A Place Called Home
A.J. Muste Memorial Institute
AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety

AAUW Educational Foundation
The Abraham Fund Initiatives
The Academy of Natural Sciences
Academy of American Poets
Academy of Television Arts & Sciences
Foundation

Academy of Vocal Arts
Acadiana Outreach Center

Accelerated Cure Project for Multiple
Sclerosis
Access Fund

ACCION USA
Achieve!Minneapolis
Achievement Centers for Children
Acterra

ActionAid International USA
Activated Ministries
Action Institute for the Study of Religion
and Liberty
Actors' Fund of America
Actors Theatre of Louisville

The Adirondack Council
Adirondack Museum

Adler Planetarium & Astronomy Museum
Admiral Nimitz Foundation
Adventures For Wish Kids
Advocates for Children of New York
Advocates for Youth
Advocates International
Affirmations Lesbian and Gay
Community Center

African Enterprise
Africare
After-School All-Stars
Aga Khan Foundation
AIDS Action Committee of
Massachusetts

AIDS Emergency Fund
AIDS Research Alliance
Air Force Aid Society
Air Force Association
Air Force Enlisted Village

Akron Art Museum

Akron Community Foundation
Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank
Alabama Shakespeare Festival
Alameda County Community Food Bank

Alaska Conservation Foundation
The Alban Institute
Albany Institute of History & Art

All Children's Hospital Foundation

All Kinds of Minds
All Stars Helping Kids
Allentown Art Museum

Alley Cat Allies
Alliance for Aging Research
Alliance for Education
Alliance for Justice
Ballet Hispanico

Ballet San Jose

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Museum
Baltimore Community Foundation
The Baltimore Museum of Art

Baltimore Symphony Orchestra
Baptist Medical & Dental Mission
International
Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute

Bard College
Barnabas Foundation

Barnard College

Baton Rouge Area Foundation
The Battery Conservancy
Bay Area Discovery Museum

Brooklyn Botanic Garden

Bruce Museum

Buffalo Bayou Partnership

Buffalo Bill Historical Center

Buffalo City Mission

Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra

Building with Books

The Bushnell

Business Executives for National Security

Business for Social Responsibility

Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Damon Runyon Cancer Research

Foundation

Diabetes Action Research and Education
Foundation

Earthjustice

Epilepsy Foundation (National Office)

Episcopal Relief and Development

Federation for American Immigration
Reform

First Candle / SIDS Alliance

Fistula Foundation

Food Animal Concerns Trust

Food for the Poor

Freedom from Hunger

Friends of the Earth

Friends of the Orphans

Give Kids the World

Glaucoma Research Foundation
Global Impact
Globus Relief

Grassroots International
Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind
Guiding Eyes for the Blind

D.C. Central Kitchen

Dade Community Foundation
Daily Bread Food Bank

Dallas Museum of Art
The Dallas Opera
Dallas Zoological Society
Black Tie Dinner, Inc.

Dare 2 Share Ministries
Dare to Care Food Bank

Darkness to Light

Darrell Green Youth Life Foundation
Daughters of the American Revolution
David Horowitz Freedom Center
Dawn Ministries
The Elephant Sanctuary
U.S. Committee for Refugees and

Immigrants
United Animal Nations
USO

Variety - The Children's Charity of the
U.S.

Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund

Women's Funding Network
Tacoma Art Museum
Tacoma Rescue Mission
Tampa Metropolitan Area YMCA
Tampa's Lowry Park Zoo

Target Hunger
Tarrant Area Food Bank
Taxpayers for Common Sense
The Tech Museum of Innovation
Teen Living Programs
Telfair Museum of Art
Ten Chimneys Foundation

Texas Heart Institute
Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Radio
Texas State Aquarium
The National D-Day Museum
The Senior Citizens League
Treatment Advocacy Center
Trickle Up Programs
U.S. Soccer Foundation
UMCOR
United for a Fair Economy

United Mitochondrial Disease Foundation
United Scleroderma Foundation
V Foundation for Cancer Research
Volunteer Match

Water Missions International
Wheat Ridge

Wilderness Society

Wireless Foundation
World Concern
World Education
World Jewish Congress
World Relief
World Society for Protection of Animals
Y-Me National Breast Cancer
Organization
Young Survival Coalition
Osteogenesis Imperfecta Foundation

Pajama Program
PanCAN
Pearl S. Buck International
Project Concern International
Project Hope - The People-to-People
Health Foundation

ProLiteracy Worldwide
Prostate Cancer Foundation
Pulmonary Hypertension Association
Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic
Ronald McDonald House Charities

Save the Children

Seva Foundation

Skin Cancer Foundation
Smile Train
The OASIS Institute
Oceana

Ohio Environmental Council
The Ohio Masonic Home
OHR Somayach International

Ohr Torah Stone Colleges and Graduate
Programs
Olbrich Botanical Society

Old Dartmouth Historical Society
The Old Globe Theatre

Oldways Preservation Trust
Omaha Performing Arts
Omaha Symphony

Omaha's Henry Doorly Zoo
OMB Watch
One Economy Corporation
Open Door Mission
Opera Colorado
Opera San Jose

Opportunity International

OIF

Opus 118
Oral Health America
Orange County Community Foundation
Orange County Rescue Mission

Ordway Center for the Performing Arts

Oregon Ballet Theatre
OEC

PS1
Pacific Northwest Ballet
Page Education Foundation
PRI

The Paley Center for Media
Palm Beach Opera
Parkinson's Action Network
Parrish Art Museum

Partners in Health

Rainforest Alliance
Raleigh Rescue Mission
RAND Corporation
Randall's Island Sports Foundation

RAAP
Raphael House
Rawhide Boys Ranch
Reach Out and Read
Regional Plan Association
Resist
Charity Navigator