

Research Article

Digital Trust Signals and Action Affordances in Third Sector Organizations: An Exploratory Analysis of 77 NGO Profiles on the Açık Açık Platform

*Üçüncü Sektör Kuruluşlarında Dijital Güven Sinyalleri ve Eylem Olanakları:
Açık Açık Platformundaki 77 STK Profiline Keşifsel Analizi*

Esat SAYGIN

Öğr. Gör. Dr, Yüksek İhtisas Üniversitesi

Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu

esat.saygin@yuksekihtisas.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2784-2630>

Makale Geliş Tarihi	Makale Kabul Tarihi
06.06.2026	08.08.2026

Abstract

This research examines the trust and accountability signals, platform routing patterns, and stakeholder action opportunities visible in the profiles of 77 NGOs on the Açık Açık platform. Data were obtained from profiles accessed on May 28, 2026, and from the 2024 financial summaries displayed in those profiles. The measurement audit found zero variance in the codable trust and accountability elements and revealed that the donation button and visit link are mutually exclusive routing options. A formative Breadth of Action Opportunities index consisting of the donation button, call for volunteers, and online store was used in the analysis. Visibility ratios were evaluated with Wilson confidence intervals, organization type differences with the Mann–Whitney U test, and financial relationships with Spearman correlations, bootstrap confidence intervals, FDR correction, permutation tests and sensitivity analyses. Among the 60 complete cases, 6.67% showed all three action opportunities. The index was positively correlated with donation amount and total income but not significantly associated with the donation/income ratio. When total income was controlled for, the donation association was attenuated and no longer statistically significant. The findings suggest that digital action infrastructure may reflect organizational capacity rather than donation intensity and that platform architecture should be treated as a measurement condition in digital visibility research.

Keywords: third sector marketing; digital trust signals; online accountability; action opportunities; digital fundraising

Öz

Bu araştırma, Açık Açık platformunda yer alan 77 sivil toplum kuruluşunun kamuya açık profillerinde görünür kılınan güven ve hesap verebilirlik sinyallerini, platform yönlendirme biçimlerini ve paydaş eylem olanaklarını incelemektedir. Veriler, 28 Mayıs 2026 tarihinde erişilen kurumsal profiller ile bu profillerde gösterilen 2024 finansal büyüklüklerinden elde edilmiştir. Yapılandırılmış dijital profil denetiminde göstergeler görünür, görünür değil veya güvenilir biçimde kodlanamadı olarak sınıflandırılmıştır. Ölçüm denetimi, güven ve hesap verebilirlik maddelerinin kodlanabilir profillerde sıfır varyans gösterdiğini; bağış butonu ile ziyaret bağlantısının platform mimarisi içinde birbirini dışlayan yönlendirme seçenekleri olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu nedenle birincil analiz, bağış butonu, gönüllülük çağrısı ve çevrim içi mağazadan oluşan üç maddeli biçimlendirici Eylem Olanakları

Önerilen Atıf /Suggested Citation

Saygın, E., 2026, Digital Trust Signals and Action Affordances in Third Sector Organizations: An Exploratory Analysis of 77 NGO Profiles on the Açık Açık Platform, Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi Dergisi, 61(3), 3361-3380.

Genişliği endeksiyle yürütülmüştür. Görünürlük oranları Wilson güven aralıklarıyla, kuruluş türü farklılıkları Mann–Whitney U testiyle ve finansal ilişkiler Spearman korelasyonu, bootstrap güven aralıkları, FDR düzeltmesi, permütasyon testi ve duyarlılık analizleriyle değerlendirilmiştir. Tam verisi bulunan 60 kuruluşun yalnızca %6,67'si üç olanağın tamamını sunmuştur. Endeks bağış tutarı ve toplam gelirle pozitif ilişkiliyken bağış/gelir oranıyla istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki saptanmamıştır. Toplam gelir kontrol edildiğinde bağış ilişkisi zayıflamış ve istatistiksel anlamlılığını yitirmiştir. Bulgular, dijital eylem altyapısının bağış yoğunluğundan çok örgütsel kapasiteyle bağlantılı olabileceğini ve platform mimarisinin dijital görünürlük ölçümlerinde bir ölçüm koşulu olarak ele alınması gerektiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *üçüncü sektör pazarlaması; dijital güven sinyalleri; çevrim içi hesap verebilirlik; eylem olanağı; dijital fon geliştirme*

1. Introduction

Third sector organizations have a critical position in contemporary societies in terms of generating social benefits, providing support to disadvantaged groups, conducting rights-based advocacy, providing social services and contributing to the solution of public problems. However, the sustainability of these organizations cannot be explained solely by the claim of mission, goodwill or social benefit. NGOs should establish trust-based relationships with donors, volunteers, beneficiaries, supporters, members, public institutions and private sector actors; they need to make their social impact visible and be able to direct their stakeholders to concrete action. For this reason, marketing in the context of the third sector is too broad to be reduced to the logic of commercial sales; it is a strategic area that is directly related to trust, legitimacy, accountability, social impact and stakeholder value proposition.

The nonprofit marketing literature examines the marketing practices of nonprofits under headings such as donor relations, volunteer engagement, social marketing, brand trust, market orientation, and stakeholder communication. Recent systematic reviews show that the field of nonprofit marketing is expanding; however, they also indicate that new research designs are needed in digitalization, online donation, digital interaction, and stakeholder-based value creation (Werke & Bogale, 2024, p. 603). This need makes it necessary to examine the digital profiles of NGOs not only as a promotional area, but also in terms of trust generation, accountability and stakeholder action.

The digital environment is much more than just a technical tool for increasing visibility for NGOs. Websites, donation platforms, social media accounts and corporate profile pages are public contact areas that show who organizations are, what values they have, how they use resources, what social impacts they produce and what kind of contribution they expect from stakeholders. Saxton and Guo (2011, pp. 270-272) discuss online accountability with the dimensions of disclosure and dialogue and show that nonprofit organizations can use internet-based tools for accountability purposes. Lovejoy and Saxton (2012, pp. 337-338) draw attention to the potential of digital environments to mobilize stakeholders by evaluating nonprofit digital communication through information, community and action functions.

The starting point of this research is this: An NGO's digital profile is not just an informational corporate page, but a marketing touchpoint where trust, transparency, social impact, and call-to-action signals are generated for donors, volunteers, beneficiaries, and supporters. Freeman's stakeholder approach suggests that all groups that affect or are affected by the achievement of an organization's goals are at the center of organizational strategy (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Moving to the context of the third sector, this approach makes it possible to treat the digital profiles of NGOs as a common public space in which a value proposition for different stakeholder groups is made visible. For this reason, financial information, board of directors, employee list, independent audit report, social impact report, and annual report are treated as trust and accountability signals. Donation button, volunteer call, and online store visibility represent potential calls to action, whereas the website visit link is examined as a platform routing field.

In the marketing literature, it is accepted that nonprofit organizations also need marketing-oriented strategies in terms of providing resources, gaining supporters, maintaining voluntary participation, building trust and managing stakeholder relations. The meta-analysis by Shoham, Ruvio, Vigoda-Gadot, and Schwabsky (2006, pp. 464) reveals that there are significant relationships between market orientation and organizational performance in voluntary and nonprofit organizations. Kara, Spillan, and

DeShields (2004, p. 59) also empirically examined the link between market orientation and performance in nonprofit service providers.

Relationship marketing literature emphasizes that long-term relationships are built on trust and commitment. Morgan and Hunt's commitment-trust theory suggests that successful relationship marketing requires relationship commitment and trust as key mediating variables (Morgan & Hunt, 1994, p. 20). When this approach is moved to the context of the third sector, it is clear that donor or volunteer relationships cannot be sustained with periodic campaign communication; rather, they should be structured on reliability, mutual value and continuity. Sargeant and Lee's study in the context of charities also shows that donor trust and relationship commitment are important for donation behavior (Sargeant & Lee, 2004, p. 185).

Signaling theory and the legitimacy approach are also important for understanding the digital visibility of NGOs. Spence's (1973, pp. 355-356) signaling approach reveals that observable signals gain meaning for decision makers in cases where uncertainty and information gaps are present. In the context of the third sector, the donor, volunteer, or supporter often does not have direct access to the inner workings of the organization. In this case, financial information, annual report, independent audit report, board visibility, and social impact narrative can act as outward signals about the organization's credibility. Suchman's legitimacy approach provides a basis for interpreting digital disclosures as public-facing elements through which organizations seek to be perceived as socially acceptable, appropriate, and desirable (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

The study examines the digital visibility indicators and 2024 financial visibility data of 77 NGOs profiled on the Açık Açık platform. The Açık Açık platform is a convenient data source for this research, as it provides a structure that makes the information and document provision status of the profiled NGOs publicly visible. However, platform data is treated as public digital profile visibility data, not official audit data. Therefore, in this research, it was not the actual internal transparency performance of the organizations, but the indicators of trust, social impact, digital marketing and financial visibility that they presented in their Açık Açık profiles.

The existing literature provides significant knowledge on nonprofit marketing, market orientation, donor trust, relationship marketing, online accountability, and social media use. However, a significant portion of these studies address trust, accountability, social impact, digital calls to action, and financial outcomes separately. Studies based on standardized profile platforms may also treat every visible field as an independent organizational choice, even when interface rules make fields mandatory, mutually exclusive, or structurally dependent. This study addresses that gap by separating descriptive trust signals from stakeholder action pathways, auditing the measurement structure before index construction, and examining whether action pathway breadth is associated with the financial aggregates displayed in Açık Açık profiles.

1.1. Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

The nonprofit marketing literature discusses the marketing practices of nonprofit organizations under headings such as donor relations, volunteer participation, social marketing, brand trust, market orientation and stakeholder communication. Recent systematic reviews show that this field is expanding on the axes of digitalization, online donation, digital interaction, and stakeholder-based value creation (Jung, Kim, & Suh, 2023; Werke & Bogale, 2024, p. 603). This framework makes it necessary to examine the digital profiles of NGOs not only as a promotional area but also in terms of trust generation, accountability and stakeholder capacity to take action.

Third sector marketing does not mean direct transfer of business marketing to NGOs. Marketing in this field consists of the processes of establishing a relationship of trust with stakeholders, making social value visible, strengthening donor and volunteer loyalty, offering accountability to the public and producing corporate legitimacy rather than selling to the consumer. The meta-analysis of Shoham et al. (2006, pp. 453-454) shows that there are significant relationships between market orientation and organizational performance in voluntary and nonprofit organizations. Kara, Spillan, and DeShields (2004, p. 59) also empirically examined the link between market orientation and performance in nonprofit service providers.

The stakeholder approach provides an important theoretical basis for understanding the digital profiles of third sector organizations. Freeman's stakeholder theory suggests that groups that affect or are affected by the achievement of an organization's goals are at the center of organizational strategy (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). For NGOs, this approach becomes even more critical because donors, volunteers, beneficiaries, supporters, public institutions and society are often stakeholders with different expectations and forms of contribution. For this reason, NGO marketing is not a one-way promotional activity, but strategic relationship management in which different value propositions are presented to different stakeholders.

For third sector organizations, trust is one of the basic conditions of corporate sustainability. The donor or volunteer does not directly experience the result of their contribution in most cases; they make decisions based on the organization's credibility, accountability, and social impact narrative.

Relationship marketing theory considers trust and commitment as the basic mechanisms of sustainable exchange relationships (Morgan & Hunt, 1994, p. 20). The link of donor trust to relationship commitment and behavior in the context of charities has been empirically demonstrated (Sargeant & Lee, 2004, p. 185). However, trust is not only established by the organization's declaration of goodwill. It is important for donors to have access to observable information about the organization's effectiveness and use of financial resources; there is evidence that activity and financial information presentation can affect donation behavior (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011, pp. 942–943).

A digital profile is an initial touchpoint in this relationship. The board of directors, employees, annual report, audit report, and social impact narrative provide information about the organization's identity and accountability. Donation, volunteering, or online store links make visible ways in which the stakeholder can actually participate in the relationship. This study conceptualizes the first group as "trust and accountability signals" and the second group as "action opportunities".

1.2. Online Accountability, Signaling, and Legitimacy

Accountability is a multifaceted relationship that determines to which stakeholders, on what issues, and through which mechanisms an organization discloses information. Reports and disclosure statements, performance evaluation, participation, self-regulation and social audit are different accountability mechanisms within this relationship (Ebrahim, 2003, pp. 813–817). Online environments increase the public reach of these mechanisms, but do not eliminate the difference between disclosure and actual performance. Recent research likewise treats online accountability as multidimensional, including accessibility, engagement, performance, governance, and mission-related practices rather than document visibility alone (Cooley, 2024, pp. 4-6).

Based on signaling theory, it can be said that observable signals are important in the evaluations of decision makers under information asymmetry (Spence, 1973, pp. 355–356). When a donor does not have direct access to the organization's internal processes, a link to a financial statement, board list, or audit report can create a signal about corporate credibility. On the other hand, the legitimacy approach defines legitimacy as the perception or acceptance of an organization's actions as desirable, appropriate, or fitting within a system of socially constructed norms, values, beliefs, and definitions (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

Online openness indices demonstrate that online information can be systematically encoded (Nazuk & Shabbir, 2018, pp. 1–4; Nazuk, Nadir, Ansari, & Nawaz, 2020, pp. 1–4). However, a link being visible does not necessarily mean it is current, accessible, accurate, or comprehensive. Therefore, the current research does not aim to measure the level of transparency; it only measures the visibility of information and trust signals related to transparency.

1.3. Digital Action Opportunities and Platform Routing Architecture

The affordance perspective on technology considers a digital feature not only as a technical object but also in terms of the potential for action it offers to the user. Opportunities are "potentials for action" arising from the relationship between fixed technical specifications and users' intentions and context of use (Vaast & Káganer, 2013, pp. 79-80). In this study, an opportunity for action is defined as the visible way that technically enables a profile visitor to perform a specific action.

The donation button represents a direct financial contribution, the call to volunteer represents a contribution of time and effort, and the online store represents a way to support the mission through purchase. These indicators are not reflections of each other; each constitutes a different element of the field of action. They can therefore be aggregated into a formative coverage index, but are not expected to show internal consistency or unidimensional factor structure (Coltman et al., 2008, pp. 1251–1254; Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001, pp. 270–272).

Digital fundraising research shows that online donation appeals can increase donations to the focal organization; however, this increase may partly substitute for donations to similar causes (Adena & Hager, 2025, pp. 3216–3218, 3227–3229). Message diversity was correlated with higher donations, while dialogue and community orientation, content quality, and functional organizational framework were reported as important elements of digital fundraising success (Bhati & McDonnell, 2025, pp. 729–731; Harken, Mertins, & Urselmann, 2025). Salido-Andrés, Rey-García, Álvarez-González, and Vázquez-Casielles (2022, p. 773) found no significant impact on online campaign success when they measured disclosure by text length. In contrast, providing up-to-date information on campaign progress and the eventual use of funds was found to be significantly associated with campaign success (Salido-Andrés, Rey-García, Álvarez-González, & Vázquez-Casielles, 2022, pp. 773–774). In addition, larger organizations may invest more in digital infrastructure, suggesting that the association between visibility and donation amount may reflect reverse causality or a shared capacity factor.

Measured paths of action on external platforms are not independent of the platform's design decisions. If one interface hides one connection while displaying another, the two indicators represent alternative states of the same routing slot, rather than independent organizational choices. Therefore, platform architecture is not just a data source, but also part of the measurement model.

2. Purpose and Method

2.1. Purpose of the Research and Research Questions

The aim of this research is to systematically code the digital trust, transparency, social impact, digital marketing, and financial visibility indicators of NGOs participating in the Açık Açık platform; to separate defining trust signals from non-redundant stakeholder action opportunities; and to examine how platform design influences the creation and interpretation of a formative index. The following research questions were addressed:

RQ1. At what levels are trust and accountability signals and digital action pathways visible in Açık Açık profiles?

RQ2. Are the donation button and the website visit link independent indicators, or do they reflect a structural dependency created by the platform?

RQ3. Does the breadth of the three retained stakeholder action opportunities differ between associations and foundations?

RQ4. Is the breadth of action opportunities related to donation amount, total income, and the donation/income ratio; and does the association with donations persist after controlling for total income?

2.2. Research Design and Analytical Sample

The research is a quantitative, structured digital profile audit. The unit of analysis is not the individual, but the corporate NGO profile. No questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, experiments or participant observations were conducted. The analytical sample consists of 77 unique NGO profiles included in the researcher's archived dataset, compiled from publicly accessible profiles on the Açık Açık platform (Açık Açık, n.d.). This sample does not represent all NGOs in Turkey, particularly those that have never participated in the platform.

The profiles were accessed on May 28, 2026. For each record, the entity name, legal type, field of activity, profile URL, date accessed, coding note, and financial data source were retained. The sample consists of 42 associations, 33 foundations, one community organization and one association/foundation category. Digital visibility indicators represent the profile status in 2026, and financial indicators

represent the 2024 accounting period; therefore, the two data levels were not considered concurrent measurements.

Table 1: Analytical Sample by Organization Type

Organization type	n	%
Association	42	54.55
Foundation	33	42.86
Community organization	1	1.30
Association/Foundation	1	1.30
Total	77	100.00

2.3. Data Levels and Coding Rules

Two levels of evidence were used in the research. The D2 level refers to whether the area or link is visible in the Açık Açık profile. The D2F level, on the other hand, refers to the annual donation total and total income for 2024 displayed in the profile's financial information. D2F values are not treated as independently audited financial statements, but as financial aggregates publicly displayed on the platform. Because D2 records field visibility at the 2026 audit date whereas D2F contains archived 2024 financial values retained in the study file, the number of codable D2 records may differ from the number of available D2F observations.

The coding used a 1, 0, and NA format. "1" indicates that the indicator is clearly visible; "0" indicates that the relevant field is not explicitly present or is shown in the form of "-"; "NA" indicates that a reliable decision cannot be made. NA values were not treated as absence in the primary analysis. In the sensitivity analysis, the NA = 0 scenario was calculated separately and interpreted only as the conservative lower bound.

Coding decisions were made by a single coder, using predefined decision rules and audit notes for each record. Since there is no independent second coder, intercoder reliability could not be estimated. This is one of the important limitations of the research.

2.4. Measurement Audit and Operationalization of Variables

First, all visibility items were checked in terms of distributions, missingness, and pairwise relationships. No "0" was observed in the codable records for financial information, board of directors, employee list, independent audit report, social impact report, annual report, or project/story items. Because these items did not differentiate among organizations, they were not combined into an inferential index, and inferential tests were not performed.

A second measurement check revealed that the donation button and the "visit" link were excluded from each other and summarized together across all 61 profiles where everything else could be coded. This results in the two fields appearing as alternative states within the same platform redirection slot. The "visit" variable was excluded as a standalone action element and retained only as a platform redirection category.

The primary formative index is the sum of donation button, call for volunteering, and online store visibility. The Breadth of Action Opportunities index ranges from 0 to 3; for comparable presentation, it is divided by three and multiplied by 100. Since the three indicators constitute different types of actions, Cronbach's alpha, factor analysis, and reflective scale validity tests were not applied.

Table 2: Measurement Status of Variables and Their Use in Analysis

Dimension/variable	Operational definition	Status in the analysis
Trust/accountability signals	Profile visibility of financial, board, employee, and report areas	Descriptive due to zero variance
Platform routing format	Donate button or "visit" link to corporate site	Separate routing category because of mutual exclusivity
Breadth of Action Opportunities	Donation button + call for volunteering + online store; 0–3	Primary formative index
2024 donation amount	Annual donation total as shown in profile	Spearman and partial rank correlation
2024 total income	Total income as displayed in the profile	Spearman correlation; control for financial scale
Donation/income ratio	Annual donation / total income	Donation intensity indicator

2.5. Statistical Analysis

The analyses were conducted in the Python 3.13.5 environment using NumPy 2.3.5, SciPy 1.17.0, and statsmodels 0.14.6. All hypothesis tests were two-sided and the significance level was determined as .05. For reproducibility of results, a fixed random seed of 20260714 was used in resampling and permutation processes.

In the first stage, organization types and visibility frequencies for individual items were calculated and Wilson 95% confidence intervals were given for the observed binary rates. NA values were not treated as absence in the primary analysis. The missingness pattern was investigated by comparing the profiles in which all three action items were coded and the profiles in which at least one item could not be coded with the Mann–Whitney U tests in terms of donations, income, donation/income ratio and year of establishment.

In the second stage, the joint distribution of donation and visit variables was examined; after their mutual exclusivity was established, the Breadth of Action Opportunities based on three items was calculated. The primary analysis was based on 60 profiles in which all three items were coded. In the additional sensitivity analysis, all 77 profiles were evaluated by accepting NA values as zero. In the third stage, associations and foundations were compared with the Mann–Whitney U test and reported as the rank biserial correlation effect size. Multiple subgroup tests were not performed because there were no predefined and sufficiently large comparison groups in the fields of activity.

In the fourth stage, the relationships between the Breadth of Action Opportunities and donation, income and donation/income ratio were examined with the Spearman rank correlation. 95% confidence intervals were calculated by 10,000 paired percentile bootstrap resamples. In the predefined test family consisting of three financial outcomes, the p values were subjected to Benjamini–Hochberg false discovery rate correction. The association with donations was also evaluated using partial rank correlation while controlling for total income, and the two-sided p value was obtained with 10,000 permutations. Whether the results were driven by a single organization was tested by a leave-one-out analysis. Since the Spearman test is based on ranks, financial variables were not subjected to logarithmic transformation.

2.6. Ethical Status

In the study, no data were collected from human participants, and no personal or sensitive data identifying donors, volunteers, or beneficiaries were processed. Only publicly available corporate profile data and financial visibility information were used. Therefore, the study was evaluated as outside the scope of research requiring ethics committee approval for human participants.

3. Findings

3.1. Indicator Visibility and Codability

Trust and accountability indicators showed high conditional visibility in codable profiles. However, the absence of a "0" in these items indicates that there is no differentiation between organizations and that visibility is conditioned by platform participation/template structure. For this reason, 100 percent observed rates should not be interpreted as the de facto transparency of NGOs in Turkey.

Table 3: Visibility of Profile Indicators

Indicator	Visible	Not visible	NA	Observed %	95% CI	All n=77 %
Financial Information	64	0	13	100.00	[94.34; 100.00]	83.12
Board of Directors	62	0	15	100.00	[94.17; 100.00]	80.52
Employee list	62	0	15	100.00	[94.17; 100.00]	80.52
Independent audit report	62	0	15	100.00	[94.17; 100.00]	80.52
Social impact report	62	0	15	100.00	[94.17; 100.00]	80.52
Annual report	62	0	15	100.00	[94.17; 100.00]	80.52
Project/story	66	0	11	100.00	[94.50; 100.00]	85.71
Donate button	11	50	16	18.03	[10.38; 29.47]	14.29
Call for volunteering	36	25	16	59.02	[46.50; 70.46]	46.75
Visit link	50	11	16	81.97	[70.53; 89.62]	64.94
Online store	39	37	1	51.32	[40.29; 62.22]	50.65

Note. "Observed %" is based only on profiles coded 0/1. "All n = 77 %" is the conservative lower bound, which does not treat NA records as visible; NA is not evidence of absence.

3.2. Platform Routing Architecture

In none of the 61 profiles in which both the donation button and the visit link could be coded did the two links appear simultaneously. In 11 profiles, the donation button was visible and the visit link was absent; in 50 profiles, the donation button was absent and the visit link was visible. Therefore, the two variables were perfectly negatively associated ($\phi = -1.00$), and their sum equaled 1 for every record. Including both items in a four-item action index would therefore have added a constant score of 1 to every observation.

Table 4: Joint Distribution of Donate Button and Visit Link (n = 61)

Donate button	Visit link	n	Comment
Visible	Not visible	11	Direct donation routing
Not visible	Visible	50	Indirect routing to the corporate website
Visible	Visible	0	Not observed
Not visible	Not visible	0	Not observed

Note. The two fields are not independent visibility indicators; they are considered alternative referral states of the platform.

3.3. Breadth of Action Opportunities

All three independent action items could be coded in 60 profiles. Of these profiles, 15 (25.00%) made no action opportunity visible, 18 (30.00%) made one, 23 (38.33%) two, and only 4 (6.67%) made all three action opportunities visible. The mean of the normalized index is 42.22 and the median is 33.33. In the NA = 0 sensitivity scenario, the mean decreases to 37.23, but the basic pattern of the distribution does not change.

Table 5: Breadth of Action Opportunities Distribution and Descriptive Statistics

Analysis	n	Mean	Median	SD	Quartiles	Min–Max.
Analysis of complete cases (3 items)	60	42.22	33.33	30.60	25.00–66.67	0–100
Conservative sensitivity (NA=0)	77	37.23	33.33	29.60	0.00–66.67	0–100

Note. Index = (donation button + call for volunteering + online store) / 3 × 100. Complete case distribution: 0 action opportunities n = 15; 1 action opportunity n = 18; 2 action opportunities n = 23; 3 action opportunities n = 4.

3.4. Organization Type and Missingness Sensitivity

In the complete case sample, the mean number of action opportunities was 1.19 for associations and 1.35 for foundations. The difference was not significant ($U = 382.00$, $p = .581$, rank biserial $r = -.082$). The result also did not change in the NA = 0 sensitivity analysis ($U = 646.50$, $p = .605$, rank biserial $r = -.067$). This finding suggests that legal status does not strongly distinguish the breadth of action opportunities in this sample.

Table 6: Mean Comparison by Organization Type (0–3)

Organization type	n	Mean	U	p	Rank biserial r
Association	32	1.19	382.00	.581	-.082
Foundation	26	1.35	—	—	—

There is no significant difference between the 60 fully coded and the 17 incompletely coded profiles in terms of donation amount ($p = .197$), total income ($p = .246$) and year of establishment ($p = .618$). Although the donation/income ratio was higher in the incompletely coded group, the difference was not statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($p = .071$). There is therefore no clear evidence that the complete case results are based solely on financially small organizations; still, it is not assumed that the missingness is completely random.

3.5. Relationships Between Financial Visibility and Opportunities for Action

The total annual donations for 2024 range from 0 to 1,945,434,023 TL, and the total income ranges from 283,041 to 3,342,735,368 TL. The distributions are strongly skewed to the right; for this reason, medians were taken as a basis in the interpretation of central tendencies and relationships were examined with methods based on ranks.

Table 7: 2024 Financial Visibility Indicators

Indicator	n	Mean	Median	Quartiles	Min.–Max.
Annual donation total (TL)	77	61,753,874	7,025,732	1,465,650–20,607,436	0–1,945,434,023
Total income (TL)	77	113,271,381	12,618,728	4,010,187–58,360,325	283,041–3,342,735,368
Donation/income ratio	77	0.527	0.622	0.322–0.775	0.000–0.970

Table 8: Relationships Between Breadth of Action Opportunities and Financial Indicators

Analysis	Financial indicator	n	ρ / partial r	95% CI	p	FDR q
Analysis of complete cases	Donation amount	60	0.430	[0.181; 0.646]	< .001	< .001
Analysis of complete cases	Total income	60	0.484	[0.275; 0.660]	< .001	< .001
Analysis of complete cases	Donation/income ratio	60	0.204	[-0.056; 0.455]	0.117	0.117
NA=0 sensitivity	Donation amount	77	0.398	[0.181; 0.586]	< .001	< .001
NA=0 sensitivity	Total income	77	0.419	[0.214; 0.593]	< .001	< .001
NA=0 sensitivity	Donation/income ratio	77	0.139	[-0.091; 0.360]	0.229	0.229
Partial rank correlation	Donation amount (controlling for total income)	60	0.101	[-0.172; 0.413]	0.450	—

Note. The rows for complete cases and NA = 0 report Spearman's ρ ; the partial rank correlation row reports partial r. Confidence intervals are based on 10,000 paired percentile bootstrap resamples. In the partial rank correlation, the p value was calculated with 10,000 permutations. FDR q values were corrected using the Benjamini–Hochberg method within the test family of three financial outcomes. All tests are two sided.

In the complete case analysis, the Breadth of Action Opportunities index was moderately and positively correlated with donation amount ($\rho = .430$, 95% CI [.181, .646], $q < .001$). The point estimate for total income was somewhat larger ($\rho = .484$, 95% CI [.275, .660], $q < .001$), although the two coefficients were not directly compared. The association with the donation/income ratio was weak and not significant ($\rho = .204$, 95% CI [-.056, .455], $q = .117$). The sensitivity analysis treating NA values as 0 produced the same substantive pattern.

After adjustment for total income as an indicator of organizational financial scale, the association with donation amount was attenuated and was no longer statistically significant (partial r = .101, 95% CI [-.172, .413], permutation p = .450). In the leave-one-out analysis, the donation correlation ranged from .404 to .498 and the total-income correlation from .460 to .526. Thus, no single organization drove the bivariate associations.

Analyses of individual indicators showed the largest point estimates for online store visibility: $\rho = .443$ with total income and $\rho = .448$ with donation amount, with both q values below .001 after FDR adjustment. Donation button visibility was associated with total income ($\rho = .339$, $q = .011$) but not with

donation amount after FDR adjustment ($p = .264$, $q = .060$). Volunteer call visibility was not significantly associated with either financial indicator.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

4.1. Decoupling Trust Signals from Action Opportunities

The initial finding of the research is the widespread visibility of areas of trust and accountability in codable profiles. However, zero variance in these areas suggests that the result may be related to platform selection, profile template, and the availability of codable information rather than high organizational transparency. A clear distinction must therefore be made between "visible signal" and "de facto transparency". This distinction is a methodological implication of the current study's scope of measurement. It is emphasized in the literature that online accountability should be handled through multiple processes such as disclosure and dialogue (Cooley, 2024, pp. 4–6; Saxton and Guo, 2011, pp. 270–272).

The findings for action opportunities present a different picture. A quarter of organizations did not make any of the donation, volunteering or online store pathways visible; only 6.67% displayed all three. This result suggests that the visibility of information and accountability signals does not mean that pathways for stakeholder action are equally developed. Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012, pp. 337–338) information–community–action distinction and Bhati & McDonnell's (2025, pp. 723–724) literature review, both of which show that organizations use social media mainly for information dissemination, support this interpretation.

4.2. Platform Architecture as a Measurement Condition

A central case-based methodological finding of the study is the identification of mutual exclusivity between the donation button and the visit link. This relationship suggests that the two variables are not independent organizational behaviors, but rather alternative routing states offered by the platform. Adding two fields to the same index does not expand the scope of measurement; it adds a fixed score to each observation.

This finding suggests that platform architecture cannot be considered "background" in digital data exploration. Interface rules determine which features can appear together and thus partially produce statistical relationships. Before creating a composite index, researchers should check not only the correlations of the variables, but also their logical and design dependencies. The formative measurement approach's emphasis on content and indicator specificity is particularly important in this context (Coltman et al., 2008, pp. 1251–1254; Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001, pp. 270–272).

4.3. Financial Scale, Digital Capacity and Donation Intensity

At first glance, the positive relationships between the breadth of action opportunities and donation amount and total income can be interpreted as digital visibility supporting fundraising. There is empirical evidence that online fundraising can increase donations to the focal organization; however, it has also been reported that these effects may include partial substitution from donations made to similar purposes (Adena & Hager, 2025, pp. 3216–3218, 3227–3229). In addition, message diversity, dialogue and community orientation, content quality, and functional organizational framework are all associated with digital fundraising outcomes (Bhati & McDonnell, 2025, pp. 729–731; Harken et al., 2025).

However, the partial correlation result of the current study requires a more cautious interpretation of the donation relationship. When total income was controlled for, the association was attenuated and was no longer statistically significant. In addition, no statistically significant association was detected between the breadth of action and the share of donations in total income. The most consistent interpretation is that larger organizations may have greater capacity to develop digital infrastructure and multiple action channels. Reverse causality is also possible, but the cross-sectional design cannot determine the causal direction.

At the item level, the online store had the largest point estimates for the financial associations, although differences between the item correlations were not directly tested. An online store may reflect greater organizational capacity than the other links because it requires payment, logistics, and maintenance

infrastructure. The lack of an association between the call for volunteering and financial scale suggests that financial and participatory action pathways may not draw on the same organizational resources.

4.4. Case-Based Patterns and Methodological Implications

The first contribution is to conceptually separate visible trust signals and action opportunities in digital marketing in the third sector. Trust signals provide data for stakeholder evaluation; action opportunities provide a technical pathway for taking action. The two dimensions can complement each other, but they are not the same thing.

The second contribution is to identify the platform routing architecture as a distinct measurement layer beyond organizational visibility. In digital marketing research, the option structure of the interface shapes the measured variables as well as user behavior.

The third contribution is to separate financial scale and donation intensity in the relationship between visibility and finance. Action opportunities were associated with larger donation and total income figures, whereas their association with the share of donations in total income was not statistically significant. This distinction prevents an overly causal interpretation of the results as "digital marketing generates donations".

4.5. Implications for Managers and the Platform

NGO managers should consider that making reports, management information, and project narratives visible is not enough on its own, but it is necessary. Stakeholders need to have clear, up-to-date, and easy access to donation channels, volunteer applications, and purchase pathways that support the mission. However, it should not be expected that every organization will use all channels with the same intensity; the action architecture should be designed according to the mission, stakeholder profile and resource model. Platform operators can show both direct donations and corporate site referrals instead of offering them interchangeably. In addition, document year, timeliness, accessibility, and link functionality should be standardized fields. This streamlines user decision-making processes and enhances the relevance of research data. Funders and corporate supporters can consider digital action infrastructure not only as a communication option, but also as a capacity building space. In particular, small organizations' access to secure donation systems, volunteer application systems, and sustainable online sales infrastructure can be bolstered by shared technology services.

4.6. Limitations and Future Research

The first limitation of the study is that it is limited to 77 profiles on a single external platform. The findings cannot be generalized to all NGOs in Turkey and may be influenced by platform participation. The second limitation relates to the D2 and D2F data levels. The document content, year, timeliness, and functionality of the visible report fields have not been validated at the D3 level.

The third limitation is the use of a single coder. Although decision rules and coding notes supported reproducibility, intercoder reliability could not be estimated. Future work should use at least two coders, publish a pre-registered codebook, and report on the dispute resolution process.

The fourth limitation is the temporal mismatch between the 2026 digital profile indicators and the 2024 financial data in this cross-sectional design. The opportunity for action indicators reflect the profile structure observed at 28 May 2026, while the financial indicators reflect the 2024 accounting period. Therefore, relationships cannot be interpreted as concurrent or future effects.

Opportunities for action may arise from financial capacity, but they may also be influenced by managerial capacity and unobservable factors such as brand awareness, professional fundraising capacity, and digital budget.

Future research should compare multiple platforms, disaggregate the impact of platform design on visibility scores, and measure the consequences of digital action pathways on clicks, applications, donation conversions, and trust perceptions. Adding capacity variables such as organizational size, number of employees, digital budget and brand awareness will also strengthen the interpretation of financial scale. The equal weighting of the three indicators is an exploratory specification, not an empirically validated weighting scheme. Future studies should test the index's content and criterion

validity, intercoder reliability, measurement stability across platforms and samples, and alternative weighting structures.

4.7. Conclusion

This study analyzed indicators of digital trust, social impact, stakeholder action, and financial visibility of 77 NGOs profiled on the Açık Açık platform. Signals of trust and accountability were common in the codable profiles, but digital pathways for stakeholder action were more limited. Importantly, the donation button and website visit link were not independent indicators; they were mutually exclusive redirection options generated by the platform. A three-item formative index shows how many of the donation, volunteering, and online store pathways were provided. The index was correlated with donation amount and total revenue, but not with the share of revenue generated from donations. After adjusting for total revenue, the donation correlation was no longer statistically significant. Therefore, digital action visibility should be interpreted not as direct evidence of donation effectiveness, but as a feature that can move in line with the scale and digital capacity of the organization. The key takeaway from third-sector marketing is that appearing trustworthy and facilitating stakeholder action are related but distinct. Public profiles should be evaluated not only based on what organizations disclose, but also on which actions are technically accessible and how the platform shapes that accessibility.

5. Declarations

Ethical statement: No data were collected from human participants in this research. No questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, observations, or experiments were used. Personal data, donor identity, volunteer identity, beneficiary identity, or sensitive personal data were not processed in the study. The study used only publicly available corporate NGO profiles and the visibility indicators contained in those profiles. For this reason, the study is not considered within the scope of research that requires ethics committee approval.

Financial support and conflict of interest statement: No financial support has been received from any person, institution or organization for this study. The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

Notice on the use of artificial intelligence: During the preparation process of this article, the author used AI-supported tools (Claude - Anthropic and ChatGPT - OpenAI) as auxiliary tools in the linguistic editing of the text, systematization of the conceptual framework, organization of data tables, and reporting of descriptive findings. The research problem, the selection of the theoretical framework, the identification of data sources, the design of the analysis, the interpretation of the findings, the literature comparisons, the derivation of the results, and the final scientific responsibility of the text belong entirely to the author. The AI outputs have been carefully reviewed, verified, edited or rejected as needed by the author. All data used in the study were obtained from publicly available primary sources, especially the NGO profiles published on the Açık Açık platform and the 2024 financial visibility tables in these profiles and were not generated by artificial intelligence. The originality, accuracy and scientific integrity of the article are the responsibility of the author.

References

- Açık Açık. (n.d.). Açık Açık STK platformu: Kamuya açık STK profilleri. 28 Mayıs 2026 tarihinde <https://acikacik.org/stk/sivil-toplum-kuruluslari> adresinden erişildi.
- Adena, M., & Hager, A. (2025). Does online fundraising increase charitable giving? A nationwide field experiment on Facebook. *Management Science*, 71(4), 3216–3231. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.00596>
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924–973. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>
- Bhati, A., & McDonnell, D. (2025). Message content and diversity as an effective nonprofit fundraising strategy on social media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 54(3), 721–736. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640241303920>

- Coltman, T., Devinney, T. M., Midgley, D. F., & Venaik, S. (2008). Formative versus reflective measurement models: Two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12), 1250–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.013>
- Cooley, A. (2024). Toward greater legitimacy: Online accountability practices of Ukrainian nonprofits. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(1), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14010004>
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index construction with formative indicators: An alternative to scale development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.269.18845>
- Ebrahim, A. (2003). Accountability in practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. *World Development*, 31(5), 813–829. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(03\)00014-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00014-7)
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.
- Harken, S., Mertins, V., & Urselmann, M. (2025). Online fundraising for nonprofit organizations via social media marketing: A critical success factors analysis in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. *Journal of Philanthropy* 30(3), e70028. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.70028>
- Jung, J., Kim, M., & Suh, J. (2023). The scope of “marketing” research in the nonprofit sector: Lessons from the last 20 years literature. *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing*, 28(4), e1745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1745>
- Kara, A., Spillan, J. E., & DeShields, O. W., Jr. (2004). An empirical investigation of the link between market orientation and business performance in nonprofit service providers. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2004.11658519>
- Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01576.x>
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302>
- Nazuk, A., Nadir, S., Ansari, A. R., & Nawaz, R. (2020). NGO online disclosures index in the presence of auxiliary information. *PLOS ONE*, 15(9), e0238297. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238297>
- Nazuk, A., & Shabbir, J. (2018). A new disclosure index for non-governmental organizations. *PLOS ONE*, 13(2), e0191337. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191337>
- Salido-Andrés, N., Rey-García, M., Álvarez-González, L. I., & Vázquez-Casielles, R. (2022). When the winner takes it all: Online campaign factors influencing the success of donation-based crowdfunding for charitable causes. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 19(4), 763–780. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-021-00320-4>
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Donor trust and relationship commitment in the U.K. charity sector: The impact on behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764004263321>
- Saxton, G. D., & Guo, C. (2011). Accountability online: Understanding the web-based accountability practices of nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(2), 270–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009341086>
- Shoham, A., Ruvio, A., Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Schwabsky, N. (2006). Market orientations in the nonprofit and voluntary sector: A meta-analysis of their relationships with organizational performance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), 453–476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006287671>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>

- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331>
- Vaast, E., & Káganer, E. (2013). Social media affordances and governance in the workplace: An examination of organizational policies. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(1), 78–101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12032>
- Werke, S. Z., & Bogale, A. T. (2024). Nonprofit marketing: A systematic review. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 36(5), 603–640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2023.2290531>

Appendix 1. Coding and Replication Rules

The following rules are provided to ensure that D2 profile visibility coding can be reapplied on the same data source. Coding is based on the visibility of the relevant field or link in the profile, not on the accuracy of its content.

Supplementary Table 1: Key Coding Decisions

Indicator	1 = visible	0 = not visible	NA = Not reliably codable
Financial Information	The financial information field is clearly visible in the profile	The field is clearly absent or "-"	Profile section inaccessible or insufficient evidence
Board of directors / employee list	The corresponding list or field appears	The field is clearly not available	The area could not be reliably evaluated
Report fields	A field or link for the report type appears	Report field clearly absent	Area/link visibility is unclear
Donate button	An active donation link or button is visible	No donation link or button is visible	Relevant section could not be coded
Call for volunteering	A volunteer application link is visible	There is clearly no way to volunteer	Relevant section could not be coded
Visit link	A link to the corporate website is visible	Redirection is clearly absent	Relevant section could not be coded
Online store	An online store, e-card, or sales link is visible	No store link is visible	Store status could not be determined
Project/story	A project, activity, or story field is visible	Field clearly absent	Profile content could not be coded

Appendix 2. Financial Relations at the Item Level**Supplementary Table 2: Spearman Correlations of Action Items with Financial Aggregates**

Item	n	Total income ρ [95% CI]	FDR q	Donation amount ρ [95% CI]	FDR q
Donate button	61	0.339 [0.057; 0.560]	0.011	0.264 [-0.037; 0.516]	0.060
Call for volunteering	61	0.218 [-0.032; 0.454]	0.092	0.199 [-0.061; 0.443]	0.124
Online store	76	0.443 [0.240; 0.621]	< .001	0.448 [0.240; 0.630]	< .001

Note. Confidence intervals are based on 10,000 paired percentile bootstrap resamples, and q values are based on the Benjamini–Hochberg correction for the three items within each financial outcome.

Araştırma Makalesi

Digital Trust Signals and Action Affordances in Third Sector Organizations: An Exploratory Analysis of 77 NGO Profiles on the Açık Açık Platform

Üçüncü Sektör Kuruluşlarında Dijital Güven Sinyalleri ve Eylem Olanakları: Açık Açık Platformundaki 77 STK Profiline Keşifsel Analizi

Esat SAYGIN

Öğr. Gör. Dr, Yüksek İhtisas Üniversitesi

Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu

esat.saygin@yuksekihtisas.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2784-2630>

Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma, Açık Açık platformunda profili bulunan üçüncü sektör kuruluşlarının kamuya açık dijital profillerinde güven, şeffaflık, sosyal etki, dijital pazarlama ve finansal görünürlük göstergelerini nasıl sunduklarını incelemektedir. Araştırmanın temel çıkış noktası, sivil toplum kuruluşlarının dijital profillerinin yalnızca kurumsal bilgi veren tanıtım sayfaları olarak değil, aynı zamanda bağışçı, gönüllü, yararlanıcı, destekçi, kamu kurumu ve özel sektör aktörleri için güven ve değer önerisi üreten temas noktaları olarak ele alınması gerektiğidir. Bu nedenle çalışma, kuruluşların gerçek iç şeffaflık düzeylerini, rapor içeriklerinin doğruluğunu ya da bağımsız denetim performansını ölçmeyi amaçlamamaktadır. Bunun yerine, kamuya açık dijital profillerde hangi güven sinyallerinin, sosyal etki göstergelerinin ve eylem çağrısı unsurlarının görünür kılındığını karşılaştırmalı biçimde analiz etmektedir.

Araştırmanın kuramsal zemini üçüncü sektör pazarlaması, paydaş yaklaşımı, ilişki pazarlaması, sinyal teorisi, meşruiyet yaklaşımı, çevrim içi hesap verebilirlik ve dijital bağış literatürüne dayanmaktadır. Paydaş yaklaşımı, örgütsel stratejinin yalnızca iç aktörlere veya finansal hedeflere indirgenemeyeceğini, örgütün amaçlarına etki eden veya bu amaçlardan etkilenen farklı paydaş gruplarının dikkate alınması gerektiğini göstermektedir. Üçüncü sektör bağlamında bu yaklaşım daha da kritik hâle gelmektedir; çünkü bağışçılar, gönüllüler, yararlanıcılar, üyeler ve kamuoyu farklı beklentilerle aynı kurumsal profile yönelmektedir. İlişki pazarlaması literatürü ise uzun vadeli bağışçı ve gönüllü ilişkilerinin güven ve bağlılık üzerinden sürdürülebileceğini vurgulamaktadır. Sinyal teorisi ve meşruiyet yaklaşımı da bilgi asimetrisinin bulunduğu durumlarda yıllık rapor, finansal bilgi, bağımsız denetim raporu, yönetim kurulu görünürlüğü ve sosyal etki anlatısı gibi unsurların dış paydaşlar açısından anlamlı güven işaretleri hâline gelebileceğini göstermektedir.

Çalışma nicel ağırlıklı yapılandırılmış dijital doküman analizi olarak tasarlanmıştır. Araştırmada insan katılımcılardan veri toplanmamış; anket, görüşme, odak grup, gözlem veya deney uygulanmamıştır. Veri kaynağı, Açık Açık platformunda kamuya açık biçimde yayımlanan STK profilleri ve bu profillerde yer alan 2024 finansal görünürlük tablolarıdır. Araştırmanın örneklemini platformda profili bulunan 77 sivil toplum kuruluşundan oluşmaktadır. Örnekleme 42 dernek, 33 vakıf, 1 topluluk ve 1 dernek/vakıf yer almaktadır. Bu nedenle çalışma, Türkiye'deki tüm sivil toplum kuruluşlarını temsil etme iddiası taşımamakta; operasyonel evrenini Açık Açık platformunda kodlanabilir profile sahip kuruluşlarla sınırlamaktadır.

Araştırmada iki veri düzeyi kullanılmıştır. D2 düzeyi, ilgili göstergenin Açık Açık profilinde görünür olup olmadığını ifade etmektedir. Örneğin faaliyet raporu alanının görünür olarak kodlanması, ilgili alanın profile yer aldığını gösterir; ancak rapor içeriğinin yılı, kapsamı veya doğruluğu bu düzeyde ayrıca doğrulanmamıştır. D2F düzeyi ise Açık Açık profillerindeki 2024 finansal görünürlük tablolarından yıllık bağış toplamı ve toplam gelir değişkenlerinin elde edilmesini ifade etmektedir. Kodlama mantığı üçlü bir yapı üzerine kurulmuştur: 1 ilgili göstergenin görünür olduğunu, 0 göstergenin görünür olmadığını, NA ise güvenilir biçimde kodlanmadığını göstermektedir. Kodlanamayan alanlar 0 kabul edilmemiştir. Böylece görünür olmama ile doğrulanamama durumlarının birbirine karıştırılması önlenmiştir.

Bu kapsamda güven ve şeffaflık görünürlüğü; finansal bilgi, yönetim kurulu, çalışan listesi, bağımsız denetim raporu, sosyal etki raporu ve faaliyet raporu değişkenleri üzerinden incelenmiştir. Bununla birlikte, çıkarımsal analizden önce yapılan ölçüm denetimi, bu göstergelerin kodlanabilir profillerde sıfır varyans gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Bağış butonu ile ziyaret bağlantısı da birlikte kodlanabildikleri 61 profil içinde birbirini dışlayan ve bütün olguları kapsayan iki platform yönlendirmesi olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu nedenle 11 maddeli toplam görünürlük endeksi kullanılmamış; birincil biçimlendirici Eylem Olanğı Genişliği (EOG) endeksi yalnızca bağış butonu, gönüllülük çağrısı ve çevrim içi mağaza göstergelerinden oluşturulmuştur. Endeks 0 ile 3 arasında hesaplanmış ve karşılaştırılabilir sunum için 0 ile 100 arasında normleştirilmiştir.

Bulgular, kodlanabilir profillerde güven, şeffaflık ve sosyal etki göstergelerinin oldukça yüksek görünürlüğe sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Finansal bilgi değişkeni gözlenen 64 kaydın tamamında, yönetim kurulu, çalışan listesi, bağımsız denetim raporu, sosyal etki raporu ve faaliyet raporu değişkenleri ise gözlenen 62 kaydın tamamında görünürdür. Bu sonuç, Açık Açık profillerinde güven ve hesap verebilirlik sinyallerinin güçlü biçimde sunulduğunu göstermektedir. Bununla birlikte, bu tam görünürlük gerçek iç şeffaflık performansı olarak değil, platformun standart profil yapısı içinde ilgili alanların görünürlük düzeyi olarak yorumlanmalıdır.

Eyleme yönlendiren göstergelerde daha sınırlı ve farklılaşmış bir yapı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bağış butonu, kodlanabilen 61 profil içinde 11 profile (%18,03); gönüllülük çağrısı 36 profile (%59,02) ve çevrim içi mağaza 76 profil içinde 39 profile (%51,32) görünürdür. Ziyaret bağlantısı 61 profil içinde 50 profile görünmekle birlikte, bağış butonunun bulunduğu hiçbir profile yer almamıştır. Dolayısıyla bu iki alan bağımsız kurumsal tercihler olarak değil, platformun sunduğu alternatif yönlendirme durumları olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu bulgu, platform mimarisinin yalnızca veri kaynağı değil, hangi göstergelerin birlikte ölçülebileceğini belirleyen yönetsel bir koşul olduğunu göstermektedir.

Üç eylem göstergesinin tamamının kodlandığı 60 profil içinde 15 kuruluş hiçbir eylem olanağı göstermemiş, 18 kuruluş bir, 23 kuruluş iki ve yalnızca 4 kuruluş üç olanağın tamamını sunmuştur. Normleştirilmiş EOG ortalaması 42,22, medyanı 33,33 ve standart sapması 30,60'tır. Derneklerin ortalaması 1,19, vakıfların ortalaması 1,35 olup aradaki fark anlamlı değildir ($U = 382,00$; $p = ,581$; rank-biserial $r = -,082$). EOG, bağış tutarı ($p = ,430$) ve toplam gelirle ($p = ,484$) pozitif ilişkiliyken bağışların toplam gelire oranıyla anlamlı biçimde ilişkili değildir ($p = ,204$; $q = ,117$). Toplam gelire göre yapılan kısmi sıra korelasyonunda bağış ilişkisi zayıflamış ve anlamlılığını yitirmiştir ($r = ,101$; $p = ,450$). Bir gözlem dışarıda bırakılarak tekrarlanan analizler, iki değişkenli ilişkilerin tek bir kuruluş tarafından sürüklenmediğini göstermiştir.

Bulguların uygulama açısından önemli sonuçları vardır. STK'ların dijital profillerinde finansal bilgi, yönetim kurulu, faaliyet raporu ve sosyal etki raporu gibi güven unsurlarını görünür kılmaları gerekli olmakla birlikte, bu görünürlüğün bağış, gönüllülük, üyelik veya kampanya katılımı gibi somut eylemlere bağlanması da gerekir. Özellikle bağış butonu görünürlüğünün düşük olması, dijital güven zemininin her zaman erişilebilir eylem yollarına dönüşmediğini göstermektedir. Bu nedenle STK'ların bağış süreçlerini açık, güven verici, kullanıcı dostu ve kolay erişilebilir biçimde yapılandırması; gönüllülük çağrılarını ise yalnızca sembolik açıklamalar olarak değil, başvuru sürecini kolaylaştıran işlevsel temas noktaları olarak tasarlamaları önerilmektedir.

Platformlar açısından bakıldığında, Açık Açık ve benzeri dijital ortamlar STK profillerinde yalnızca belge alanlarının bulunup bulunmadığını göstermenin ötesine geçebilir. Belgenin yılı, güncelliği, türü, erişilebilirliği ve bağlantı işlevselliği daha standart biçimde sunulduğunda kullanıcılar ilgili kuruluşun

yalnızca belge yayımlayıp yayımlamadığını değil, bu belgelerin ne kadar güncel ve değerlendirilebilir olduğunu da görebilir. Ayrıca doğrudan bağış ve kurumsal web sitesi yönlendirmelerinin birbirinin alternatifi olarak sunulması yerine her iki bağlantının birlikte gösterilmesi, hem kullanıcıların karar sürecini hem de platform verilerinin araştırma değerini güçlendirebilir.

Çalışmanın özgün yönü, görünür güven sinyalleri ile paydaşların teknik olarak erişebildiği eylem yollarını birbirinden ayırması ve platform mimarisini ölçüm modelinin bir parçası olarak değerlendirmesidir. Böylece makale, pazarlamayı yalnızca tanıtım veya kaynak geliştirme faaliyeti olarak değil, paydaş değer önerisini görünür kılan ve güveni erişilebilir eylem yollarıyla ilişkilendiren çok boyutlu bir stratejik alan olarak konumlandırmaktadır. Üç maddeli biçimlendirici endeks, psikometrik olarak doğrulanmış yansıtıcı bir ölçek değil, farklı eylem yollarının kapsamını gösteren keşifsel bir ölçüm aracıdır.

Etik açıdan araştırma, yalnızca kamuya açık kurumsal profil bilgilerinden ve platformda görünür finansal göstergelerden yararlandığı için kişisel veri işleme, katılımcı mahremiyeti veya yararlanıcı kimliğiyle ilgili bir risk üretmemektedir. Bununla birlikte, çalışma platform görünürlüğünü gerçek iç performansla özdeşleştirmeme konusunda özellikle dikkatli davranmaktadır. Tek platformla sınırlı örneklem, tek kodlayıcı kullanılması, profil göstergelerinin 2026'da, finansal göstergelerin ise 2024 dönemi için gözlenmesi ve olasılıklı örnekleme yapılmaması sonuçların sınırlarını oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle çıkarımsal sonuçlar keşifsel nitelikte değerlendirilmelidir.

Bu bulgular, EOG'nin yalnızca akademik bir ölçüm aracı değil, aynı zamanda profil iyileştirme ve dijital temas noktalarını önceliklendirme mekanizması olarak kullanılabileceğini düşündürmektedir. Kuruluşlar hangi güven göstergelerini görünür kıldıklarını ve hangi eylem yollarında zayıf kaldıklarını bu çerçeve üzerinden izleyebilir. Gelecek araştırmalarda endeksin içerik ve ölçüt geçerliği, kodlayıcılar arası güvenilirliği, farklı platform ve örneklemdeki ölçüm kararlılığı ile alternatif ağırlıklandırma yapıları sınanmalıdır. Çoklu platform karşılaştırmaları, en az iki bağımsız kodlayıcı, önceden hazırlanmış kod kitapları ve tıklama, başvuru, bağış dönüşümü ile güven algısı gibi sonuç ölçütleri ölçüm yaklaşımının sürekliliğini güçlendirecektir.