



Fatalism and donation intention: who is more in control of their own life?

Muhammed Bilgehan Aytaç¹ 

Received: 24 November 2022 / Accepted: 22 May 2023

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2023

Abstract

To date, consumer psychology literature has ignored the role of fatalistic beliefs in donation intention. Two subsequent quantitative survey studies ($N_s=289$; 350) address this issue by investigating consumers' fatalistic beliefs together with internal beliefs, empathy, and donation intention. In the first study, the new Fatalistic Story Scale is developed to measure how people evaluate others' fate vs. self-fate through hypothetical life events. The second study analyzed people's fatalistic beliefs' relationship with donation intention and empathy. Findings of the first study suggested that people approach others' lives more fatalistically than their own life. Considering this insight together with certain negative effects of fatalistic beliefs on beneficial and positive behaviors that have proven by studies from various disciplines, fatalism is expected to be negatively related to empathy and donation intention. Conversely, second study's findings suggested that fatalism positively predicts empathy and donation intention. This contradiction and other findings are discussed together with implications.

Keywords Fatalism · Prosocial consumption · Donation intention · Empathy · Locus of control

1 Introduction

The social and environmental crises that our world is experiencing today are increasing rapidly. Correspondingly, more and more businesses, NGO's and even governments are running charity campaigns. In daily life, consumers face prosocial appeals almost everywhere, whether in a grocery store or on their Instagram pages, and almost all appeals invite them to donate for a cause. Even total amount of charitable giving

✉ Muhammed Bilgehan Aytaç
bilgehanaytac@aksaray.edu.tr

¹ Communication Faculty, Aksaray University, Aksaray, Turkey

by individuals increasing gradually¹, research have shown that people are staying away from these prosocial requests for many different reasons (Andreoni, Rao, & Trachtman, 2017; DellaVigna et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2016).

It is already known that worrying or having concerns about a social or an environmental problem is not sufficient to motivate people to take action, which can be termed the value-action gap (e.g., Blake, 1999). This can occur when an individual feels little or no control over the possible outcome (Huebner & Lipsey, 1981) or feels the negative outcomes are uncontrollable (Peterson & Seligman, 1983). Furthermore, it is known that individuals increase their fatalistic attitudes when faced with complex issues, in order to reduce the stress they experience (Tang et al., 2014).

People develop locus of control beliefs based on their experiences about their interaction with the environment. If they perceive the action-outcome relationship as unpredictable, they are likely to develop beliefs in external control; if they perceive the outcome as more predictable, they incline to develop internal beliefs. One of the confusing concepts with the internal locus of control is self-efficacy. While both are related to future-oriented beliefs, self-efficacy is particularly about controlling one's effort rather than the outcome (Bradley & Sparks, 2002). Furthermore, self-efficacy can be more context-specific (Harp et al., 2017; Ma & Tschirhart, 2021; Labban et al., 2022).

Fate can be seen as the sum of the uncontrollable factors that affect an action or occurrence. It is generally analyzed under the phenomenon called external locus of control, which is a belief that outcomes of situations are determined by forces external to one's self, such as powerful others, luck, fate, or chance (Rotter, 1966). Ross and colleagues (1983) described fatalism as a belief in an external locus of control over the events in one's life (p. 384). Different from chance or luck, the essence of fate represents stronger beliefs about predetermination due to its reliance on more religious and powerful authorities. Luck or chance on the other hand represent more event-depending or action-related situations.² Prior research has discussed two distinct forms of fatalism: cosmological (Weber, 1930) and structural (Durkheim, 1897). According to this distinction, cosmological fatalism is based on belief systems, whereas structural fatalism stems from structural conditions such as extreme regulation (Acevedo, 2008). Supporting the Durkheimian view, by analyzing World Value Survey data, Ruiu (2013) found that over-regulated societies tend to be more fatalistic.

The ignorance and lack of action taken by people in the face of environmental problems is one of the biggest issues confronting social scientists today. Particularly, fatalistic beliefs in this context prevent people from taking action. In general, fatalists take bigger risks and neglect safety procedures (Kouabenan, 1998) and fatalism

¹ Giving by individuals in the USA almost consists of 70% of total giving (Giving USA Foundation, 2020).

² While the definition of luck in the Cambridge Dictionary emphasizes positive outcomes (*the force that causes things, especially good things, to happen to you by chance and not as a result of your own efforts or abilities*), the definition of fate (*what happens to a particular person or thing, especially something final or negative, such as death or defeat*) emphasizes negative outcomes and even death. I predict that this is because fate is perceived as more unchangeable such that one cannot prevent bad things if they are predetermined. On the other hand, luck or chance evokes more positive feelings which actually imply one can change the outcome if lucky when taking the action (Cambridge University Press, n.d.).

inhibits disaster preparedness (Baytiyeh & Naja, 2014; McClure et al., 2001). In a similar vein, the understanding that the world will end one day, apocalyptic discourse in other words, fosters the belief that climate change is also inevitable or unstoppable. Accordingly, people may believe that fighting against climate change is pointless (McNeish, 2017; Mayer & Smith, 2019; Suthirat & Takashi, 2013).

Overall, fatalistic beliefs motivate people to be apathetic toward not only environmental problems but also personal issues. People who believe they have control on their health are found to have greater psychological adaptation than those who do not hold this belief; moreover it is found that this belief is related to physical symptoms they experience (Shapiro et al., 1996). It has been shown that individuals' critical decisions are affected by fatalistic beliefs, such as choices about unemployment protection (D'Orlando et al., 2011). Also Ruiu (2012) found that fatalism creates a cultural barrier for entrepreneurship.

Even though it is one of the most discussed issues in psychology, literature to date has remained silent about the role of fatalism in prosocial consumption. Yurdakul and Atik (2016) found that fatalistic attributions to poverty make individuals to internalize their conditions and González and Lay (2017) found that this attributions reduced helping behavior by decreasing empathy. However, Gonzalez and Lay (2017) focused on a specific issue's fatalistic attribution and did not approach fatalism as a general belief. To put it differently, they evaluate fatalism in a specific context.

Before clarifying the relationship between fatalistic beliefs and prosocial consumption, I first examine whether people evaluate others' lives as more controllable than their own lives. Analyzing the first study's results allowed me to develop several hypotheses, which I then test in the second study which investigates the effect of various forms of fatalistic beliefs (divine control, general fatalism, luck, helplessness, and internality) on donation intention and empathy. Findings are discussed with theoretical contributions, implications for marketers, and directions for future studies.

1.1 Consumer fatalism

Numerous studies illustrate the importance of fatalistic beliefs on consumer decision making processes. According to Kalamas and colleagues (2014), consumers who attribute environmental change to external forces such as fate or luck are not apt to engage in pro-environmental behaviors. Several studies found that fatalist consumers are less likely to save money (Shapiro & Wu, 2011; Wu, 2005). Hoffman and colleagues (2003) found that consumers who believe they manage their own fates use the Internet instrumentally to support their other activities, whereas consumers who believe in the influence of external factors use the Web ritualistically to substitute for other activities like gathering with friends. Sarofim et al. (2022) illustrated the mediating role of belief-in-fate in explaining the effects of religiosity on customers' responses after service failure. The study showed that fatalistic beliefs lead to customer's forgiveness. Lin and Reich (2018) illustrated that consumers could choose the random option; in other words, they can choose to rely on chance for an outcome of the prosocial request, which may increase the amount and donation rate. Pentecost et al. (2017) also illustrated the internal locus of control beliefs negatively related to amotivation toward blood donation.

Instead of evaluating fatalism as a unique variable, consumer studies have mostly focused on locus of control in terms of: health locus of control, service locus of control, consumer locus of control, and weight locus of control. Bradley and Sparks (2002) put forward that consumers' expectations from services may be affected by their perception about locus of control. They developed the concept of service locus of control (consumers' belief that the service they get is determined by external forces such as powerful other or luck, or is internal) which other studies demonstrate has an effect on consumer behaviors like coproduction (Büttgen et al., 2012) in the service setting. Even though Busseri and colleagues (1998) developed the concept of consumer locus of control with a scale, their scale did not consider the role of fatalism. Using this scale, Watson (2009) found that consumers oriented towards external locus of control were more inclined to compulsive buying. Martin et al. (2007) found that females with external beliefs about weight – *a person's body weight is more a matter of fate and outside a person's control* – more positively evaluated large-sized female models in advertisements (p. 99). Workman and Studak (2007) found that female fashion followers who were oriented towards external locus of control indicated less capacity to entertain themselves compared with those oriented toward an internal locus. A number of studies illustrated beliefs about health locus of control affecting several consumption behaviors, such as organic food (Lee et al., 2018), smoking (Helmer et al., 2012) or checking food expiry dates (Ozcakir et al., 2014). Findings of the O'Connor and Kabadayi (2020)'s study suggested that consumers who have stronger beliefs on external forces such as fate, luck, and chance determine life events (i.e., external LOC) have lower health insurance literacy.

He et al. (2019) found that internal locus of control predicts Chinese consumers' intention to buy eco-friendly food. Similarly, Trivedi et al. (2015) found that the willingness to pay for environmental friendly products is higher for Indian consumers with a higher internal locus of control beliefs. Berman (1973) in an early study found that heavier smokers tended to be more external in their beliefs whereas nonsmokers inclined to be more internal in their beliefs. Buckley and Tuama (2010) found that men as health consumers tend to respond to public health promotion campaigns fatalistically.

In contradiction with the general opinion in the literature, Becheur et al. (2019) showed the positive effect of fatalism on persuasion to road safety advertising. Authors discussed this finding under the phenomenon of negotiable fate, which refers to that a person can negotiate control with fate by exercising agency within the limits that fate has determined (Chaturvedi et al., 2009; p.881), and for the authors, this finding may stem from the effort of negotiating with fate to sustain positive views (Au et al., 2012).

1.2 Current studies

The main focus of the current investigation is clarifying the relationship between fatalism and prosocial consumption. In the first study, I investigate that whether people differently evaluate other's life in terms of the role of fate or not. The first study aimed to create a more robust background for the hypothesis for the second study.

Only one study in the literature offers insights about how people evaluate others' lives in terms of fate. González and Lay (2017) found that fatalistic attributions of poverty of others decrease helping intention. Instead of focusing on a single issue, and putting aside poverty or environmental issues, the first study checked how people differently evaluate the role of fate in others' lives in a number of daily life problems or situations. To put it differently, the first study investigated whether people evaluate the same situations more fatalistically for others than for themselves. More formally:

H₁ *Individuals evaluate the role of fate significantly and statistically differently when the actor is someone else (vs. themselves).*

Based on the findings of the first study, I developed several hypotheses which are then tested in the second study. The second study analyzes the relationships among different dimensions of fatalism (Esparza et al., 2015), donation intention, and empathy. Data for both studies were collected via online questionnaire forms. The studies were conducted in Turkey which was previously found to be highly fatalistic country (Acevedo, 2008).

2 Study 1

2.1 Methodology

2.1.1 Participants and procedure

Two hundred eighty-nine individuals (148 females; $M_{age}=36.17$, $SD_{age}=13.91$) participated in the first study via an online survey link. The author of the study spread the link for the survey among students at a Turkish university via the university portal as well as through his social media channels. No specific inclusion criteria were used for recruiting participants. As an incentive to participate in the survey, participants were offered a chance to win a voucher for a music and book store.

Participants were randomly assigned to two different survey conditions (self-fate vs. others' fate). Each survey consisted of 14 scenarios created especially for this study. Each scenario describes a different life story in which there is a decision to be made or action to be taken by the subject of the story (Appendix A). Both groups read the same stories where only the subject of the story was different. For the first group, stories asked the reader to take on the role of subject of the story (e.g., Assume that you were a soldier...) while for the second group fictional characters were used as subjects of the story (e.g., Alex was a soldier...). Unisex names were used for subjects to make participants of both sexes empathize more easily. After reading each scenario, participants were asked to indicate their response on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from "1: It is entirely in my [or for the second group, the subject's name] control" to "7: It is entirely in the hands of fate/luck." Afterwards they filled out demographics and necessary information for winning the voucher.

2.2 Results

The scale used was found as a reliable measurement tool ($\alpha=0.86$). Each item's mean was higher for the second group (others' fate) and the sum of the mean of the items was significantly higher for the second group ($M_{\text{self}}=3.52$, $SD_{\text{self}}=1.050$; $M_{\text{others}}=3.81$, $SD_{\text{others}}=1.057$; $t(287)=-2.32$, $p=.02$). Principal components factor analysis was applied to the 14 stories using varimax rotation. Three factors explained 51.3% of the variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.88, above the recommended threshold of 0.6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(91)=840.26$, $p=.00$). In the second stage, a total of three items were eliminated because they contributed to two factors concurrently. As a result of final analysis, two factors were explored that explained 47.3% of the variance, and all of the factors exceeded an Eigenvalue of 1. Again KMO measure was above the recommended threshold (0.87) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(55)=775.64$, $p=.00$). The first factor (6 items; $\alpha=0.77$) was named Relationship and Achieving and the second factor (5 items; $\alpha=0.73$) was named Turning Point and Health (Appendix A). Further, confirmatory factor analysis conducted and goodness of fit (GFI) indices were higher than the recommended threshold, which confirms the fit between the model and the analyzed data: Chi square / degrees of freedom (CMIN/DF) <5 ; RMSEA <0.08 ; CFI, GFI, NFI >0.90 ; AGFI >0.85 (see Appendix A for detailed GFI values) (Hair et al., 2014).

Comparing both factors' means with t-test revealed that both factors' means were significantly higher for the second (others) group (Relationship and Achieving; $M_{\text{self}}=3.40$, $SD_{\text{self}}=1.18$; $M_{\text{others}}=3.68$, $SD_{\text{others}}=1.18$; $t(287)=-2.01$, $p=.04$; Turning Point and Health; $M_{\text{self}}=3.89$, $SD_{\text{self}}=1.23$; $M_{\text{others}}=4.17$, $SD_{\text{others}}=1.27$; $t(287)=-1.94$, $p=.05$). Overall, either for the mean of the whole scale or explored factors, people rated others' conditions as less controllable by individuals and more controlled by external forces – fate, in other words; thus H_1 is supported.

2.3 Discussion

The first study found that for the same life stories people rated fate's role higher than the actor's role when the actor was someone else rather than oneself. The inventory used (Fatalistic Story Scale) was especially created for this study, and after reliability and the validity of the scale were analyzed two distinct factors were discovered. The first factor consists of items related to an individual's success in managing relationships and achieving something in life generally, while second factor includes items about a person's health and critical moments in life. Overall, for the second group, in which participants read stories about fictional other people, the role of fate was higher in both factors.

One possible explanation for this finding is that people may have found it difficult to evaluate the (other) subject's internal control in the stories; to put it differently, they may have difficulties in perspective taking. Thus, there would be a negative relationship between empathy and fatalistic beliefs. For example, for the story about cancer when the actor in the story is someone else they see cancer as less controllable by the sick person ($M_{\text{self}}=4.65$, $SD_{\text{self}}=1.62$; $M_{\text{others}}=4.98$, $SD_{\text{others}}=1.64$; $t(287)=$

--1.68, $p=.09$). This point would seem to confirm González and Lay's (2017) finding about the negative relationship between empathy and fatalism. However, clarifying other external forces like luck or divine control may create more informative insights both for the discussion of current findings as well as for future studies. Further, it would allow us to check whether belief in luck or divine control differs from belief in fate. Additionally, for more robust findings internal beliefs should be compared with external beliefs. In other words, if external belief is negatively related to empathy, internality should be positively related. More formally:

H₂ *There is a negative relationship between empathy and external beliefs (fatalism, luck, divine control, helplessness).*

H₃ *There is a positive relationship between empathy and internality.*

Because empathy is one of the most significant predictors of donation intention (Basil et al., 2008; Verhaert & Van den Poel, 2011; Kasri & Indriani, 2021), I expect donation intention to be also negatively related to external beliefs. People with external beliefs would think giving will not change anything for the cause or the victim. By contrast, those with internal beliefs would think they do have an impact on the cause and correspondingly they would be more motivated to engage in prosocial consumption. More formally:

H₄ *There is a negative relationship between donation intention and external beliefs (fatalism, luck, divine control, helplessness).*

H₅ *There is a positive relationship between donation intention and internality.*

3 Study 2

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Participants and procedure

An online questionnaire form was created for collecting data. The data consisted of 350 (196 females; $M_{age}=31.81$, $SD_{age}=14.39$) responses after eliminating invalid responses (such as those who failed to correctly answer attention check or who filled out the survey twice). The same procedure and incentives were used as in Study 1 for inviting participants. The survey consisted of the Multidimensional Fatalism Scale (Esparza et al., 2015), the Toronto Empathy Scale (Spreng et al., 2009), a donation intention scale which consists of chosen items from the Prosocial Consumption Scale (Distant-Others) (Cavanaugh et al., 2015), and demographics.

The Multidimensional Fatalism Scale consists of 30 items and five factors which can be classified as four external locus of control (divine control, luck, helplessness and fatalisms) and one internal (internality). The scale offers to measure different

understandings of fatalistic belief such as luck or divine control. An example item for Divine Control is: “Everything that happens is part of God’s plan” and for Luck is: “When I get what I want, it’s usually because I’m lucky.” The scale was first translated into Turkish by the author of this study, with the support of a language expert who controlled the cultural adaptation process of the scale. Following this, two researchers independently analyzed and controlled the translation of the scale. The Toronto Empathy Scale (Spreng et al., 2009) is used for measuring empathy. This is a short and powerful empathy scale focused on the emotional process of empathy and consists of 16 items. The scale was translated into Turkish by Totan and colleagues (2012) and as a result of adaptation the scale became a 13-item unidimensional assessment tool (test-retest reliability coefficients were 0.79 and 0.73). Finally, for measuring donation intention four items were taken from the Prosocial Consumption Scale (Distant-Others) by Cavanaugh et al. (2015), which asks about participants’ intention to engage several consumption behaviors in the coming year (e.g., Donate used items/clothing to a charitable organization to help local families in need) measured on a seven-point scale (1 = “extremely unlikely,” and 7 = “extremely likely”).

3.2 Results

Reliability and validity of the scales used were analyzed separately and all scales were found to be reliable measurement tools ($\alpha > 0.7$; see Table 1 for Cronbach’s Alpha values). The validity of the Multidimensional Fatalism Scale was measured by exploratory factor analysis. Items loaded into five factors as in the original scale, and Internality, Fatalism, Divine Control, Luck, and Helplessness explained 59.13% of the variance. KMO was 0.87 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(435) = 5100.71$, $p = .00$). Confirmatory factor analysis and goodness of fit (GFI) indices were higher than or very close to recommended thresholds (see Appendix B for detailed GFI values) (Hair et al., 2014). No factor analysis was applied to the Toronto Empathy Scale which was created as and suggested for application as a unidimensional scale (Spreng et al., 2009; Totan et al., 2012).

For testing the hypotheses, multivariate regression analysis took empathy and donation intention separately as dependent variables. For the first model, the dependent variable was empathy and the independent variables were internality, fatalism, divine control, luck, and helplessness. The analyzed model was found to be significant (adj. $R^2 = .06$, $F(5, 344) = 4.36$, $p = .00$). Contrary to the hypotheses, fatalism positively predicted empathy ($\beta = 0.13$, $p = .03$) whereas luck ($\beta = -0.12$, $p = .02$) and helplessness ($\beta = -0.18$, $p = .00$) were negative predictors of empathy. Internality and divine control did not significantly predict empathy ($p > .05$). Based on regression analysis results, H_2 was accepted for luck and helplessness and H_3 was rejected.

The dependent variable of the second model was donation intention and independent variables were again internality, fatalism, divine control, luck, and helplessness. Overall, the model was found as significant explaining almost 10% of the variance of donation intention (adj. $R^2 = .09$, $F(5, 344) = 7.13$, $p = .00$). Fatalism was the only significant and positive predictor for donation intention ($\beta = 0.27$, $p = .00$) while luck was the only significant negative predictor ($\beta = -0.12$, $p = .03$). Unexpectedly, inter-

Table 1 Descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliability

	α	μ	SD	Internality	Fatalism	Divine Control	Luck	Helplessness	Empathy
Internality	0.800	5.270	1.147						
Fatalism	0.814	4.702	1.412	-0.123*					
Divine Control	0.936	5.307	1.781	-0.248**	0.540**				
Luck	0.853	3.151	1.398	0.006	0.119*	-0.026			
Helplessness	0.774	2.667	1.290	-0.102	0.317**	0.131*	0.251**		
Empathy	0.764	4.254	0.543	0.031	0.026	-0.018	-0.155**	-0.186**	
Donation Intention	0.786	5.227	1.500	0.025	0.267**	0.190**	-0.090	0.028	0.292**

** $p \leq .01$ level (2-tailed)* $p \leq .05$ level (2-tailed)

Table 2 Regression Analysis Predicting Empathy

→Empathy	t	p	β^*	F	p	Adj. R ²	R ²
Internality	0.240	0.810	0.013	4.360	0.001	0.046	0.060
Fatalism	2.128	.034	0.139				
Divine Control	-1.063	0.289	-0.068				
Luck	-2.318	0.021	-0.126				
Helplessness	-3.305	0.001	-0.188				

*Standardized Coefficients

VIF Values range from 1.080 to 1.560

Durbin-Watson value is 1.986

Table 3 Regression Analysis Predicting Donation Intention

→Donation Intention	t	p	β	SE	F	p	Adj. R ²	R ²
Internality	1.343	0.180	0.093	0.070	7.135	0.000	0.081	0.094
Fatalism	4.079	.000	0.278	0.068				
Divine Control	1.076	0.283	0.057	0.053				
Luck	-2.122	0.035	-0.121	0.057				
Helplessness	-0.492	0.623	-0.032	0.065				

VIF Values range from 1.080 to 1.560

Durbin-Watson value is 1.992

nality did not predict donation intention and fatalism positively predicted it, so H₅ was rejected and H₄ only accepted for the luck variable.

3.3 Discussion

The second study aimed to test hypotheses about the relationship between fatalism, donation intention, and empathy. The findings of the study illustrate that while fatalistic beliefs positively predicted empathy and donation intention, belief in luck negatively predicted both independent variables and helplessness negatively predicted empathy. Contrary to predictions, internality did not significantly predict empathy and prosocial consumption intention. Divine control, which is an external belief that everything is predetermined by God, did not predict either attitude. Furthermore, fatalists were found to have higher donation intention when participants were divided into two separate groups as fatalists and internalists (see Appendix B for further analysis).

4 Conclusion and implications

In the first study, I have examined whether people differently evaluate the role of fate for other people, and the results confirmed the central hypothesis. People see others' life as less controllable. In the second study, contrary to what I expected, I found that fatalism positively predicts empathy and donation intention, while internality -which is negatively correlated with fatalism- did not predict empathy and donation intention.

Even though the literature suggests the adverse effect of fatalistic beliefs on environmental problems and social issues (McClure et al., 2001; McNeish, 2017; Mayer & Smith, 2019; Suthirat & Takashi, 2013) my findings suggest that fatalism can motivate people to engage in prosocial behavior. This may stem from the understanding of negotiable fate in which people believe that they can control their fate to some extent but not completely (Au et al., 2012). Thus, fatalist individuals may think that they cannot change others' life completely, however to some extent, fate can allow them to ease others' problems by donating; they may see giving as negotiating with fate, in other words. Findings also suggested that fatalism is the only factor that predicts emphatic attitude. A possible explanation of this may be; individuals with fatalistic beliefs may consider others as the victims of fate as themselves; thus, they may be more emphatic. It is known that people are more inclined to help others who experience the same threat (Zheng, 2021).

Another interesting point that findings suggest is that internality did not predict donation intention and empathy. This finding may stem from the narcissistic or selfish nature of internal beliefs. People with internal beliefs see themselves as more competent than average in managing their own lives, and to some extent, this attitude may be related to narcissism, and it is already known that there is not a linear relationship between narcissism and prosocial behavior (Konrath et al., 2016; Kauten & Barry, 2014). Furthermore, it should be noted that the data is collected in Turkey, where internal beliefs represent a more modern and secular lifestyle in which people are tended to invest their resources in themselves rather than others. Rather than traditional and conservative understanding, this secular understating brings individualistic attitudes, and this kind of attitude involves more self-improvement by investing sources the self rather than others. This finding also somehow overlaps with Kashif et al. (2015) findings in which they found that the "Perceived behavioural control" and "attitude" which are the elements of theory of planned behaviour (TPB) did not predict donation intention for a Malaysian sample. According to authors, this may stem from the structure of the society and collectivistic understanding may curb individualistic motivations. Similar with Malaysia, Turkish society share collectivist cultural values thus individualistic values may not motivate people to donate within this climate.

Prior research showed that religious individuals (Ahmed, 2009; Guo et al., 2013; Van Cappellen et al., 2016; Yeung, 2018; Chapman et al., 2020) and individuals who see God as authoritarian (Bayramoglu et al., 2018) are inclined to engage in prosocial behavior (Hwang, 2018) and a national-level analysis illustrated the role of religion on prosocial behavior in less affluent countries (Guo et al., 2020). Further, it is illustrated that religious primes can lead to increased participation in prosocial campaigns (Guéguen, Bougeard-Delfosse, and Jacob, 2015) and highly religious people are less skeptical about to cause (Deb, 2021). Contrastingly, this study found no significant relationship between divine control – which is a religious external locus of control belief – and prosocial consumption. Hardy and Carlo (2005) found that even though religiosity predicts altruistic prosocial behavior, it does not predict emotional prosocial behavior, which is helping in emotionally evocative circumstances. Supporting this finding, the current work demonstrates that divine control does not predict empathy on the Toronto Empathy Scale which measures empathy as an emotional process.

Fatalistic beliefs interplay with dominion and stewardship can be another future avenue for prosocial consumption research. Leary et al. (2016) found that religious individuals express greater beliefs of dominion (vs. stewardship) which in turn negatively influence one's tendency to engage in sustainable behavior. Current findings overlap with this insight, considering divine control did not predict donation intention.

This finding also can be discussed under the negotiable fate phenomenon. Individuals who think God predetermines their fate may not perceive fate as negotiable. Thus, they may prefer staying more passive when facing prosocial requests. In this point, the call of Baytiyeh and Naja (2014) should be highlighted in which they emphasize the role of education in fighting against the negative impact of fatalistic beliefs in the Middle East on critical issues like disaster risk reduction. Even it is not asked within the context of the current study, as observed, most of the participants were Muslims considering almost 90% of the total population of Turkey consists of Muslims. Overall, Islamic teaching suggests a more negotiable fate rather than solid predetermination. For example, in the Quran, it is said that “(17:13) And [for] every person We have imposed his fate upon his neck” which implies every person has a responsibility -or control in other words- on their actions. Inconsistently, as previously discussed and current findings suggest, religious attributions of fate motivate one to ignore one's impact on prosocial behaviors. Public policymakers and marketers interested in developing public relations efforts in these environments should fight against this attitude by developing several education campaigns. This study's findings offer several insights to marketers who deal with prosocial campaigns. Notably, emphasizing fate when promoting victims in social marketing appeals can work especially well for fatalistic segments. On the other hand, emphasizing individuals' fate predetermined by God may backfire the prosocial request. Marketing appeals may use a softer narrative and may consider emphasizing negotiable fate. Within this context, future research also can examine the role of fatalism in responding to guilt appeals (Hibbert et al., 2007). More fatalistic individuals may feel more guilt while responding to these appeals; however, attribution to God may decrease anticipated guilt.

Overall, women are found as more fatalistic especially about issues related to health and critical moments (see Appendix B for additional analysis). According to this finding, it can be suggested that women would be more motivated about health-related prosocial marketing campaigns such as blood donation (Bani & Giussani, 2010). Louie and Obermiller (2000) noted that women give more importance to charity's cause than men. Future research can analyze the role of fatalistic beliefs on different prosocial behaviors together with gender base analysis. Not only for donation or volunteering but also social entrepreneurship or leadership behaviors can be analyzed. For example, how these fatalistic tendencies affect women in leading non-profit organizations (Dula, 2021). Overall, it should be noted that the data collected in Turkey which is previously found as highly fatalistic country (Acaevdo, 2008), and different samples can uncover different stories. Future studies can also compare the role of fatalism in different prosocial contexts (e.g., sustainable clothing disposal behavior [Bianchi and Birtwistle, 2012; Park et al., 2017] or purchase of cause-related products [Urbonavicius et al., 2019]) with monetary donation.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-023-00383-5>.

Authors' contributions Not applicable.

Funding The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Data Availability Data available on request from the author.

Code Availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests Not applicable.

Ethics approval The protocol used in this study was not submitted to an ethics committee for an opinion because of the use of simple and not sensitive questions on a voluntary basis.

Informed consent Interested volunteers were informed about the nature and purpose of the study and offered the opportunity to participate. Participants were informed of their rights with regard to the study (freedom to participate or not, right to withdraw from the study at any time, right of access to the data collected).

References

- Acevedo, G. A. (2008). Islamic fatalism and the clash of civilizations: An appraisal of a contentious and dubious theory. *Social Forces*, 86(4), 1711–1752.
- Ahmed, A. M. (2009). Are religious people more prosocial? A quasi-experimental study with Madrasah pupils in a rural community in India. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 368–374.
- Andreoni, J., Rao, J. M., & Trachtman, H. (2017). Avoiding the ask: A field experiment on altruism, empathy, and charitable giving. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(3), 625–653.
- Au, E. W., Chiu, C. Y., Zhang, Z. X., Mallorie, L., Chaturvedi, A., Viswanathan, M., & Savani, K. (2012). Negotiable fate: Social ecological foundation and psychological functions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(6), 931–942.
- Bani, M., & Giussani, B. (2010). Gender differences in giving blood: A review of the literature. *Blood Transfusion*, 8(4), 278–287.
- Basil, D. Z., Ridgway, N. M., & Basil, M. D. (2008). Guilt and giving: A process model of empathy and efficacy. *Psychology & Marketing*, 25(1), 1–23.
- Bayramoglu, Y., Harma, M., & Yilmaz, O. (2018). The relationship between attachment to God, prosociality, and image of God. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 40(2–3), 202–224.
- Baytiyeh, H., & Naja, M. (2014). Can education reduce Middle Eastern fatalistic attitude regarding earthquake disasters? *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 23(4), 343–355.
- Becheur, I., Guizani, H., & Shaaban, K. (2019). Belief in fate and self-efficacy in road safety advertising based on guilt: An explanation based on negotiable fate. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 27(4), 233–241.
- Berman, A. L. (1973). Smoking behavior: How is it related to locus of control, death anxiety, and belief in afterlife? *OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying*, 4(2), 149–155.
- Bianchi, C., & Birtwistle, G. (2012). Consumer clothing disposal behaviour: A comparative study. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 36(3), 335–341.
- Blake, J. (1999). Overcoming the 'value-action gap' in environmental policy: Tensions between national policy and local experience. *Local Environment*, 4, 257–278.

- Bradley, G. L., & Sparks, B. A. (2002). Service locus of control: Its conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(4), 312–324.
- Buckley, J., & Tuama, Ö. S. (2010). I send the wife to the doctor?—Men's behaviour as health consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(5), 587–595.
- Busseri, M. A., Lefcourt, H. M., & Kerton, R. R. (1998). Locus of control for consumer outcomes: Predicting consumer behavior I. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(12), 1067–1087.
- Büttgen, M., Schumann, J. H., & Ates, Z. (2012). Service locus of control and customer coproduction: The role of prior service experience and organizational socialization. *Journal of Service Research*, 15(2), 166–181.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Fate. In Cambridge dictionary. Retrieved March 13 (2021). from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/fate>.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Luck. In Cambridge dictionary. Retrieved March 13 (2021). from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/luck>.
- Cavanaugh, L. A., Bettman, J. R., & Luce, M. F. (2015). Feeling love and doing more for distant others: Specific positive emotions differentially affect prosocial consumption. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(5), 657–673.
- Chapman, C. M., Masser, B. M., & Louis, W. R. (2020). Identity motives in charitable giving: Explanations for charity preferences from a global donor survey. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(9), 1277–1291.
- Chaturvedi, A., Chiu, C. Y., & Viswanathan, M. (2009). Literacy, negotiable fate, and thinking style among low income women in India. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(5), 880–893.
- D'Orlando, F., Ferrante, F., & Ruiii, G. (2011). Culturally based beliefs and labor market institutions. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40, 150–162.
- Deb, M. (2021). The impact of scepticism in cause-related marketing campaigns on audiences' behavioural intentions with religiosity as a moderator. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 18(3), 387–401.
- DellaVigna, S., List, J. A., & Malmendier, U. (2012). Testing for altruism and social pressure in charitable giving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1), 1–56.
- Dula, L. (2021). Gendered Funding: United Way Board Composition and the Funding of Women-and Girl-Serving Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Advance online publication <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F08997640211057406>.
- Durkheim, E. (1897). *Suicide*, translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. Glencoe, Ill.: republished by Free Press, 1951.
- Esparza, O. A., Wiebe, J. S., & Quiñones, J. (2015). Simultaneous development of a multidimensional fatalism measure in English and Spanish. *Current Psychology*, 34(4), 597–612.
- Giving USA 2020: Charitable giving showed solid growth, climbing to \$449.64 billion in 2019, one of the highest years for giving on record. Retrieved March 5, 2021 from <https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2020-charitable-giving-showed-solid-growth-climbing-to-449-64-billion-in-2019-one-of-the-highest-years-for-giving-on-record/>.
- González, R., & Lay, S. (2017). Sense of responsibility and empathy: Bridging the gap between attributions and helping behaviours. *Intergroup helping* (pp. 331–347). Cham: Springer.
- Guéguen, N., Bougeard-Delfosse, C., & Jacob, C. (2015). The positive effect of the mere presence of a religious symbol on compliance with an organ donation request. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 21(2), 92–99.
- Guo, C., Webb, N. J., Abzug, R., & Peck, L. R. (2013). Religious affiliation, religious attendance, and participation in social change organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(1), 34–58.
- Guo, Q., Liu, Z., & Tian, Q. (2020). Religiosity and prosocial behavior at national level. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 12(1), 55.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Religiosity and prosocial behaviours in adolescence: The mediating role of prosocial values. *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(2), 231–249.
- Harp, E. R., Scherer, L. L., & Allen, J. A. (2017). Volunteer engagement and retention: Their relationship to community service self-efficacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(2), 442–458.
- He, Q., Duan, Y., Wang, R., & Fu, Z. (2019). Factors affecting consumers' purchase intention of eco-friendly food in China: The evidence from respondents in Beijing. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 43(5), 457–470.

- Helmer, S. M., Krämer, A., & Mikolajczyk, R. T. (2012). Health-related locus of control and health behaviour among university students in North Rhine Westphalia, Germany. *BMC Research Notes*, 5(1), 1–8.
- Hibbert, S., Smith, A., Davies, A., & Ireland, F. (2007). Guilt appeals: Persuasion knowledge and charitable giving. *Psychology & Marketing*, 24(8), 723–742.
- Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P., & Schlosser, A. E. (2003). Locus of control, web use, and consumer attitudes toward internet regulation. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 22(1), 41–57.
- Huebner, R. B., & Lipsey, M. W. (1981). The relationship of three measures of locus of control to environment activism. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 2, 45–58.
- Hwang, H. (2018). Do religion and religiosity affect consumers' intentions to adopt pro-environmental behaviours? *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42(6), 664–674.
- Kalamas, M., Cleveland, M., & Laroche, M. (2014). Pro-environmental behaviors for thee but not for me: Green giants, green gods, and external environmental locus of control. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(2), 12–22.
- Kashif, M., Sarifuddin, S., & Hassan, A. (2015). Charity donation: Intentions and behavior. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 90–102.
- Kasri, R. A., & Indriani, E. (2021). Empathy or perceived credibility? An empirical study of Muslim donating behaviour through online charitable crowdfunding in Indonesia. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-09-2020-0468>.
- Kauten, R., & Barry, C. T. (2014). Do you think I'm as kind as I do? The relation of adolescent narcissism with self-and peer-perceptions of prosocial and aggressive behavior. *Personality and individual differences*, 61, 69–73.
- Konrath, S., Ho, M. H., & Zarins, S. (2016). The strategic helper: Narcissism and prosocial motives and behaviors. *Current Psychology*, 35(2), 182–194.
- Kouabenan, D. R. (1998). Beliefs and the perception of risks and accidents. *Risk Analysis*, 18(3), 243–252.
- Labban, A., Novell, C., & Bauer, S. (2022). Examining the impact of mindsets on donation intentions to homelessness charities via parallel serial mediation. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-022-00336-4>.
- Leary, R. B., Minton, E. A., & Mittelstaedt, J. D. (2016). Thou shall not? The influence of religion on beliefs of stewardship and dominion, sustainable behaviors, and marketing systems. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 36(4), 457–470.
- Lee, H. C., Chang, C. T., Cheng, Z. H., & Chen, Y. T. (2018). Will an organic label always increase food consumption? It depends on food type and consumer differences in health locus of control. *Food Quality and Preference*, 63, 88–96.
- Lin, S. C., & Reich, T. (2018). To give or not to give? Choosing chance under moral conflict. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 28(2), 211–233.
- Lin, S. C., Schaumberg, R. L., & Reich, T. (2016). Sidestepping the rock and the hard place: The private avoidance of prosocial requests. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 64, 35–40.
- Louie, T. A., & Obermiller, C. (2000). Gender stereotypes and social-desirability effects on charity donation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 17(2), 121–136.
- Ma, Y., & Tschirhart, M. (2021). Enhancing self-efficacy during Community Service: Factors influencing AmeriCorps' Members' change in self-efficacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 50(5), 1009–1028.
- Martin, B. A., Veer, E., & Pervan, S. J. (2007). Self-referencing and consumer evaluations of larger-sized female models: A weight locus of control perspective. *Marketing Letters*, 18(3), 197–209.
- Mayer, A., & Smith, E. K. (2019). Unstoppable climate change? The influence of fatalistic beliefs about climate change on behavioural change and willingness to pay cross-nationally. *Climate Policy*, 19(4), 511–523.
- McClure, J., Allen, M. W., & Walkey, F. (2001). Countering fatalism: Causal information in news reports affects judgments about earthquake damage. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 23(2), 109–121.
- McNeish, W. (2017). From revelation to revolution: Apocalypticism in green politics. *Environmental Politics*, 26, 1035–1054.
- O'Connor, G. E., & Kabadayi, S. (2020). Examining antecedents of health insurance literacy: The role of locus of control, cognitive style, and financial knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 54(1), 227–260.
- Ozcakir, A., Dogan, F. O., Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2014). Health locus of control, health related behaviors and demographic factors: A study in a turkish population. *Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research*, 3856–3869.

- Park, M., Cho, H., Johnson, K. K., & Yurchisin, J. (2017). Use of behavioral reasoning theory to examine the role of social responsibility in attitudes toward apparel donation. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 41(3), 333–339.
- Pentecost, R., Arli, D., & Thiele, S. (2017). It's my choice! Investigating barriers to pro-social blood donating behavior. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 35(2), 243–258.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (1983). Learned helplessness and victimization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39(2), 103–116.
- Ross, C. E., Mirowsky, J., & Cockerham, W. C. (1983). Social class, mexican culture, and fatalism: Their effects on psychological distress. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11(4), 383–399.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1.
- Ruiu, G. (2012). *The role of culture and institutions in entrepreneurial selection*. PhD diss. University of Cassino and Southern Lazio.
- Ruiu, G. (2013). The origin of fatalistic tendencies: An empirical investigation. *Economics & Sociology*, 6(2), 103–125.
- Sarofim, S., Tolba, A., & Kalliny, M. (2022). The effect of religiosity on customer's response to service failure: Belief-in-fate, forgiveness, and emotional wellbeing. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 56(1), 465–486.
- Shapiro, J., & Wu, S. (2011). Fatalism and savings. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40(5), 645–651.
- Shapiro, D. H. Jr., Schwartz, C. E., & Astin, J. A. (1996). Controlling ourselves, controlling our world: Psychology's role in understanding positive and negative consequences of seeking and gaining control. *American Psychologist*, 51(12), 1213.
- Spreng, R., Kinnon, N., Mar, C. M., R. A., & Levine, B. (2009). The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Scale development and initial validation of a factor-analytic solution to multiple empathy measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(1), 62–71.
- Suthirat, K., & Takashi, K. (2013). Everyone will die anyway": Managing the cultural bias towards fatalistic thinking about global climate change in the Thai context. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2, 5–17.
- Tang, S., Shepherd, S., & Kay, A. C. (2014). Do difficult decisions motivate belief in fate? A test in the context of the 2012 US presidential election. *Psychological Science*, 25(4), 1046–1048.
- Totan, T., Doğan, T., & Sapmaz, F. (2012). The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Evaluation of psychometric properties among turkish university students. *Egitim Arastirmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 46, 179–198.
- Trivedi, R. H., Patel, J. D., & Savalia, J. R. (2015). Pro-environmental behaviour, locus of control and willingness to pay for environmental friendly products. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 67–89.
- Urbonavicius, S., Adomavičiute, K., Urbutytė, I., & Cherian, J. (2019). Donation to charity and purchase of cause-related products: The influence of existential guilt and experience. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 18(2), 89–96.
- Van Cappellen, P., Saroglou, V., & Toth-Gauthier, M. (2016). Religiosity and prosocial behavior among churchgoers: Exploring underlying mechanisms. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 26(1), 19–30.
- Verhaert, G. A., & Van den Poel, D. (2011). Empathy as added value in predicting donation behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1288–1295.
- Watson, S. (2009). Credit card misuse, money attitudes, and compulsive buying behaviors: A comparison of internal and external locus of control (LOC) consumers. *College Student Journal*, 43(2), 268–276.
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London: Georg Allen & Unwin.
- Workman, J. E., & Studak, C. M. (2007). Relationships among fashion consumer groups, locus of control, boredom proneness, boredom coping and intrinsic enjoyment. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1), 66–75.
- Wu, S. (2005). Fatalistic tendencies: An explanation of why people don't save. *Contributions to Economic Analysis and Policy*, 4(1), 1–21.
- Yeung, J. W. (2018). Are religious people really more helpful? Public and private religiosity and volunteering participation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(6), 1178–1200.
- Yurdakul, D., & Atik, D. (2016). Coping with poverty through internalization and resistance: The role of religion. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 36(3), 321–336.
- Zheng, C., Liu, N., Luo, C., & Wang, L. (2021). Effects of the severity of collective threats on people's donation intention. *Psychology & Marketing*, 38(9), 1426–1439.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.