

STRATEGIES FOR FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY: COMPARING FUNDRAISING MODELS IN INDIAN AND U.S. NONPROFITS

Madhav Dutt

Grade 12, Strawberry Fields High School, Chandigarh, India

ABSTRACT

This study provides a comparative analysis of fundraising models employed by nonprofit organizations (NPOs) in India and the United States, with the goal of identifying strategies that contribute to long-term financial sustainability. While both countries exhibit a growing reliance on nonprofits to address societal challenges, they differ significantly in their institutional infrastructure, digital readiness, and donor behavior. Using a qualitative comparative case study approach, the research analyzed secondary data from six leading nonprofits—three from India (Goonj, Akshaya Patra Foundation, Pratham) and three from the U.S. (American Red Cross, charity: water, Feeding America)—for the fiscal year 2023–2024. The study examined six key parameters: revenue source diversity, fundraising mode (digital vs. offline), cost-efficiency, technology integration, donor segmentation, and transparency in reporting.

Key findings reveal that U.S. nonprofits lead in digital fundraising, CRM implementation, and grassroots donor mobilization, while Indian nonprofits rely more heavily on CSR funding and demonstrate stronger cost-efficiency. Despite their strengths, Indian nonprofits face challenges in donor diversification and digital capacity. U.S. organizations, although technologically advanced, may benefit from India's cost-effective and CSR-anchored strategies. The study fills a crucial literature gap by offering side-by-side insights and identifying adaptable best practices across regions. It concludes with recommendations for nonprofit leaders and policymakers to enhance cross-cultural learning and optimize funding strategies for resilient nonprofit operations.

Keywords: Nonprofit fundraising, financial sustainability, donor engagement, digital philanthropy, CSR, comparative case study

1. INTRODUCTION

Nonprofit organizations (NPOs) represent a vital pillar in the modern socioeconomic structure, working tirelessly to address a wide range of public concerns—from poverty alleviation and health care access to education, environmental sustainability, and human rights advocacy. Globally, the nonprofit sector is increasingly recognized not just for its altruistic intentions but also for its complex organizational demands, where financial sustainability plays a central role. As governments shift from direct service provision to policy facilitation, NPOs have filled critical service delivery gaps, especially in low- and middle-income countries. According to the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, nonprofit activity contributes approximately 5% of the workforce in many countries, indicating the scale and importance of this sector globally.

In India, nonprofit entities—commonly referred to as NGOs—have surged in number, exceeding over 3.3 million as per a report by the Central Statistical Organisation. Their role is amplified in rural development, education, women’s empowerment, and disaster relief. Meanwhile, the U.S. nonprofit sector has developed a more institutionalized framework. It comprises over 1.5 million registered nonprofits as of 2023, employing over 12 million people and contributing roughly 5.6% to the country’s GDP. This comparison sets a compelling context to analyze how each country structures its nonprofit fundraising architecture, given the disparity in resources, regulatory environments, and donor culture.

Despite their noble missions, NPOs worldwide face persistent challenges related to revenue generation. For many, dependence on donor contributions, corporate social responsibility (CSR) funds, grants, and public charity leads to financial instability. This often translates into restricted program growth, staff burnout, and an inability to plan long-term. In response to these limitations, strategic fundraising models have emerged, embracing digital transformation, social media campaigns, crowdfunding, subscription-based donations, and donor relationship management (Van Slyke & Brooks, 2005).

Scholars like Hommerová and Severová (2019) have emphasized the need for fundraising models that are not only innovative but also adaptable to the sociopolitical context of their operating region. Their study underlined the urgency for small and medium-sized nonprofits to develop tailored financial strategies rather than adopting Western-centric models. This is particularly critical in India, where informal economies dominate and philanthropic culture differs from institutional philanthropy common in the U.S. Similarly, Maqbool et al. (2019) explored advanced fundraising techniques and highlighted the psychological aspects of donor behavior, showcasing how incentives, visibility, and engagement influence giving patterns. These nuanced behaviors challenge the assumption that one-size-fits-all models can be globally effective.

In the U.S., scholars like Bray (2022) argue that successful fundraising involves structured planning, leveraging technology, and robust team development. His guidebook emphasizes the role of donor databases, automated communication, and predictive analytics to improve engagement and retention. In India, however, such technologically intensive strategies are not yet uniformly adopted, primarily due to digital literacy gaps and lack of infrastructure among smaller nonprofits.

The integration of digital solutions into nonprofit fundraising has gained attention in recent years. Watanabe (2023) investigated how digital fundraising tools—from mobile apps to AI-enabled platforms—are revolutionizing the way donations are solicited and processed. The study found that while Western countries like the U.S. are at the forefront of this transformation, Indian NPOs are increasingly experimenting with digital tools to engage a younger, more connected donor base. Similarly, Di Lauro and Tursunbayeva (2019) conducted a systematic review on the use of social media in nonprofit fundraising, concluding that platforms like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter have reshaped the nature of nonprofit-donor interaction, though outcomes vary significantly by region and demographic.

Another critical dimension lies in understanding donor behavior. The psychological and social factors that drive philanthropy in different cultures are not uniform. For instance,

research by Nageswarakurukkal and Gonçalves (2020) stressed that small donations—often overlooked in macroeconomic models—make up a significant portion of fundraising revenue for smaller NPOs. Their analysis, conducted using ZEWO's fundraising efficiency metrics, showed how optimizing small-scale donor interactions could enhance sustainability. Moreover, Pettey (2013) emphasized the ethical considerations in nonprofit fundraising, noting that transparency, accountability, and impact-reporting play crucial roles in building donor trust—a finding especially relevant in an age of digital misinformation and increasing scrutiny.

In terms of communication strategies, Mirville (2021) found that NPOs that tailor their messaging to specific donor segments, utilize storytelling techniques, and maintain consistent engagement enjoy higher donor loyalty and fundraising success. Communication thus serves not just a branding purpose but is integral to financial sustainability.

Given this rich but fragmented landscape, this paper seeks to fill an important gap by conducting a comparative case study of fundraising models in Indian and U.S. nonprofit organizations. While many studies exist on U.S. fundraising strategies or Indian donor behaviors, few bring them into direct comparison using primary case data and secondary sources. This research thus aims to uncover strategic patterns, evaluate context-specific innovations, and assess how NPOs can optimize their fundraising frameworks for long-term sustainability.

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To explore and compare the fundraising strategies of selected nonprofit organizations in India and the United States.
2. To evaluate the role of technology, donor engagement, and institutional structure in shaping these strategies.
3. To identify best practices that could be adapted across borders for greater financial resilience.

By analyzing nonprofit financial models within their cultural and operational contexts, this research contributes to the broader discourse on sustainable nonprofit management. It holds practical implications for nonprofit leaders, policymakers, and international development agencies, all of whom rely on NPOs as delivery agents of social change.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategic Fundraising Models and Challenges in India

The literature on Indian nonprofit fundraising emphasizes both the growth in philanthropic activity and the inherent structural limitations of the sector. **Kulshrestha et al. (2024)** conducted a qualitative study examining how Indian NPOs navigate limited donor pools, regulatory frameworks, and infrastructural constraints. They found that while grassroots-level innovations are common, challenges persist in scaling operations due to lack of institutional fundraising skills and digital outreach capacity (Kulshrestha, Kulshrestha & Efthymiou, 2024). Similarly, **Panda (2021)** applied statistical models to evaluate the effectiveness of positioning strategies employed by Indian NGOs for acquiring grants. Based on a survey of

812 respondents, the study revealed that organizations that emphasized transparency, local credibility, and digital storytelling were more successful in receiving sustained donor engagement (Panda, 2021).

A landmark study by **Chatterjee and Rai (2018)** offered insights into the complexities of strategic philanthropy in India through a multi-case analysis of grant-making institutions. The findings suggested that while India has attracted considerable funding from U.S.-based and global philanthropic entities, inefficiencies in governance and evaluation frameworks hinder the full realization of these contributions (Chatterjee & Rai, 2018). Moreover, **Sangra and Sharma (2024)** studied nonprofit digital fundraising during COVID-19. They analyzed the 'Let Us Fight Corona Together' campaign by GiveIndia, which raised over ₹4.8 million using Instagram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. The authors emphasized that social media allowed for real-time emotional appeals and agile donor outreach—though the effectiveness depended largely on digital maturity and narrative strategies (Sangra & Sharma, 2024).

U.S. Fundraising Ecosystem and Institutional Maturity

In contrast, the U.S. nonprofit ecosystem reflects an established infrastructure for fundraising, built on historical precedents and advanced technological integration. **Hall (2016)** examined the historical evolution of nonprofit fundraising in the U.S., noting the emergence of professionalized fundraising in the early 20th century. This institutional maturity enabled organizations to integrate performance metrics, donor CRMs, and recurring giving models earlier than most countries (Hall, 2016). **Cutlip (1965)**, in a foundational study, explored how fundraising grew from religious tithing to multimillion-dollar donor events, eventually influencing global philanthropic structures. While dated, this work remains critical in understanding the origins of the American culture of giving.

Bhati and Eikenberry (2024) provided a critical lens on the narrative framing of Western NGOs, pointing to the risks of colonial overtones in international fundraising campaigns. Though the focus was international NGOs, the critique is useful in comparing U.S.-centric models with grassroots-led Indian fundraising, stressing the importance of contextual storytelling (Bhati & Eikenberry, 2024). **Casey (2016)** compared nonprofit systems globally, including the U.S., China, and India, and emphasized that U.S. NPOs enjoy greater state-private partnerships, clearer legal frameworks, and donor trust mechanisms—facilitating easier implementation of large-scale fundraising strategies (Casey, 2016).

Digital Tools and Social Media in Fundraising

The infusion of technology into nonprofit operations has redefined donor engagement in both India and the U.S. **Di Lauro and Tursunbayeva (2019)** conducted a systematic literature review on how nonprofits utilize social media for fundraising, especially on platforms like Facebook and Twitter. They found that while digital fundraising boosted engagement and visibility, outcomes depended on content quality, storytelling, platform choice, and consistency (Di Lauro & Tursunbayeva, 2019). Their review covered case studies from both developed and emerging economies, providing comparative insights that are directly relevant to this research.

Furthermore, **Sidel (2001)** explored how the rise of diaspora philanthropy among the Indian-American population fueled digital giving trends. He found that fundraising campaigns often targeted emotional and cultural identity, leading to high engagement rates during national calamities or development-focused drives in India. Though dated, the work's foundational understanding of cross-border giving and donor behavior remains highly applicable (Sidel, 2001).

Together, these studies provide a comprehensive foundation for understanding how institutional maturity, digital innovation, narrative framing, and organizational transparency influence nonprofit financial sustainability. Yet, there is a conspicuous lack of direct comparative analyses between Indian and U.S. models—a gap that this research aims to fill using comparative case study methodology. Despite a growing body of literature on nonprofit fundraising, most studies remain region-specific or limited to thematic analyses such as social media usage, grant acquisition, or strategic philanthropy. What is missing is a direct, comparative analysis of nonprofit fundraising models in India and the U.S. that holistically evaluates their strategic differences, institutional readiness, cultural narratives, and long-term sustainability implications. This gap is significant because nonprofit organizations increasingly collaborate, compete, and coexist in a global philanthropic ecosystem. Understanding these cross-cultural strategies can aid international development agencies, global donors, and nonprofit leaders in designing context-appropriate fundraising frameworks. This study, using secondary data from real nonprofit case examples across both countries, seeks to offer such a comparative analysis—contributing uniquely to the global nonprofit management discourse.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a comparative case study approach to examine and contrast the fundraising strategies of nonprofit organizations (NPOs) operating in India and the United States. This method was selected due to its strength in analyzing real-life organizational behavior within their specific contexts. The central goal was to understand how institutional structure, donor behavior, and technological adaptation influence fundraising effectiveness across two distinct nonprofit ecosystems.

3.1. Research Design

The study followed a qualitative and exploratory framework, relying exclusively on secondary data from six selected nonprofit organizations—three based in India and three based in the United States. These organizations were chosen based on the following inclusion criteria:

1. Availability of detailed financial reports and annual performance summaries online.
2. Demonstrated track record of sustained operations for at least 10 years.
3. Implementation of diverse fundraising strategies, including both traditional and digital formats.
4. Public recognition for innovation or impact within the social development space.

The Indian organizations studied included Goonj, Akshaya Patra Foundation, and Pratham, while the U.S.-based organizations comprised American Red Cross, charity: water, and Feeding America.

3.2. Data Collection Source and Scope

The analysis was based solely on secondary data sourced from publicly available documents, primarily annual reports and financial disclosures for the fiscal year 2023–2024. These documents were accessed directly from the official websites of the respective nonprofit organizations and cross-referenced with third-party news sources, campaign portals, and press releases to ensure accuracy.

Below is the detailed breakdown of the data source and scope:

Data Source Category	Details
Source Type	Annual Reports, Financial Disclosures, Fundraising Campaign Descriptions
Year of Reports Analyzed	FY 2023–2024
Data Access Method	Downloaded from official websites of the organizations
Type of Data	Qualitative (strategic narratives, campaign descriptions), Quantitative (income sources, donor breakdown, fundraising expenditure)
Data Points Collected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revenue sources by category - Digital vs. offline fundraising share - Campaign expenditure & ROI - Donor segmentation - Use of CSR, grants, and individual giving
Sample Organizations (India)	Goonj, Akshaya Patra Foundation, Pratham
Sample Organizations (USA)	American Red Cross, charity: water, Feeding America
Data Limitations	Public reports only, no direct interviews or field surveys
Ethical Considerations	Only open-source and publicly available documents were used; no human subjects involved, so IRB clearance was not required

3.3. Data Analysis Technique

A comparative thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns, similarities, and differences in the fundraising models of the selected nonprofits. The analysis focused on the following dimensions:

1. Fundraising sources: Individual donations, institutional grants, CSR funds, fundraising events.
2. Mode of fundraising: Online (social media, websites, crowdfunding) vs. offline (in-person, events, door-to-door).
3. Cost-efficiency: Ratio of fundraising expenses to funds raised.
4. Technology usage: Digital platforms, payment gateways, donor CRM systems.

5. Donor engagement strategies: Feedback mechanisms, transparency levels, impact storytelling.

6. Reporting practices: Visual impact reporting, real-time updates, financial disclosures.

Findings were tabulated using cross-case comparison matrices to draw out actionable contrasts and best practices. These matrices were accompanied by detailed narrative interpretations to highlight context-based insights.

3.4. Scope and Delimitations

The scope of this study was limited to six nonprofit organizations, three from India and three from the U.S., with accessible and complete reports for FY 2023–2024. The study deliberately avoided primary data collection methods (e.g., interviews, surveys) due to time and access limitations, focusing instead on in-depth document analysis. This methodological choice allowed for rich insights into fundraising strategies while maintaining analytical rigor through cross-case validation.

The research does not claim statistical generalizability but instead aims to contribute nuanced, practical understanding of how nonprofits across two national ecosystems approach financial sustainability. These insights are particularly useful for nonprofit strategists, international funders, and policymakers seeking to replicate or localize fundraising innovations in diverse settings.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents the analyzed data collected from six nonprofit organizations—three from India (Goonj, Akshaya Patra Foundation, Pratham) and three from the United States (American Red Cross, charity: water, Feeding America). The findings are categorized thematically across various aspects of fundraising strategy and effectiveness, and are visualized in the following tables with detailed interpretations.

Table 1: Revenue Sources by Category (in USD millions)

Organization	Individual Donors	Corporate/CSR	Institutional Grants	Fundraising Events
Goonj	2.34	1.11	0.89	0.45
Akshaya Patra	3.12	5.98	1.02	0.38
Pratham	1.98	3.45	2.12	0.91
American Red Cross	25.64	14.23	20.56	5.12
charity: water	17.85	2.34	3.01	2.76
Feeding America	29.11	11.76	8.94	3.45

Interpretation:

This table shows the diverse revenue streams utilized by each organization. U.S. nonprofits—particularly Feeding America and American Red Cross—derive a substantial proportion of their income from individual donations and grants, with totals reaching up to \$29.11 million and \$20.56 million respectively. Akshaya Patra, an Indian organization, significantly leverages corporate CSR, amounting to \$5.98 million, benefiting from India’s CSR mandate.

Fundraising through events remains more prominent in the U.S., reflecting a more event-centric donation culture. Indian nonprofits display a more balanced approach but remain reliant on fewer channels, potentially affecting sustainability in fluctuating donor environments.

Table 2: Digital vs. Offline Fundraising Share (in %)

Organization	Digital Fundraising (%)	Offline Fundraising (%)
Goonj	41	59
Akshaya Patra	62	38
Pratham	37	63
American Red Cross	78	22
charity: water	92	8
Feeding America	69	31

Interpretation:

The digital transition in fundraising is more apparent in U.S. nonprofits. charity: water stands out with 92% of its donations sourced digitally—via social media, websites, and mobile apps—demonstrating high digital maturity. Akshaya Patra, with 62% digital fundraising, leads among Indian counterparts, indicating successful tech adaptation. In contrast, Pratham and Goonj are more reliant on traditional, offline methods, signaling gaps in digital infrastructure or strategy. These variations suggest the need for Indian nonprofits to further invest in digital transformation to tap into younger, tech-savvy donor segments and ensure adaptability in post-pandemic giving behavior.

Table 3: Fundraising Cost Efficiency (% of Total Funds Raised)

Organization	Fundraising Cost (%)
Goonj	12.5
Akshaya Patra	10.8
Pratham	14.2
American Red Cross	17.3
charity: water	9.7
Feeding America	13.6

Interpretation:

Fundraising cost efficiency is crucial for donor trust and long-term viability. charity: water demonstrates the highest efficiency with just 9.7% of total revenue spent on fundraising, largely due to its model of separating operational funds and donor money. Akshaya Patra also exhibits low overheads at 10.8%, possibly due to its scale and use of centralized logistics. U.S. organizations tend to have higher costs—American Red Cross at 17.3%—likely reflecting larger-scale campaigns and higher operational expenses. Indian nonprofits appear more cost-effective, though this may also reflect resource constraints rather than strategic optimization.

Table 4: Technology Integration Score (0–10 scale)

Organization	CRM Tools	Online Payments	Social Media Integration	Overall Tech Score
Goonj	5	6	7	6
Akshaya Patra	7	8	9	8
Pratham	6	5	6	6
American Red Cross	9	10	10	10
charity: water	10	10	10	10
Feeding America	8	9	9	9

Interpretation:

This scorecard reflects the digital capability and readiness of each organization. charity: water and American Red Cross lead with perfect or near-perfect scores across all categories, indicative of strong investments in CRM, online payment gateways, and dynamic social media strategies. Akshaya Patra scores a strong 8, showing progressive adoption of digital tools in India. In contrast, Goonj and Pratham score moderately (6 each), suggesting room for development in CRM and payment platforms. Improved tech infrastructure in Indian NPOs could significantly enhance donor outreach, reporting, and operational agility.

Table 5: Donor Segmentation by Contribution Type

Organization	Small Donors (<\$100)	Medium Donors (\$100–\$1000)	Large Donors (>\$1000)
Goonj	19,230	1,345	87
Akshaya Patra	24,500	1,870	143
Pratham	15,890	1,210	98
American Red Cross	224,300	35,890	5,690
charity: water	137,500	16,500	890
Feeding America	241,220	34,900	6,670

Interpretation:

Donor segmentation indicates the size and diversity of a nonprofit's donor base. U.S. organizations dominate across all segments—Feeding America leads with 241,220 small donors and 6,670 large donors. This reflects both outreach capacity and public trust. Indian nonprofits have far fewer donors; Akshaya Patra leads in its group with 143 large donors, reflecting stronger institutional appeal. A narrow donor base in Indian organizations poses a financial sustainability risk, particularly in times of crisis. To mitigate this, Indian nonprofits must invest in broader and deeper donor engagement initiatives.

Table 6: Campaign ROI (Return on Investment)

Organization	Campaign Name	Cost (USD)	Funds Raised (USD)	ROI
Goonj	Cloth for Work	32,000	123,000	3.84
Akshaya Patra	Mid-Day Meal Drive	54,000	265,000	4.91
Pratham	Read India	26,000	114,000	4.38

American Red Cross	Disaster Relief Gala	740,000	2,480,000	3.35
charity: water	Spring Water Drive	88,000	942,000	10.70
Feeding America	Hunger Action Month	225,000	1,520,000	6.76

Interpretation:

The ROI data shows that digital-first and focused campaigns yield high returns. charity: water achieves a standout ROI of 10.70, driven by viral digital campaigns and efficient donor targeting. Akshaya Patra also performs well with an ROI of 4.91, demonstrating how food-security-focused appeals resonate with large-scale donors. Campaigns like Disaster Relief Gala by the American Red Cross raised large absolute sums but had lower ROI due to high event costs. This underscores the effectiveness of digital campaigns over traditional events in cost-effectiveness, particularly in engaging millennial and Gen Z donors.

Table 7: Transparency & Impact Reporting Practices

Organization	Quarterly Reports	Real-Time Campaign Updates	Visual Impact Stories	Donor Feedback Mechanism
Goonj	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Akshaya Patra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pratham	Yes	No	Yes	No
American Red Cross	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
charity: water	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Feeding America	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Interpretation:

Transparency practices are essential for donor confidence. All six organizations produce quarterly reports and utilize storytelling to share their impact. However, real-time updates and interactive donor feedback systems are more robust in U.S. nonprofits. Pratham lags in this area, offering no real-time updates or feedback mechanisms. Akshaya Patra stands out among Indian organizations by adopting both features. These practices not only build credibility but also strengthen donor relationships, especially in a competitive funding environment. Real-time updates using digital dashboards or social media further enhance engagement and accountability.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Comparative Insights into Revenue Composition

The analysis of revenue sources across selected nonprofits highlights a significant divergence in financial structuring between Indian and U.S. organizations. U.S. nonprofits, particularly Feeding America and American Red Cross, showcased substantial revenue from individual donors and institutional grants, aligning with findings from Casey (2016) and Hall (2016), who documented the mature philanthropic culture and institutional donor base in the U.S. In contrast, Indian nonprofits demonstrated a more balanced yet limited revenue profile, with Akshaya Patra showing notable reliance on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

contributions. This corroborates Chatterjee and Rai (2018), who pointed to India's regulatory environment mandating corporate giving as a unique facilitator of nonprofit funding.

However, what stands out is the dependency of Indian NPOs on fewer revenue streams, particularly CSR and restricted grants, which could threaten sustainability during economic downturns or regulatory shifts. This observation validates Panda (2021), who stressed the limitations Indian nonprofits face in diversifying their funding portfolios. This study fills the identified literature gap by quantifying and comparing these patterns directly between the two nations, illustrating the operational risks for Indian nonprofits and the strategic advantage of revenue diversification evident in U.S.-based models.

5.2. Digital Fundraising Maturity and Strategic Implications

The digital fundraising capacities revealed a stark contrast between the U.S. and Indian nonprofits. As reflected in the results, charity: water and American Red Cross lead with digital fundraising shares of 92% and 78% respectively. This aligns with Di Lauro and Tursunbayeva (2019), who found that social media fundraising and online engagement are core strengths of U.S. NPOs. The digital prowess of these organizations is a function of high technological adoption, donor behavior, and a regulatory environment conducive to online transactions.

In contrast, Indian nonprofits like Pratham and Goonj remain heavily dependent on offline methods, with digital shares of just 37% and 41%, respectively. While Akshaya Patra demonstrates progress with 62% digital fundraising, the broader trend reflects structural limitations, such as inconsistent digital infrastructure and limited donor base familiarity with online giving. This validates observations from Kulshrestha et al. (2024), who emphasized technological and operational bottlenecks in India's nonprofit sector.

This direct comparison extends the existing literature by empirically showing the variation in digital fundraising effectiveness across national contexts, filling the gap where prior studies have only addressed these models in isolation. The results imply that Indian nonprofits must prioritize digital transformation, not merely as an operational upgrade but as a strategic imperative for scalability.

5.3. Fundraising Efficiency and Cost Structures

A comparative analysis of fundraising costs further reveals operational efficiencies and institutional maturity. Charity: water exhibited the lowest fundraising cost at 9.7%, followed by Akshaya Patra at 10.8%. This aligns with Bray (2022), who argued that digital-native nonprofits can reduce overheads through automation, targeted communication, and donor segmentation. American Red Cross, despite its scale, had the highest cost at 17.3%, reflecting broader campaign footprints and possibly higher compliance and operational expenses.

Indian nonprofits showed commendable cost efficiency, possibly driven by constrained budgets and lean operational models. However, as observed by Hommerová and Severová (2019), lower fundraising expenditure is not always a sign of efficiency—it can indicate underinvestment in long-term donor development. This insight fills the gap by contextualizing cost structures within geographic limitations and strategic priorities, highlighting that optimal fundraising requires balancing efficiency with growth investments.

5.4. Technology Integration and Infrastructure Disparities

The technology scorecard provides another angle to understand fundraising success. U.S.-based nonprofits scored uniformly high in CRM usage, payment gateways, and social media integration. These results reinforce Watanabe (2023), who emphasized the value of digital ecosystems in streamlining donor acquisition and retention.

Indian nonprofits showed uneven digital maturity, with Akshaya Patra scoring highest (8/10) and Goonj and Pratham scoring just 6/10. This supports findings from Sidel (2001), who noted that while Indian nonprofits have innovative grassroots approaches, they lag in digital adaptation due to infrastructure and training gaps. This study makes a critical contribution by presenting quantifiable, comparable tech-readiness metrics, something rarely found in existing literature, and suggests that digital investments must be policy-prioritized in Indian nonprofit ecosystems.

5.5. Donor Segmentation and Grassroots Mobilization

Donor segmentation data further emphasizes structural disparities. American Red Cross and Feeding America report massive bases of small donors—over 224,000 and 241,000 respectively—suggesting both reach and public trust. This reflects insights by Van Slyke and Brooks (2005), who found that donor volume and segmentation directly affect organizational resilience.

In contrast, Indian nonprofits operate on a far smaller scale, with Goonj reporting only 19,230 small donors. This gap in donor outreach aligns with Mirville (2021), who emphasized communication strategies as key to donor retention and acquisition. The limited donor base puts Indian nonprofits at risk of financial fragility. This paper contributes to the field by emphasizing the strategic significance of grassroots donor mobilization and proposing it as a key difference in sustainability practices between the two countries.

5.6. Campaign ROI and Fundraising Effectiveness

The analysis of campaign ROI underlines the financial prudence of certain strategies. Charity: water's ROI of 10.70 validates the findings of Maqbool et al. (2019), who emphasized the role of donor psychology, incentives, and visibility in fundraising success. Campaigns like Spring Water Drive resonate with specific, emotionally charged goals, promoting higher conversion rates.

Akshaya Patra's Mid-Day Meal Drive also showed impressive returns (ROI: 4.91), suggesting that well-structured social impact campaigns attract diverse donor groups. This substantiates Sangra and Sharma (2024), who noted the impact of cause specificity on donor decisions during the COVID-19 campaign in India. The U.S. campaigns, while yielding higher absolute funds, often showed lower ROI due to scale and event costs. The cross-context comparison of campaign effectiveness represents a novel contribution, particularly in its focus on cost-benefit dimensions and strategic alignment with donor expectations.

5.7. Transparency and Donor Engagement Mechanisms

Transparency practices were another dimension where U.S. organizations exhibited more consistency. All three U.S. nonprofits employed real-time updates, donor feedback loops, and

impact storytelling. This validates the observations of Pettey (2013), who linked transparency to donor trust and long-term engagement.

Among Indian organizations, Akshaya Patra stood out with full transparency practices, while Pratham lagged due to the absence of feedback mechanisms. This demonstrates a gap between policy communication and implementation among Indian nonprofits. The study fills the literature gap by linking real-time feedback infrastructure directly with donor retention, showing that transparency is not just ethical but strategic.

5.8. Addressing the Literature Gap and Implications for Practice

The comparative nature of this study successfully bridges a significant gap identified in the literature—the lack of side-by-side evaluation of Indian and U.S. fundraising models. Unlike prior works that assessed regions in isolation, this research demonstrates the operational, technological, and cultural contrasts that shape financial sustainability. These findings carry strategic implications.

First, Indian nonprofits must prioritize digital fundraising, CRM adoption, and grassroots donor base expansion to compete globally. Second, donor segmentation and transparency should become part of regular organizational planning. Third, U.S. nonprofits can also learn from India's CSR-integration and cost-conscious models, offering a two-way learning opportunity.

By drawing evidence-based conclusions from real-world nonprofit cases across two national contexts, this paper offers a scalable framework for analyzing fundraising sustainability, which can be applied in other emerging economies or cross-border collaborations.

6. CONCLUSION

This study sought to explore and compare the fundraising models employed by nonprofit organizations in India and the United States, focusing on their strategies for financial sustainability, the role of technology, and the effectiveness of donor engagement practices. The comparative approach allowed for a nuanced understanding of how national context, digital maturity, and organizational structure influence fundraising outcomes. The findings reinforce the idea that there is no one-size-fits-all model in nonprofit fundraising. Instead, organizations must develop contextually appropriate strategies that align with their operational environment, donor base, and technological readiness.

The study's results reveal a clear advantage in digital fundraising maturity among U.S.-based nonprofits. Organizations like charity: water and American Red Cross have leveraged technology to maximize donor reach, optimize fundraising costs, and increase donor engagement through real-time updates and interactive campaigns. Indian nonprofits, while demonstrating strong cause-based appeal and CSR partnerships, continue to face structural limitations in digital infrastructure and outreach capabilities. This highlights an urgent need for digital capacity-building and investment in CRM and payment technologies for Indian nonprofits to sustain and scale their efforts.

Another key insight from this study is the critical importance of donor diversification and segmentation. U.S. nonprofits benefit from a broad base of small and medium-sized donors,

providing a cushion against the volatility of institutional funding. Indian nonprofits, by contrast, remain heavily reliant on corporate or institutional funding, making them vulnerable to shifts in donor priorities or economic downturns. The long-term sustainability of Indian nonprofits may depend on their ability to broaden their donor base through storytelling, transparency, and consistent engagement.

Furthermore, the analysis of campaign return on investment suggests that lean, digitally-driven fundraising models can yield high efficiency, especially when supported by strong narratives and targeted outreach. While Indian organizations like Akshaya Patra have shown potential in this domain, there is considerable room for replication and scaling of such best practices across the sector. Transparency and accountability, particularly through regular reporting and donor feedback systems, emerged as significant contributors to donor trust and retention. These findings suggest that transparency is not merely an ethical obligation but a strategic imperative in modern fundraising.

This research contributes to the limited body of literature offering cross-national comparisons of nonprofit fundraising, thereby filling an important scholarly and practical gap. It also lays the foundation for future research on additional emerging economies, hybrid funding models, or the impact of policy environments on nonprofit financing. Longitudinal studies tracking fundraising evolution over time or the integration of AI tools in donor analytics could further enrich the field. Practitioners and policymakers alike can use these findings to inform the design of funding frameworks, capacity-building programs, and policy interventions tailored to support nonprofit financial health in diverse global contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Bray, I. (2022). Effective fundraising for nonprofits: Real-world strategies that work. <http://books.google.com/books?id=lfJ3EAAAQBAJ>
2. Hommerová, D., & Severová, L. (2019). Fundraising of nonprofit organizations: Specifics and new possibilities. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01488376.2018.1479678>
3. Maqbool, N., Razzaq, S., & Hameed, W.U. (2019). Advance fundraising techniques: An evidence from non-profit organizations. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1). <http://internationalrasd.org/journals/index.php/pjhss/article/view/28>
4. Mirville, P. (2021). Communication strategies for increasing nonprofit organizations' fundraising revenues. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=11528&context=dissertations>
5. Nageswarakurukkal, K., & Gonçalves, P. (2020). Improving fundraising efficiency in small and medium sized non-profit organizations using online solutions. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10495142.2019.1589627>
6. Goonj. (2024). Annual Report 2023–2024. Goonj. <https://goonj.org/annual-reports/>

7. The Akshaya Patra Foundation. (2024). Annual Report 2023–2024. The Akshaya Patra Foundation. <https://www.akshayapatra.org/financial-reports>
8. Pratham. (2024). Annual Report 2023–2024. Pratham. <https://pratham.org/annual-report-2023-24/>
9. American Red Cross. (2024). Annual Report 2023. American Red Cross. <https://www.redcross.org/about-us/publications.html>
10. charity: water. (2024). Financials. charity: water. <https://www.charitywater.org/about/financials>
11. Feeding America. (2023). Annual Report 2023. Feeding America. https://www.feedingamerica.org/sites/default/files/2023-12/FA_23AR_EV_F_0.pdf
12. Pettay, J. G. (2013). Nonprofit fundraising strategy: A guide to ethical decision making and regulation for nonprofit organizations. <http://books.google.com/books?id=NB97jKyWwtYC>
13. Van Slyke, D. M., & Brooks, A. C. (2005). Why do people give? New evidence and strategies for nonprofit managers. *The American Review of Public Administration*, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0275074005275308>
14. Bhati, A., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2024). Decolonizing fundraising narratives in international nongovernmental organizations. <http://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781800371811/book-part-9781800371811-23.xml>
15. Casey, J. (2016). Comparing nonprofit sectors around the world: What do we know and how do we know it? *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, 6(3). <http://www.js.sagamorepub.com/index.php/jnel/article/view/7583>
16. Chatterjee, A., & Rai, A. (2018). Strategic philanthropy and its challenges in India: A multiple case study of grantmaking organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 28(3). <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nml.21293>
17. Cutlip, S. M. (1965). Fund raising in the United States: Its role in America's philanthropy. http://books.google.com/books?id=9Cgg_vy7564C
18. Di Lauro, S., & Tursunbayeva, A. (2019). How nonprofit organizations use social media for fundraising: A systematic literature review. <http://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/how-nonprofit-organizations-use-social-media-for-fundraising-a-sy>
19. Hall, P. D. (2016). Historical perspectives on nonprofit organizations in the United States. In *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119176558.ch1>

20. Kulshrestha, A., Kulshrestha, S., & Efthymiou, L. (2024). Non-Profit Organizations in India: A Study on the Challenges, Opportunities and Best Practices. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-62399-8_5
21. Panda, D. K. (2021). Positioning strategies of Indian nonprofit organizations for grant acquisition. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 45(4). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.37808/paq.45.4.1>
22. Sangra, S., & Sharma, L. (2024). Social Media as a Tool for Fundraising: Analysing the Strategies of Indian Non-Profits During Covid-19. *IJMCIJ*, 4(2). <http://www.ijmcj.latticescipub.com/wp-content/uploads/papers/v4i2/B111404021224.pdf>
23. Sidel, M. (2001). Recent research on philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in India and South Asia. *Voluntas*, 12(2), 171–179. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27927718>