

Motivating the Affluent Young Male to Donate to Non-profit Arts Organisations

Rita Kottasz

Introduction

Arts organisations are operating in a highly unstable and turbulent environment. In the United Kingdom, the government is demanding greater accountability, while funds and resources for arts organisations have been reduced dramatically (Kawashima, 1997). Today, arts venues must increasingly earn their own livings (for example via sponsorship or fundraising) and at the same time demonstrate social relevance to justify those public funds that they do still receive (Hooper-Greenhill, 1999). Although the marketing and fundraising techniques used by art organisations are increasingly sophisticated (see Scoffield, 2000; Kottasz, 2001), competition is tough and funds are extremely hard to come by. It is important to note that arts organisations compete not only with other arts venues for funds, but also with all other charities that rely on public donations. Indeed, there are now over 185,000 registered charities in the UK competing for funds (Musi, 2001) and the number is rising by 5,000 annually (Guardian, 2000). (Note that throughout the paper the term charity is used to refer to all non-profit organisations including non-profit arts venues.)

Recent evidence has suggested that individual donations to non-profit organisations in the UK have declined or, at best, have remained stagnant (Pharoah, 1996; Storey, 2001). The rapidly expanding charity sector and a levelling off in overall donations has made the job of fundraising increasingly difficult (see for example Pharoah and Tanner, 1997; Bendapudi et al, 1996; NCVO, 1999). A contracting donor pool has made donor acquisition particularly problematic; response rates to mailings have fallen and the initial returns accruing from recruitment activity appear to be in decline (Sargeant, 1999a). Thus, according to the NCVO (1999) and Sargeant et al (2000), non-profits are having to profile their supporter base and manipulate the resulting information more and more carefully in order to refine the targeting of those statistically more likely to support their organisation. This, however, can only alleviate the situation in the short term. NCVO (1999) pointed out that the greater the extent to which charities intensify their marketing efforts the more the elite 5 per cent of donors will become overwhelmed with requests for support, and as a consequence response rates and attainable returns on investment will diminish. Sargeant

et al (2000) and Wolpert (2002) suggested that the *long-term* solution to the donor recruitment problem was to persuade a larger proportion of the population to give and, most importantly, to give at higher levels.

Clearly, therefore, in order to compete with other charities effectively, arts organisations need to persuade "non-traditional" donors to give, especially those with the greatest capacity to proffer large donations. An important sector known *not* to be particularly interested in donating comprises affluent young males (Smy, 2000), despite their growing incomes and increasing societal influence. Note immediately that the number of individuals in Britain earning six-figure incomes has risen by almost 50 per cent over the past four years (Wray, 2002). Figures calculated by the UK Inland Revenue authorities show that there are approximately 326,000 people in Britain who earned £100,000 a year or more before tax in 2002 (Wray, 2002). Forty-five per cent of the people earning £50,000 a year or more in 1999-2000 (around 471,000 individuals) lived in London and the South-East, and they were mostly male. (The average wage of employees in the "Square Mile" of the City of London in 2002 was £60,000; Demetriou, 2002).

Datamonitor (2002) reported in 2002 that the number of wealthy individuals (earning between £30,000 and £200,000 per year) was expected to rise by 6.8 per cent annually for the next five years. Critically, a large proportion of this affluent group is relatively young (Smy, 2000), making this particular group one of the most attractive target markets for arts fundraisers (see Bashford, 2002). Affluent young males are perhaps more important than ever in the arts fundraising context considering that new recruits are increasingly hard to come by and the age of the average donor is rising rapidly (Pharoah and Tanner, 1997). Pharoah and Tanner urged researchers to find ways to motivate the young in their twenties and thirties to donate to the non-profit sector. The present research sought to contribute to the attainment of this objective *via* an empirical study of the donor preferences of young (under age 40) high-income (earning more than £50,000 per year) males residing in the South East of England. Recommendations to arts organisations are offered on how best to cater for and communicate to this particular segment of the donor market.

Literature Review

Extrinsic and Intrinsic Determinants of Donor Behaviour

A priori, a number of extrinsic variables can be attributed to the giving behaviour of young, professional, affluent males. Extrinsic determinants are mainly demographic variables that impact on the manner in which non-profit appeals are perceived and how the decision making process is conducted (Sargeant, 1999b). Professional and managerial jobs tend to be occupied by better educated people and the latter are more likely to give to charity (Schlegelmilch and Tynan, 1987; Jones and Posnett, 1991; Newman, 1998). In general, higher income earners donate more generously (Schlegelmilch et. al, 1997; Clotfelter, 2001; Schervish and Havens, 2001), as do individuals holding high status or power in society (Guy and Patton, 1989). The wealthy, moreover, have been found to give for *different reasons* than the poor. Silver (1980) concluded that lower socio-economic groups donated to charities because they were better able to empathise with the latter's predicament, whereas higher socio-economic groups gave not only to assist the reduction of suffering, but also to initiate longer-term social change (see Radley and Kennedy, 1995). Also, the wealthy have been found to be more willing to donate to educational, cultural and arts causes (Ostrower, 1997) and to be least likely to support homelessness and children's charities (Reed, 1998).

Unfortunately for the fundraiser, the profile of the young male affluent professional closely matches the profile of the typical non-donor. Harvey (1990) and Jones and Posnett (1991) studied differences in charitable giving by gender and found that men were less likely in general to give than women. A specific problem potentially arising from gender-related disparities in donor behaviour arises from the work of Brunel and Nelson (2000), who concluded that women preferred fundraising appeals which emphasised helping others, while men broadly were more likely to respond to communications efforts which suggested *personal benefits* for themselves (for example, tax breaks on charitable giving). Equally, younger people have been found to be less prone to giving (Simpson, 1986; Sargeant et al, 2000) and more suspicious of institutions and fundraisers (Falco et al, 1998; Sargeant et al, 2000). In general, today's

younger generation appears to be less motivated to give to charitable causes than in the past (Pharoah and Tanner, 1997; Kleinman, 2000). As Simpson (1986) pointed out: "(in the UK) this generation seems less inclined to believe in philanthropy. They are much more consumption driven, they buy things for themselves. Young people today like to spend money on eating out, on clothes and other things - more than people did 20 years ago". Yankelovich (1985) and Clark et al (2001) asserted that there has been a resurgence of materialistic values among younger consumers. Indeed, Goodden (1994) proposed that there was substantial evidence to demonstrate that when it came to charitable giving this new generation was more apt to ask *what is in it for me?* It is relevant to note, however, that Nichols's (1994) findings indicated that, given the chance, the young generation was in fact willing to share its resources with charities. Indeed, Pidgeon and Saxton (1992) stated that the main reason for the young not being actively involved in donating to charities was because they have rarely been asked. They noted, moreover, that a great deal of fresh research was needed to establish the different donor motivations of new audiences.

Grace (2000) reported that young entrepreneurs "don't talk in terms of charitable giving, they talk about it as an investment". Such donors were interested in seeing *immediate* results and solutions to social problems and hence wanted to have hands-on involvement with the running of their supported organisations (Gorov, 1999; Grace, 2000; Price, 2000). As Braus (1994) noted: "many of today's donors, particularly baby boomers and women, want a precise explanation of how their money will be used. They also want the opportunity to choose how the money will be spent" (see also Goodden, 1994). This was because they were suspicious of fundraising activities and did not know whether the money really went to the causes to which they donated.

Intrinsic factors

The intrinsic determinants of charitable giving refer to the underlying individual motives for electing to support a charity. It has been argued that individuals may choose to help others because they expect some economic or social reward for doing so (Collard, 1978). According to Weiser (2002), for example, many

education and arts donations are received by elite institutions that service the upper class from which the donors emanate, thus helping to cement affluent donors' social ties. Equally, individuals may donate or help with the expectation that others may return the favour in the future when the giver has a need (Penrod, 1983). The motivation for helping may be egoistic, altruistic or both. Egoistic motivation has the ultimate goal of increasing a person's own welfare (Martin, 1994) by gaining rewards for helping or avoiding punishment for not helping (Cialdini et al, 1990). These rewards and punishments include intangible cognitive and psychological outcomes, as well as tangible benefits and penalties; they also may be bestowed by the person (e.g. pride versus guilt) or by society (e.g. praise versus condemnation). Egoistic motivations extend to such issues as securing recognition, a sense of belonging, career advancement, tax advantages, peer pressure, and political gains (American Association of Fundraising Council, 1994). Likewise, when confronted with a charitable cause, a person may experience distress (Piliavin et al, 1981). The person may then try to reduce personal distress by helping or escaping the need situation (e.g. by ignoring the message). This motivation is also egoistic because, even if it results in helping, the ultimate goal is to reduce the donor's personal distress. Altruistic motivation, in contrast, has the ultimate goal of enhancing the welfare of the needy (Martin, 1994) even at the expense of a person's own interest. There is however a debate as to whether true altruism exists (for a detailed examination of this philosophical debate see Batson, 1991).

Tangible Benefits

Some literature has alleged that today's donors are increasingly more interested in getting benefits and rewards from the charities they support. Charities can provide value to donors in two main ways: cause value and service value (McGrath, 1997). Cause value is the main work of the charity (for example widening access to the arts). Service value covers those things that a charity does specifically for the donor, such as showing appreciation, giving feedback and dealing with donor complaints (see Wolpert, 2002). Smy's (2000) survey of UK fundraisers revealed that many believed that, in return for their investment, rich donors prefer to receive tangible (or service) benefits such as, for example, invitations to

special events and membership schemes. McGrath (1997) and Nixon (quoted in Smy, 2000) suggested that the most direct way to add donor value was to offer more fiscal incentives to individuals and increase the value of the gift itself by matched giving (via tax breaks).

In the USA it is known that higher levels of giving occur among donors who have itemised their charitable donation deductions on their federal tax returns (Wolpert, 2002). To encourage large donations to charity as part of its "Getting Britain Giving Campaign", the UK government introduced US style tax rules in May 2000 (Hill, 2000). Allegedly, however, charities and the public have been slow on the uptake. Neil Jones, Director of Communications at the Charities Aid Foundation, said: "some charities still don't know how the changes will affect them" (Hill, 2000). In the US, as much as 40 per cent of voluntary sector income comes from so-called "planned giving" (Warwick-Ching, 2002). Ramsay (quoted in Goodden, 1994) stated that "the essential difference between annual giving and planned giving is that with planned giving, one gives from one's wealth, instead of from one's current bank account".

Accordingly, planned giving offers numerous options (the individual can set up a bequest, open a life insurance policy in favour of a charity, set up a charitable income trust, etc.) all of which are financially beneficial to the individual while they live (typically through tax incentives). On their website (<http://national.unitedway.org/>) the United Way of America, a people's charity in the United States, outlines some of the planned giving options a prospective donor may have (see Table 1). In the UK planned giving has yet to take off. However, it has been predicted that the UK could soon see a shift towards the kind of planned giving culture that has become established in the United States (Warwick-Ching, 2002).

TABLE 1. EXAMPLES OF PLANNED GIVING

The Goal of the Donor	The Donor's Gift	How to Make the Gift	The Donor's Benefits
Make a revocable gift during the donor's lifetime	Living trust	Name the charity as beneficiary of assets in a living trust	Control of trust for lifetime; possible estate tax savings
Make a large gift with little cost to the donor	Life insurance gift	Give a policy with the charity as owner and beneficiary	Current income tax deduction; possible future deductions
Avoid the twofold taxation on retirement	Retirement plan gift	Name the charity as beneficiary of the	Avoidance of heavily taxed gift to heirs,

plan assets		remainder of the assets after the donor's lifetime	allowing less costly gifts
Avoid capital gains tax on the sale of a home or other real estate	Real estate gift	Donate the property to the charity, or sell it to the charity at a bargain price	Immediate income tax deduction and avoidance of capital gains tax
Give the donor's personal residence or farm, but continue to live there	Retained life estate	Designate the ownership of the donor's home to the charity, but retain occupancy	Charitable income tax deduction and lifetime use of home

The above suggests that the (alleged) materialistic and individualistic nature of young affluent men will encourage their motivation to give for egoistic rather than altruistic reasons. For instance, they might be interested in charitable giving that reaps personal benefits (for example tax-breaks via planned giving), or will prefer to donate to a charity in which they have a personal vested interest. It may be that the group under investigation will have little time for philanthropy, will be suspicious of fundraising activities and, when choosing among donor products, will prefer to donate to a charity with a reputable image that reflects *effectiveness and efficiency*. Moreover, it may be reasonable to suppose that young affluent men will want a detailed explanation of how their donations are to be spent; and hence may want a personal hands-on involvement in the running of the charity (for example a donor may want actively to participate in arts committee meetings and monetary decision-making).

The study

Consequent to a comprehensive review of the abovementioned literature plus discussions with three investment bankers and one lawyer, a questionnaire designed to explore the donor attitudes and behaviour of young affluent males was developed. Then, the Human Resources Department of seven legal or financial services companies in the City of London with which the author's university had direct links, were contacted and invited to participate in the investigation. Five of the (large) organisations agreed to take part: a law firm (Sherman Law Group) and four banks (Deutsche Bank, Morgan Stanley, West LandesBank and The Royal Bank of Canada). The Human Resource Departments of the five companies were given detailed information about the purpose of the study and requested to identify among their employees, affluent young males to whom questionnaires could be forwarded. Consequently, a total of

348 questionnaires were distributed via email or in person by HR staff. Two hundred and six questionnaires were returned, of which 158 were usable.

Conjoint analysis combinations

The questionnaire began by asking individuals to rank in order of preference 9 types of combinations of donor products, as suggested by the literature review. A table was presented to respondents wherein the nine rows represented the 9 combinations of product characteristics and the columns the 4 product attributes. In consequence of the literature review the following donor product attributes were deemed relevant for the conjoint analysis: type of charitable organisation (cf. Ostrower, 1997; Wymer, 1997; Reed, 1998), types of reward/benefit offered (cf. Goodden, 1994; McGrath, 1997; Gorov, 1999; Smy, 2000; Bennett, 2002), extent of personal involvement (cf. Gorov, 1999; Grace, 2000; Price, 2000) and whether the charity was deemed reputable (see Bennett and Gabriel, 2000 for details of relevant supporting literature). Table 2 provides details of the attributes and attribute levels used in the conjoint phase of the study. The questionnaire included detailed examples and descriptions of the various attributes and levels. Thus, for instance, the term "tax breaks" was illustrated by examples drawn from Table 1.

The goal of the conjoint survey was to assign specific values to the range of options potential donors considered when making a decision on whether to donate. Conjoint analysis infers that decisions are made on the basis of trade-offs among the different product characteristics. The individual determines which combinations of product attributes are the most and least important and ranks them accordingly.

Table 2. Conjoint attributes and attribute levels

Attribute	Level
Type of Cause	(1) An Arts/Cultural Institution (2) People's Charity (e.g. children's or homeless people's charities) (3) An Animal Charity
Reputation of the Charity	(1) A very well-established and well-known charity (2) A respectable, but not well-known charity
Personal Involvement	(1) A hands-on approach (2) A hands-off approach (i.e. financial contribution is offered by the donor without any direct/active contact with the charity)

Rewards and Benefits Offered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Invitations to special charity galas and events (2) Fiscal incentives (e.g. tax breaks) (3) High personal recognition
------------------------------	---

Each characteristic has a "part-worth" reflecting its perceived relative importance. SPSS 11 was used to run the conjoint procedure, which was operationalised via the orthogonal array method. An orthogonal array method was applied because with 3 x 2 x 2 x 3 levels the task becomes overly complex (with 54 combinations) and because only a subset of all the possible donor product cards is actually needed. In the orthogonal array, each level of one variable occurs with each level of another variable with proportional frequencies. The orthoplan conjoint procedure generated nine combinations of the four attributes, which the respondents ranked in order of preference (1 = most preferred combination, 9 = least preferred combination).

Section 2 of the questionnaire included questions on demographics such as the individual's gender, age, occupation, educational background and religious beliefs. Respondents were also asked how regularly they donated and how much on average they gave to good causes each month. The respondents' levels of empathy, personal values, materialistic values were then examined, and whether the individual experienced "helper's high" (i.e., a flow of self-gratifying positive emotion consequent to a charitable act leading to enhanced self-esteem [Williamson and Clark, 1989]). An individual's propensity to feel empathy with others was measured via items adapted from Davis's (1994) seven-item inventory for assessing empathetic pre-dispositions. Examples of the items are "I feel protective towards people who are taken advantage of" and "I am often quite touched by the things I see happening to others". Richin's (1987) six-item materialism inventory, was used to measure materialistic tendency. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with statements such as "I would like to be rich enough to buy anything I want" and "it's really true that money can buy happiness". The degree to which an individual was prone to experience helper's high was evaluated by three items taken from Bennett and Gabriel (1999), e.g. "donating to non-profit causes gives me a warm feeling of personal satisfaction".

The final section of the questionnaire presented respondents with a series of items related to attitudes towards philanthropy and giving. Individuals were asked to agree or disagree (five-point Likert scales) with statements such as "my attitude and approach to philanthropy is similar to that of my parents and family", and "I am more concerned about passing wealth on to the next generation of my family than donating to charitable causes". Respondents were then asked to give reasons for their charitable behaviour, i.e. feeling proud, wanting recognition, feeling a sense of belonging to society.

Responses to the six-item materialism and the seven-item empathy instrument were factor analysed and, as reported in previous studies, unidimensional solutions emerged in both cases ($\lambda = 4.44$, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.88$ for materialism; $\lambda = 5.01$, $\alpha = 0.9$ for empathy). Hence the two sets of items were composited to form two new scales reflecting these constructs. The three helper's high items were intercorrelated ($R > 0.61$) so these too were amalgamated into a single variable.

Descriptive Results

All the respondents were aged between 22-40. Seventy-eight people in the sample were investment bankers, 57 were corporate lawyers and 23 were accountants. Although all members of the sample were UK residents, 35% had been born in other countries. Fifty-one per cent of the individuals were married. Relative to most other people, 56% of individuals regarded themselves as having a higher social status; the remaining 44% thought they were of the same social standing as most other people. In parallel with previous findings, individuals who considered themselves to be of higher standing than most others in society were twice as likely to be generous donors (in the sense of giving more than £20 on a monthly basis). Professionals working in the legal services industry seemed to be more prone to giving than were individuals working in the financial services. While 63% of lawyers contributed over £20 per month, only 33% of accountants and 12% of investment bankers gave similar amounts. Indeed, 56% of the accountants and 51% of the bankers gave £3 or less per month. Twenty per cent of the respondents classified themselves as "infrequent donors" (typically donating less than £1 to charity over a four week

period; 87% of these individuals gave this amount less than once a year). An analysis of the infrequent donor profile revealed that 70% were investment bankers.

The literature review suggested that people with higher levels of empathy contributed more to charity. There was no evidence of this in the current study. Note however that nearly all the respondents claimed to have high levels of empathy, so there was insufficient variation in the data to be able to investigate this matter in more depth. However, religious people (35% of the sample population) were significantly more likely to give larger amounts to charities, ($R= 0.431$, $p=0.001$), supporting previous findings in this regard. The sample population appeared to be rather materialistic; 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I would like to be rich enough to buy anything I want". One fifth of the sample agreed with the statement: "I am a person who looks after number one".

Fifty-one per cent of respondents claimed that their attitude and approach to philanthropy was very similar to that of their parents and family (a quarter of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement). Nearly half of the respondents agreed that they were "more concerned about passing wealth on to the next generation of my family than donating to charitable causes". This variable was positively and significantly correlated with the statement "when it comes to donating I ask 'what's in it for me?'" ($R=0.453$, $p=0.001$). Half of the accountants and investment bankers were "more likely to be concerned about passing wealth on to their own families rather than donating to charity", compared to just 35% of the lawyers. In line with previous research, a large majority (76%) of individuals claimed that they were going to donate more money once they had achieved what they had set out to achieve. This is good news perhaps for fundraisers who are increasingly worried that the current segment of older charitable donors will not be replaced in the future.

Although the prior literature on donor behaviour suggested that young people were in general suspicious of charities and fundraisers alike, this was not the case in the present sample. Only 20% claimed to feel

that way and just 9% agreed with the statement "when it comes to donating I ask *what is in it for me*"?

Over 80% of respondents claimed that they preferred a precise explanation of how their donations were to be spent or used. It is evident, therefore, that one of the most important aspects a young affluent man looks for when donating to a charity is a detailed explanation of where that money is going. (Investment bankers and accountants were more concerned about this than were the corporate lawyers).

Sixty-nine per cent of individuals agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "donating to charity gives me a warm feeling of personal satisfaction". This was the most important reason cited for giving to charitable causes. Fifty-three per cent reported that giving made them feel proud of themselves, 55% felt a sense of belonging to society when donating to charities, 18% wanted to get some fiscal incentives, and 7% wanted recognition in return for their donations. This overview suggests that only a minority of young affluent men place a strong emphasis on gaining tangible rewards when donating to charity. However, cross-tabulations showed that lawyers were more than three times as likely to want recognition and financial incentives in return for their donations than were accountants or investment bankers. (There was a high positive correlation ($R=0.497$, $p=0.01$) between the variables "I want recognition" and "I hope to get financial incentives when donating".) Individuals who donated to charity due to some form of external pressure (for example peers, employers or family) were also significantly more likely to want financial incentives when donating. Seventy-seven per cent of individuals agreed with the statement "I have a very busy and fast paced lifestyle", a variable which was positively and significantly correlated with the statement "when I donate to charitable causes I feel a sense of belonging to society". This may suggest that the kind of lifestyle these professionals lead does not allow much time for a great involvement or interaction with society. Overall, forty-six per cent of respondents stated that they would be interested in planned giving schemes if they were offered to them. Corporate lawyers and individuals that gave to charity on a more regular basis appeared to be the most interested in such schemes. The more an individual gave each month the more likely they were to be interested in planned giving ($R=0.527$, $p=0.001$).

Conjoint Analysis

Part-Worths and Relative Importance of Attributes

Table 4 shows the relative utilities that were obtained and the relative importance of each of the attributes. The average utility scores, shown in column 3 of Table 4, describe the desirability of the various aspects of an attribute, with higher scores suggesting that respondents had a greater preference for that aspect. For example, respondents preferred on the average to donate to an arts organisation (utility of 0.7342) rather than to a people's or an animal charity (utilities of 0.0358 and -0.7700).

The scores also indicated that young wealthy men preferred to give to a charity that has a well-established and good reputation, and which offered invitations to special galas and events as opposed to high personal recognition or fiscal incentives. However they did *not* require a hands-on approach or personal involvement with the charity. The fourth column of Table 3 (the relative importance) provides an indication of the importance placed by the sample on each attribute relative to the other attributes. Overall, respondents' preferences were determined more by the type of cause (which explained 33.85% of the option preferences) and the rewards and benefits offered by the charity (28.35%) than, for example, personal involvement (16.43%).

Table 3. Conjoint analysis results - relative utilities and importance

Attribute	Level	Utility	Relative Importance (%)
Type of Cause	Arts/Cultural Institute	0.7342	33.85
	People's Charity	0.0358	
	Animal Charity	-0.7700	
Reputation of Charity	Very well-established and well-known charity	0.2775	21.38
	A respectable, but not a well-known charity	-0.2775	
Personal Involvement	A hands-on approach	-0.3188	16.43
	A hands-off approach	0.3188	
Rewards and Benefits Offered	Invitations to special galas and events	0.5067	28.35
	Fiscal incentives	-0.3342	
	High personal recognition	-0.1725	

Notes: Pearson's R = 0.985; Kendall's tau = 1.000. These statistics show that the data fit was very good.

"Rewards" were on average the second most important attribute for the respondents. In particular, invitations to special gala events, black tie dinners, theatres, private viewings in art galleries, opening nights, exclusive recitals, etc. (the questionnaire cited examples of such events) were seen as very attractive.

Conclusions and Implications for Arts Fundraising

The study explored donor attitudes and behaviour among a group of people: young high-earning professional males working in the City of London; not previously investigated by the charity fundraising literature. Overall the results suggest that the group does indeed represent a distinct market segment possessing unique characteristics. Furthermore, disparities in attitudes towards charitable giving occurred with respect to the individual's profession. Lawyers tended to donate larger amounts of money to charity and on a more regular basis than individuals working in financial services. This might be explained perhaps by the fact that the corporate lawyers in the sample were significantly ($p=0.001$) more empathetic (mean = 2.00) than members of the other two groups (mean = 1.78 in both cases) and it is known (see above) that empathetic predisposition is positively associated with charitable giving. It is interesting to speculate why the lawyers were more empathetic than investment bankers or accountants. Might it be the case that empathetic people are attracted to the legal profession? Do individuals become more empathetic through practising law? Seventy per cent of infrequent donors identified in the sample worked for investment banks. Lawyers were significantly more likely to be interested in planned giving than were individuals from other professions. They were also more interested in fiscal incentives and more likely to want personal recognition for their contributions. Another significant difference ($p=0.001$) with respect to occupation arose in relation to the intention to donate later in life (after having achieved "what I have set out to achieve"). Bankers scored lowest and lawyers highest on this dimension. Also, bankers were much more likely ($p=0.001$) to want precise explanations of how donations are used. Such outcomes suggest the need for occupationally differentiated marketing strategies and communications when approaching young

affluent males in various professional categories. An appeal that is highly attractive to a high earning young lawyer may be far less alluring to a rich young investment banker.

It is relevant to note that arts and cultural organisations are, on the face of it, probably better able than other charities to provide their donors with the social activities (gala events, black tie dinners, private viewings, etc.) that affluent young men find so appealing. Activities could include the hire of private boxes and entertainment facilities at major national sporting events, the reservation of blocks of expensive seats at first nights of theatre or operatic productions, days at the races, adventure pursuits such as white water canoeing or paint-balling, detective "who done it" evenings in five-star country hotels, etc. a potential problem would of course, be the adverse publicity likely to arise if the news media discovered that arts organisations were spending their income on corporate hospitality type events.

The finding that, on the average, the respondents preferred attribute combinations involving donations to very well-established and well-known charities, creates problems for smaller "niche" arts institutions that have not been in existence for long periods and/or are not well-known. Similarly, the fact that 80% of the sample wanted detailed information on how their donations would be used confirms the need for arts organisations (especially smaller and less well-known ones) to have extensive and effective marketing communications that provide information about their operations.

Another interesting result with practical implications was that, overall, the members of the sample were not attracted by attribute combinations containing planned charity giving. *A priori*, investment bankers and accountants might be expected to be inclined towards these possibilities in consequence of their financial technicality and because of the tax benefits they offer to wealthy people. Planned giving has been found to be of growing importance in the USA (see Smy, 2000; Warwick-Ching, 2002), yet, although 46% of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that they would be "interested" in planned giving if

offered as an option, it was not a preferred selection so far as the conjoint combinations were concerned.

Additional research is required in this area.

References

American Association of Fundraising Council (1994) Giving USA, New York, American Association of Fundraising Council.

Bashford, S. (2002) RNLI to Review Brand in Hunt for Young Donors, Marketing, London, May 9, p. 12.

Batson, D.C. (1991) The Altruism Question, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Beatty, S., Kahle, L. and Homer, P. (1991) Personal Values and Gift Giving Behaviour: A Study Across Cultures, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 183-190.

Bendapudi, N., Singh, S.N. and Bendapudi, V. (1996) Enhancing Helping Behaviour: An Integrative Framework for Promotion Planning, Journal of Marketing, Vol. 60, pp.33-49.

Bennett, R. and Gabriel, H. (1999) Charity Involvement and Customer Preference for Charity Brands, The Journal of Brand Management, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 49-67.

Bennett, R. and Gabriel, H. (2000) Image Building for Charitable Organisations, Social Marketing Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 77-81.

Bennett, R. (2002) Factors Underlying the Inclination to Donate to Particular Types of Charity, International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 12-29.

Braus, P. (1994) Will Baby Boomers Give Generously, American Demographics, Vol. 16, No. 7, pp. 48-52.

Brunel, F.F. and Nelson, M.R. (2000) Explaining Gendered Responses to "Help-Self" and "Help-Others" Charity Advertising Appeals: The Mediating Role of World-Views, Journal of Advertising, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 15-29.

Cialdini, R.B., Reno, R.R. and Kallgren, C.A. (1990) A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: Recycling the Concept of Norms to Reduce Littering in Public Places, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 58, No. 6, pp. 1015-1026.

Clark, P.W., Martin, C.A. and Bush, A.J. (2001) The Effect of Role Model Influence on Adolescents' Materialism and Marketplace Knowledge, Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 27-36.

Clotfelter, C.T. (2001) Who are the Alumni Donors? Giving by Two Generations of Alumni from Selective Colleges, Nonprofit Management and Leadership, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 119-138.

Collard, D. (1978) Altruism and Economy, Oxford University Press, New York, p. 6.

Datamonitor (2002) Rich Suffer as Shares Plunge, in Metro, June 25th, London.

Demetriou, D. (2002) Suburb Has Wealthiest Households in Country, Evening Standard, 17th June, p. 25.

Falco, N., Fopma, W., Maxwell, S., Stoller, M. and Turrell, N. (1998) Planned Giving: Is Philanthropy a Learned Behaviour? Fundraising Management, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp. 36-37.

Fall, L. (2000) An Exploratory Study of the Relationship Between Human Values and Information Sources within a Tourism Framework, *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 3-28.

Goodden, H. (1994) An Enormous Inter-Generational Transfer of Wealth is Imminent: How Can Charities Benefit? *Front and Centre*, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 1, 17-18, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.

Gorov, L. (1999) Spreading the Wealth: Rich, Young Entrepreneurs are Turning to Social Activism instead of the Typical Charities with their Time and Money, *Boston Globe*, Boston, November 28, pp. A, 1:2.

Grace, K.S. (2000) *High Impact Philanthropy*, John Wiley and Sons.

Guardian (2000) Too Many Cooks? Wednesday, November 8.

Guy, B.S. and Patton, W.E. (1989) The Marketing of Altruistic Causes: Understanding Why People Help, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol.6. No.1, pp.19-31.

Harvey, J. (1990) Benefit Segmentation for Fundraisers, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 18, No.1, pp.77-86.

Hill, N. (2000) Charities Fail to Take Advantage of New Tax Rules, *Guardian*, November 9.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1999) *The Educational Role of the Museum: Education, Communication and Interpretation: Towards a Critical Pedagogy in Museums. Part 1.1.* Routledge, London. 2nd Ed.

Jones, A. and Posnett, J. (1991) Charitable Donations by UK Households: Evidence from the Family Expenditure Survey, *Applied Economics*, Vol. 23, No.2, pp. 343-351.

Kahle, L., Rose, G. and Shoham, A. (2000) Findings of LoV throughout the World and Other Evidence of Cross-National Consumer Psychographics, *Journal of Euromarketing*, Vol. 8, No. 1/2, pp.1-13.

Kawashima, N. (1997) *Museum Management in a Time of Change: Impacts of Cultural Policy on Museums in Britain, 1979-1997.* The University of Warwick. Centre for Cultural Policy Studies.

Kleinman, M. (2000) Marie Curie to Increase Donor List via DRTV Ads, *Marketing*, July 20, p. 14.

Kottasz, R. (2001) External Influences on the Management Orientations and New Product Programmes of UK Museums: A Comparative Analysis, Unpublished MPhil study.

Martin, M.W. (1994) *Virtuous Giving: Philanthropy, Voluntary Services and Caring*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

McGee, R.W. (2002) Ending Welfare as We Know It: A Modest Proposal, *Economic Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 12-17.

McGrath, S. (1997) Giving Donors Good Reason to Give Again, *Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 125-135.

Musi, M. (2001) Editorial: A Long Philanthropic Tradition, *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp.196-198.

NCVO (1999) Research Quarterly, No. 6, July, NCVO, London.

Newman, R.H. (1998) Transforming Donors into Strategic Funders, Fund Raising Management, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 31-42.

Nichols, J. (1994) Changing Demographics: Fund Raising in the 1990s, Bonus Books, Chicago, pp. 33-47. (Ph.D.)

Okechuku, C. (1994) The Importance of Product Country of Origin: A Conjoint Analysis of the United States, Canada, Germany and The Netherlands, European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 5-19.

Ostrower, F. (1997) Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press.

Penrod, S. (1983) Social Psychology, Prentice Hall, New York, pp. 439 - 473.

Pharoah, C. (1996) Individual Giving - Seesaw Evidence, Static Trends, Dimensions of the Volunteer Sector, Charities Aid Foundation, London.

Pharoah, C. and Tanner, S. (1997) Trends in Charitable Giving, Fiscal Studies, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 427-443.

Pidgeon, S. and Saxton, J. (1992) How Fundraising will Change in the 90s, Direct Response, Vol. 11, No. 9, pp. 37-43.

Piliavin, J.F., Dovidio, Gaeitner, S.L. and Clark, R.D. (1981) Emergency Intervention, New York, Academic Press.

Price, C. (2000) The Internet Entrepreneurs, Pearson Education Ltd.

Reed, D. (1998) Giving is Receiving, Precision Marketing, 9 February, pp. 17-18.

Richins, M.L. (1987) Media, Materialism and Human Happiness, in Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson (Eds.), Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 14, pp. 352-356.

Rokeach, M. (1973) The Nature of Human Values, New York, Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979) Understanding Human Values, New York, Free Press.

Sargeant, A. (1999a) Donor Retention - Just Why do Donors Stop Giving, Paper presented to ICFM Conference, 12-14th July, Birmingham, UK.

Sargeant, A. (1999b) Charitable Giving: Towards a Model of Donor Behaviour, Journal of Marketing Management, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 215-238.

Sargeant, A., Ford, J. and West, D.C. (2000) Widening the Appeal of Charity, International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 318-332.

Schervish, P.G. and Havens, J.J. (2001) Wealth and the Commonwealth: New Findings on Wherewithal and Philanthropy, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 5-25.

Schlegelmilch, B. and Tynan, A. (1987) Market Segment Orientated Fundraising Strategies: An Empirical Analysis, MIP, Vol. 7, Nos.11/12. pp. 16-24.

Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A. and Diamantopoulos, A. (1997) Responses to Different Charity Appeals: The Impact of Donor Characteristics on the Amount of Donations, European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 31, No. 8, pp. 548-561.

Scofield, S. (2000) Sink or Swim? Responding to the Changing Marketing Environment of Waterways Heritage. Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Conference, 5-7th July 2000. University of Derby.

Silver, M. (1980) Affluence, Altruism and Atrophy, New York University Press, New York.

Simpson, J.C. (1986) Baby Boomers Have 60s Heritage: But Charities Say They are Cheap, Wall Street Journal, Sept. 11, p. 33.

Smith, C. (2002) Sweet Charity, Investment Advisor, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 40-44.

Smy, L. (2000) Private Sponsorship: Tax Breaks Ensure that Giving is Easy, Financial Times, Business and the Arts, II, February 17, p. 2.

Speirn, S. (2002) (In)The Many Faces of Philanthropy, Business Week, No. 3813, Dec. 23, p. 7.

Storey, J. (2001) Charities are Facing a Crisis of Their Own, Marketing Week, April 26, p. 22.

Taylor, M. and Lansley, J. (1992) Ideology and Welfare in the UK: The Implications for the Voluntary Sector, Voluntas, Vol. 3, No. 2, November, pp.153-174.

Todd, S.J. and Lawson, R.W. (1999) Towards a Better Understanding of the Financial Donor: An Examination of Donor Behaviour in Terms of Value Structure and Demographics. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 235-244.

Walker, C. (2002) Philanthropy, Social Capital or Strategic Alliance? The Involvement of Senior UK Business Executives with the Voluntary Sector and Implications for Corporate Fundraising, International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 219-228.

Warwick-Ching, L. (2002) Understanding Charitable Giving: An Ethical Way to Spend and Save, Financial Times Supplement, October 17, pp. 12-13.

Weiser, J. (2002) (In)The Many Faces of Philanthropy, Business Week, No. 3813, Dec. 23, p. 7.

Williamson, G. and Clark, M. (1989) Providing Help and Desired Relationship Type as Determinants of Changes in Self-Evaluations, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 722-734.

Wolpert, J. (2002) What Charity Can and Cannot Do: Policy in Perspective, The Century Foundation at <http://www.tcf.org>

Wray, R. (2002) Women Struggle to Join £100k Club, The Guardian, June 13, p. 28.

Wymer, W. (1997) Segmenting Volunteers Using Values, Self-esteem, Empathy and Facilitation as Determinant Variables, Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 3-28.

Yankelovich, D. (1985) The Charitable Behaviour of Americans, Management Survey, Independent Sector, Washington DC.

<http://national.unitedway.org/>