



Cardiff
Metropolitan
University

Prifysgol
Metropolitan
Caerdydd

‘To identify and explore the factors
influencing Millennials and their
behaviour and decision making processes
(Sargeant, 1999) toward charity giving’

By

Abigail Davies

Submitted For

BA (Hons) Business and Management Studies

At

Cardiff Metropolitan University

May 2017

I declare that this Dissertation has not already been accepted in substance for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree. It is the result of my own independent research except where otherwise stated.

Abstract

The discussion of this study is to identify and explore the factors influencing millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 1999) toward charity giving. Existing literature is reviewed and used to shape the questions which are developed for the qualitative research of focus groups. 3 focus groups are carried out and examined using thematic analysis. The key findings as a result of the research are the themes of empathy, self-benefitting, personal values and evidence. Furthermore these are the significant influences upon millennials behaviour and decision making towards donating to charity.

Word Count: 13,606

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their help and support whilst writing this research project.

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Nicola Burnett-Williams for the support and guidance provided throughout my research. I am eternally grateful for her stepping in at the last minute and instilling me with the confidence that I had with her support.

My family have supported me from the start of the research project, comforting and encouraging me as required. They have given me the reassurance required to benefit my self-confidence and the project. I would like to thank them for their continuous support and for proof reading when required.

Thank you to my friends for taking part in the research and giving up their time to do so. Also for their support and encouragement throughout.

The library resources have been of great assistance to this study and therefore I am thankful for them and their accessibility and so forth Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the Study	1
1.2 Background of the Study	1
1.3 Aims and Objectives	2
1.4 Research Methodology	2
1.5 Order of Thesis	2
Chapter 2: Literature Review	4
2.1 Chapter Overview	4
2.2 Charities	4
2.2.1 Problems with Perception	4
2.3 Marketing of Charities	5
2.3.1 Recruitment of Donors	6
2.3.2 Types of Donation	7
2.4 Decision Making Process	8
2.4.1 Extrinsic	9
2.4.2 Intrinsic	9
2.5 Millennials	10
2.6 Millennials Motivation	11
2.6.1 Guilt and Empathy	11
2.6.2 Personal Values	12
2.6.3 Trust	12
2.6.4 Limited Financial Availability	13
2.7 Barriers to Motivation	13
2.7.1 Consumption Driven	13
2.7.2 Lack of Confidence	14
2.7.3 Marketing Influences	14
2.7.4 Limited financial availability	14
Chapter 3: Methodology	15
3.1 Chapter Overview	15
3.2 Research Aims and Objectives	15
3.3 Ontology and Epistemology	15
3.3.1 Ontology	16
3.3.2 Epistemology	16

3.4 Overall Approach	17
3.5 Philosophical Stance	17
3.6 Qualitative Research	17
3.6.1 Qualitative Research Method	18
3.6.2 Questions Informed by Existing Studies and Literature	19
3.7 Respondent Criteria	19
3.8 Sample	19
3.8.1 Sampling	19
3.8.2 Sample Size	20
3.9 Data Coding and Analysis	20
3.9.1 Research Questions	20
3.10 Ethics and Confidentiality	21
3.11 Tests for Validity and Reliability	22
3.12 Methodological Critique	22
3.13 Limitation of the Study	23
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion	24
4.1 Objective 1	24
4.1.1 Empathy	24
4.1.1.1 Family Connection	24
4.1.1.2 Emotionally Affected by the Cause	25
4.1.1.3 Who the Charity is Including the Cause and the Work Completed	26
4.1.1.4 Guilt	27
4.1.2 Convenience/Ease	28
4.1.2.1 Local	28
4.1.2.2 Ease of Process	29
4.1.3 Trust	29
4.1.3.1 Evidence/Explanation	30
4.1.3.2 Reputation	30
4.1.4 Personal Values	31
4.1.4.1 Social Group	31
4.1.4.2 Habits	32
4.1.4.3 Opinion/Attitude	33
4.1.5 Self-benefitting	34
4.1.5.1 Feel Good	34

4.1.5.2 Rewards	34
4.1.6 Summary of Objective 1	35
4.2 Objective 1b	35
4.2.1 Relationship Marketing.....	36
4.2.1.1 Long-term Interaction	36
4.2.1.2 Short-Term interaction.....	37
4.2.2 Transactional Marketing.....	37
4.2.2.1 Convenience.....	38
4.2.2.2 Impersonal	39
4.2.3 Informational.....	39
4.2.3.1 Evidence	40
4.2.3.2 Explanation of the Cause.....	40
4.2.4 Reaction	41
4.2.4.1 Negative Reactions	41
4.2.4.2 Positive Reactions.....	42
4.2.5 Summary of Objective 1b.....	43
4.3 Objective 2	43
4.3.1 Financial.....	43
4.3.1.1 Lack of Financial Availability.....	44
4.3.2 Self-benefitting	45
4.3.2.1 Pleasure	45
4.3.2.2 Rewards	45
4.3.3 Empathy	46
4.3.3.1 Emotional Response.....	46
4.3.3.2 Family Connection	47
4.3.3.3 Scale of Charitable Organisations	48
4.3.4 Evidence	48
4.3.5 Personal Values	49
4.3.5.1 Opinion/Attitude	49
4.3.6 Summary of Objective 2.....	50
4.4 Objective 3	50
4.4.1 Low Involvement.....	50
4.4.1.1 Motivations	51
4.4.1.2 Barriers	51
4.4.2 High Involvement.....	52

4.4.2.1 Motivations	52
4.4.2.2 Barriers	53
4.4.3 Summary of Objective 3	53
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations	54
Appendices	56
1. Developed Ethics Approval Application Summary	56
2. Participant Consent Form	62
3. Participant Information Sheet	63
4. Questions for Focus Group.....	65
5. Focus Group Transcript 3 Coded	66
6. Findings for the Theme of Motivations towards Charitable Giving	76
Reference List	86

Chapter 1: Introduction

The introduction briefly explains the research taking place as well as the background of the study and aims and objectives. The main themes of the literature review and methodology are identified followed by the order of thesis.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to identify and explore the factors influencing millennials and their behaviour and decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) towards charity giving. There are a number of influencing factors which can affect charitable giving behaviour and the motives behind it, therefore this piece of research aims to understand the influential factors so to benefit charitable organisations and assist them in enhancing their number of donation received. As there are numerous factors influencing millennials motivation and decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) towards charitable giving which can include the marketing of charities, a significant part of the research was to appreciate how marketing influences millennials and their response to it. This study is of great importance to the non-for-profit sector as voluntary donations are significant to the success and life span of the organisations as they are reliant on donations to survive.

1.2 Background of the Study

With the literature, millennials perception of charitable organisations and their marketing influences their views and opinions towards charitable giving. Millennials are motivated to donate for various reasons and successively are effected by the intrinsic and extrinsic determents of the decision making process, as according to Sargeant (1999).

1.3 Aims and Objectives

The aim is to identify and explore the factors influencing millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 1999) towards charity giving.

After looking at the aim, 4 objectives were developed

1. Identify the main motivations which are connected with millennial giving behaviour towards charities.
- 1b. To explore the effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation to give to charities.
2. To determine the main factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influence millennials charity giving.
3. Explore whether the different donations can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivation to give to charities.

1.4 Research Methodology

Qualitative research in the form of focus groups were utilised in order to achieve the aim and objectives of the study. 3 focus groups were carried out in a natural location for the participants. Thematic analysis was used to assess the data collected and establish the findings.

1.5 Order of Thesis

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the study through an overview along with justification and the importance of the study and the research aim and objectives, whilst highlighting the key themes in literature and research methodology.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter discusses the extent of the literature upon charitable organisations, their marketing, millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999), motivations and barriers to charitable giving.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology of the study, outlines the philosophical standing and basis for this research which dictates the methods applied in the study. In addition, this chapter validates the decisions towards the method of data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations used in the study.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This chapters discusses the findings established from the data collected along with analysis and discussions of the data.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Within this chapter the main themes and findings are summarised followed by recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter presents the available literature which is relevant to the study. It aims to discuss what charities are along with their aim and the current perceptions of such organisations. The marketing used by charitable organisations are identified. The decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) is defined and its relevance to millennials charitable giving motivation.

2.2 Charities

Charities carry out philanthropic work relying on the donor's motivation to work with the organisation in order to act sustainably and achieve their objectives (Joireman and Mulder, 2016). The marketing within charities is of great significance and said by Bennett and Savani (2004) to be a key organisational function due to their position in the market. Voluntary organisations in the UK are defined as having tax benefits preserved in law (Sargeant, 2009).

According to Milne and Gordon (1993), donors are becoming increasingly particular in regards to which charity they chose to interact with and support. Stronger relationships are being formed between the two parties, which is instigated by the donor, increasing the likelihood of interacting with the charity in the future (Sargeant and Ewing, 2001).

2.2.1 Problems with Perception

British charities have faced increased difficulties in fundraising and identifying the most efficient way of sourcing donors (Sargeant and Ewing, 2001). It is believed that the growth of charitable causes has influenced individual giving behaviour because newly established causes can be more appealing than that of long standing (Sargeant and Ewing, 2001).

Charities have a wide range of stakeholders who invested their time, emotions and on occasion money into them and can be left disheartened if they feel their donation is spent on marketing materials instead of visible benefits to the cause (Bennett and Savani, 2004). O'Sullivan (1993) carried out a survey and discovered that 40% of those asked believed charities misused money for advertising purposes, furthermore their donations were not thought to be used to benefit the cause at hand; this correlates with Bennett and Savani (2004).

One effective marketing campaign and its earnings can be lost in moments by another ineffective campaign suggesting that the marketing of charities costs more than it generates (Bennett and Savani, 2004). There are mistaken beliefs on how charities spend their profits including how much is used for administration and the purposes of marketing (Bennett and Savani, 2003). It is indicated that both the media and general public should have a better knowledge of a charities expenses as a result (Ormstedt, 1994). However according to Warwick (1994), donors are aware of the monies spent on fundraising and administration costs by a charity and it was anticipated that the ratios of this to charitable costs is 20:80, although Sargeant (1999) states that it is in fact closer to 50:50.

2.3 Marketing of Charities

As a result of the perceptions and challenges charities face, Bendapudi *et al* (1996) suggests that the antecedent factors such as marketing strategies should be investigated and researched as these may affect an individual's giving behaviour.

The marketing of non-for-profit organisations differs from that of for-profit businesses. Firstly they have a poor unique selling point because of the lack of direct benefits the donor would receive, making it difficult to target the markets behaviour (Rothschild,

1979). Non-for-profit organisations also target a wider audience as the message can be appropriate to all therefore they are required to communicate with a variety of stakeholders to assist reaching the organisation aims and objectives (Rothschild, 1979; Baines *et al*, 2013).

According to Sargeant (2009), marketing of non-for-profit organisations can have the following benefits; improve satisfaction rates of customers, attract resources which can assist in meeting the organisations aims and objectives, establish what the organisation can and cannot deliver/offer and utilise a systematic method which can limit the rate of wastage marketing resources generated.

Kim (2014) states that making use of altruistic pleas and using those who have benefitted from the organisations work is beneficial in encouraging people to volunteer for a charity. However, using egotistic pleas and showing those who require the help of the organisation, correlated to the monetary donations which charities receive (Kim, 2014). Furthermore it is established that different advertising approaches are required in order to receive different types of donations (Kim, 2014).

2.3.1 Recruitment of Donors

Transactional marketing is commonly used by most businesses as a way of gaining new customers on a regular basis and satisfying their needs there and then (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005). It includes a single piece of communication from the organisation to the mass market and furthermore is an impersonal way of promoting a product/service or brand (Coviello *et al*, 1997). An example of this are charity boxes at till points because they are marketing the charity and the opportunity to donate to the mass market. However relationship marketing aims to establish and build a deeper relationship with its customers therefore forming a long-term relationship (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005).

This type of marketing is thought by Berry (1995) to be extremely relevant for organisations, such as charities who are offering their customers a personal experience. According to Coviello *et al* (1997) charities will use relationship marketing in order to distribute their marketing materials to specific market segments whilst building the platforms to gain feedback from customers allowing them to improve the experience which customers have. An example of this is communications from charities with regards to updates about them sent to individuals' home; this is a form of direct marketing. Relationship marketing can also be an effective approach used by not-for-profit organisations because it allows the organisation to focus on delivering a high level of service in a competitive market (Chad *et al*, 2013).

2.3.2 Types of Donation

Not-for-profit organisations objective is to encourage people to give their time and/or monetary donations whereas for-profit convince consumers to use and purchase their products/services, indicating that their advertising strategies differ (Reed *et al*, 2007 as cited in Kim, 2014). According to Liu and Aaker (2008 as cited in Kim, 2014) both time and money are viewed with different values to consumers. Time is thought to provide an experience and therefore creates a positive emotion more than that of money (Schwarz & Clore, 1996 as cited in Kim, 2014). This can be voluntary work at a charity assisting with their fundraising activities whereas monetary donations can be donating money in a collection bucket as you pass by or setting up a standing order so to regularly donate. Liu and Aaker (2008 as cited in Kim, 2014), discovered that when asked to donate their time, donors would afterwards donate a large amount in monetary value more than what they would if they were asked to donate money first of all. Michaelidou *et al* (2015) supports this as it was found that making past donations to a charity tends to influence a person's decision to donate in the future. However other influences may

play a role for well-known charity brands with strong publicity and communications (Michaelidou *et al*, 2015). According to Michaelidou *et al* (2015), a charity with lower levels of publicity and awareness gains new donors through them rationally considering the charities.

Reed *et al* (2007 as cited in Kim, 2014) established that there are other reasons as to why people donate and of what format, stating that a person's morality can affect their donation as those with high morality are thought to donate their time rather than money as it can be viewed as a more moral action. Furthermore Kim (2014) adds that due to the research carried out into the various behaviours that donors can take on, different advertising campaigns should be utilised to attract a range of donors.

2.4 Decision Making Process

Sargeant (1999) created a model of giving behaviours towards charitable organisations which individuals go through when faced with the decision of charitable giving. It is made up of inputs (the charities brand), which influence the perceptual reaction (portrayal, relatability and power of stimulus) which is affected by both the intrinsic and extrinsic determinants (Sargeant, 1999). Following on from perceptual reaction is processing determinants (previous experiences and judgement) which then results in the output (the donation itself and/or loyalty of donor) (Sargeant, 1999).

This process shows that there are both intrinsic and extrinsic factors which influence the motivation of individuals to donate, and can influence the inputs to perceptual reaction outcome and the perceptual reaction to processing determinants outcome (Sargeant, 1999).

2.4.1 Extrinsic

The demographics of an individual and their socio-economic factors make up the extrinsic elements for their giving behaviour (Lee and Chang, 2008).

The age of an individual is thought to influence the likelihood of them giving (Nichols, 1992; Midlarsky and Hannah, 1989). The younger generation are thought to be less likely motivated to donate (IFS, 1998 as cited in Sargeant, 1999). This is supported by the CAF (2016) as in their 2015 report it showed that 16-24 year olds were the highest percentage of people who never and rarely donate to charity, with 17% and 18% consecutively and the lowest percentage in weekly at 3% and monthly at 14%.

Simpson (1986) stated that within the UK the younger generation show little signs of belief in philanthropy. Gender is also an extrinsic factor which influences the giving process (Sargeant, 1999). Women are perceived to want an increasing amount of information about the usage of their money although they are believed to donate on an irregular basis giving smaller donations compared to the male population (Braus, 1994).

Extrinsic motivation can also be defined as carrying out an activity due to the enjoyment experienced in doing so rather than the intrinsic value (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Social approval and ego endorsement can encourage this behaviour (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

2.4.2 Intrinsic

Intrinsic variables focus on the individual factors such as values, personalities and attitudes which are the underlying motives to favouring a charity (Lee and Chang, 2008). These variables can help an individual to distinguish between the appeals which are the most suitable to themselves and establish the level of support they give (Sargeant, 1999).

Empathy can be viewed as a significant intrinsic factor which influences individual charitable giving behaviour (Sargeant, 1999). According to Eisenberg and Miller (1987), the most popular view of empathy used is the cognitive perspective of thinking. Charities appeals must be effective so that it can draw empathy from the potential donor however not so overly influential that it becomes personally troubling (Fultz *et al*, 1986). It is argued by both Batson (1990) and Fultz (1986) that there is a direct link between a donors level of sympathy, their likelihood to donate and degree of support then given to the organisation.

Feelings of self-interest can also influence an individual's behaviour to give (Sargeant, 1999). It was stated by Webb and Mohr (1998) that during a study half of the participants showed a selfish nature to reasons for interacting with firms which carried out cause-related marketing. Sargeant (1999) identified that the importance of self-esteem and self-recognition have been believed to be key motives for giving.

It is clear there are a number of different influences upon charitable giving behaviour which are complex and inter-linked hinting that there are altruistic and self-interest motives for individuals giving behaviour (Sargeant 1999).

2.5 Millennials

The millennial population are typically born between 1979 and 2000, according to Connaway (2015, p.84) and can be called "Net Generation", "Generation Y" or "Echo Boomers".

It has been found that young people are thought to be less likely to donate to charitable organisations (Simpson, 1986; Sargeant *et al*, 2000) and also query the intentions of them regularly (Falco *et al*, 1998; Sargeant *et al*, 2000). Midlarsky and Hannah (1989) supports this as research shows that the older generation donate considerably more

when compared to the younger generation; this is said to be due to the life span theory and generativity (Erickson *et al.*, 1986). This is supported by the CAF (2016) charitable giving report of 2015.

According to Falco *et al* (1998) we are believed to learn our philanthropic behaviour from our parents closely connected to any religious teachings which we are brought up with (Yankelovich, 1985). In a study carried out by Opoku (2012), it was found that the 3 main influencers of a young person's donating behaviour are religion, altruism and personal benefits which are felt by the donor. Although there are a number of studies suggesting ways of understanding giving behaviour (Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007). Ko *et al* (2011, p.169) supports this however proposing that there is "a need to focus on understanding psychological dimensions of giving behaviour, such as familiarity, identity and benefits sought".

2.6 Millennials Motivation

2.6.1 Guilt and Empathy

Empathy can be understood "as an individual's emotional arousal elicited by the expression of emotion in another" (Aronfreed, 1968; Berger, 1962; Shelton and Rogers, 1981 as cited in Sargeant, 1999, p.226). Sargeant *et al* (2006) identified that individual's likelihood to donate increases when they have an empathy to the charity organisation. Guilt and empathy are feelings had by an individual which are believed to be the cause of selfless behaviour such as donating to charities (Davis, 1994). Guilt was identified by Sargeant (1999) to be an intrinsic determinant of an individual's behaviour towards charitable giving.

2.6.2 Personal Values

Motivation behind donating can stem from an individual's personal values (Keyt *et al*, 2002; Bennett, 2003; Francia *et al*, 2005). Religion is a significant stimulus behind donations (Ranganathan and Henley, 2008) and according to Davies *et al* (2010), being virtuous to God and having a sense of belonging in society can be the motives behind an individual's generosity. It was found that donors whom hold a degree of religious belief compared to that of non-donors placed importance on the strength of society and amending unfairness (Todd and Lawson, 1999).

If a person's self-concept aligns with that of an organisations identity then the individual can become attached and it can influence how they act (Gecas 1982; Schenkler, 1985; Markus and Wurf, 1987 as cited in Ko *et al*, 2011). Ko *et al* (2011, p.169) describes this cognitive link as "organisational identification". This type of connection can increase the individuals' efforts towards the organisation for example, through donations (Van Dick, 2001; Lichtenstein *et al*, 2004). Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) believe that there is a positive connection between the loyalty of donors and their altruistic behaviour.

Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) identified benefits such as career opportunities, networking and social advancement can occur for millennials when donating and can influence their decision making process (Sargeant, 1999). Millennials can be perceived to donate for selfish reasons to benefit their ego as a result of their materialistic trait (Opoku, 2012).

2.6.3 Trust

Trust is described as one of the key determines in encouraging donations (Iwaarden *et al*, 2009; Ranganathan and Sen, 2012). Charities can improve their relationship with

individuals by sharing their financial information to support where their donations are being put to use having positive effects in both the short and long term (Sargeant and Lee, 2004; Margolis, 2001; Persons, 2003, 2007 as cited in Opoku, 2012). It was identified that those who believe to understand a reasonable amount about charities also hold a high degree of trust for them (Noble and Wixley, 2014). This can also be identified as a barrier to donating; lack of trust.

2.6.4 Limited Financial Availability

Opoku (2012) found that although young people have a limited financial availability they continue to donate as they are believed to require charities services or know of someone who could benefit from the support (Stossel and Kendall, 2006). With regards to income levels being an influence on giving behaviour, there is research to suggest that those of low income and little wealth alongside those of high wealth donate a greater deal of their income compared to that of other incomes (Silver, 1980).

2.7 Barriers to Motivation

2.7.1 Consumption Driven

Millennials are a generation that live in an exceedingly materialistic society which is consumption driven; their focus and attention is placed on buying things for themselves rather than giving (Kottasz, 2004; Yankelovich, 1985; Clark *et al*, 2001). This is supported by Simpson (1986) who says that young people increasingly purchase items for themselves rather than donate to charitable organisations.

According to Goodden (1994), the younger generation are concerned with sourcing the benefits for themselves when donating rather than the benefits to others; furthermore supporting the concept of millennials being consumption driven.

2.7.2 Lack of Confidence

When donating to charities many doubt where their money is going to be put to use and are therefore suspicious of the intentions of fundraising events (Kottasz, 2004). Familiarity can also cause barriers to donating due to perceptions which have previously been developed as a result of experiences had; direct or indirectly (Johnson and Russo, 1984). Noble and Wixley (2014) found that over 1 in 3 people have concerns and trust problems with charities, furthermore supporting the literature.

2.7.3 Marketing Influences

Studies have suggested that donors can both overlook marketing communications and/or misinterpret the message if they believe the organisation to have an indistinct image (Bendapudi *et al*, 1996).

Individuals can also feel that there is a lack of fun and difference in the marketing materials of organisations and use of ill targeted appeals which then leads to individuals feeling dis-encouraged to give (Sargeant *et al*, 2006).

2.7.4 Limited financial availability

Even though the research suggests that young people continue to donate regardless of their limited financial availability, they can face limitations to donating as a result of higher education, career seeking and preparation for marriage consuming their income (Kang *et al.*, 2011).

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter presents the methodology of the study, outlines the philosophical stance taken and foundations of the research. In addition, this chapter justifies the methods of data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations within the study.

3.2 Research Aims and Objectives

The aim is to identifying and explore the factors influencing millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 199) towards charity giving’

The objectives are:

1. Identify the main motivations which are connected with millennial giving behaviour towards charities.
- 1b. To explore the effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation to give to charities.
2. To determine the main factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influence millennials charity giving.
3. Explore whether the different donations can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivation to give to charities.

3.3 Ontology and Epistemology

Ontology relates to the “nature of reality and its characteristics” (Creswell, 2013, p. 20). Reality can be understood from numerous different interpretations and opinions (Creswell, 2013); this is known as the interpretivists view point (Collis and Hussey, 2009). Interpretivists view reality as being a subjective matter which is a social concept (Collis and Hussey, 2009). On the other hand, ontology can be viewed from a

positivists' stance, which contrasts the interpretivists' opinion because they see reality as being objective; the belief only one reality is in existence (Collis and Hussey, 2009). However, epistemology is focused on what we perceive as genuine knowledge (Collis and Hussey, 2009). The researcher is believed to try and shorten the "objective separateness" between themselves and the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, p. 94 as cited in Creswell 2013, p. 20) according to the interpretivists view point (Collis and Hussey, 2009). However positivists aim to hold an objective attitude as they state genuine knowledge is that, which can be observed and measured (Collis and Hussey, 2009). Furthermore positivists are separated from that which is being researched (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

3.3.1 Ontology

During this research study, the researcher took an interpretivist stance. The research looked at the participants understanding and decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) with regards to charitable giving. Furthermore this type of research is objective and personal to each individuals experience and moral values. The researcher took the approach and understanding that there are multiple realities (Creswell, 2013) and that the participants form different perspectives due to "social reality" being "socially contrasted" (Collis and Hussey, 2009, p. 59).

3.3.2 Epistemology

The researcher took an interpretivist approach during this study. This epistemological assumption aims to shorten the distance between the participants and researcher themselves (Collis and Hussey, 2009). It allows for a level of interaction to occur between the 2 groups (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

3.4 Overall Approach

An inductive research approach was taken in regards to this study. The inductive approach involves identifying the range of themes which emerge from the research in order to establish one set of themes (Creswell, 2013). By using this approach themes and theories were able to be developed as a result of the observations which were made (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

3.5 Philosophical Stance

The philosophical stance on the researcher for this study is inductive which involves looking at individual observation along to statements of general themes; moving from specific information to general (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

3.6 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research was found to be the most appropriate type of research for this study. The research looked at the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) of millennials and their motivations behind charitable giving. It also explored whether marketing communications can be an underlying motivation or deterrent to donating. Qualitative research allows for explanation and descriptions to be given in the participants answers and for in-depth data to be gathered. It uses an interpretive approach to view the world (Creswell, 2013). Furthermore, a detailed and personal account of individual participants' motivation and personal experiences was best suited to meet the aim and objectives of this study.

Qualitative research can be deemed as an unscientific method of research which is exploring the topic area being studied (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). However, it is argued that qualitative research places an emphasis on "social experience" being

developed and creating a “given meaning” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, p. 8) unlike that of quantitative data.

A benefit of using qualitative research according to McDaniel and Gates (2008) is that it allows for the best understanding and detailed description of individuals motivations and feelings. It also allows for rich data to be collected due to the open-ended questions which are used (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). However, this can also be viewed as a limitation to the style of research because due to the small sample size, there is an element of open discussions which can lead the participants to go off on a tangent, discussing topics which aren't significant to the research (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). This results in time wasting and pressure on the researcher to regroup without damaging participants' enthusiasm (McDaniel and Gates, 2008).

3.6.1 Qualitative Research Method

A series of 3 focus groups holding 6 participants were conducted. The participants of the focus group were all millennials who had experience with charitable organisations, either positive or negative; the participants were selected based on this characteristic as it had a relation to the topic area being discussed during the focus groups (Krueger, 1994). A total of 10 questions were asked, with exploratory sub-questions on each in order to get detailed answers from all participants. Focus groups are prearranged discussions and therefore this allowed the researcher to gather opinions and perceptions on the topic area which, according to Krueger (1994, p.10) “taps into human tendencies”. This is an advantage of this research method, as rich data was able to be collected which was required for this study in line with Sargeant (1999). However the use of focus groups requires participants to trust and be comfortable in disclosing information personal to themselves (Krueger, 1994). Some find this difficult to do

and/or feel uneasy about sharing in some situations, and therefore this is viewed as a disadvantage to focus groups (Krueger, 1994).

3.6.2 Questions Informed by Existing Studies and Literature

The questions which have been created for the collection of primary data were influenced by Sargeant (1999) as he was the dominant influencer throughout. The decision making process and factors effecting it were the basis of research questions. Along with the intrinsic and extrinsic determinants of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which effect millennials motivation to donate to charitable organisations.

3.7 Respondent Criteria

The respondent criteria for this study was millennials which classifies as those born between 1979 and 2000 (Connaway, 2015). They were also required to have knowledge of what a charity is in order to discuss their experiences, positive or negative, opinions and/or perceptions in relation to the questions asked during the focus groups.

3.8 Sample

A sample is the subdivision of the population (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). Interpretivism uses a small sample size so to produce rich data which is subjective to the individual (Collis and Hussey, 2009). A natural location was used as to not influence any characteristics of the topics being studied (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

3.8.1 Sampling

Convenience sampling was utilised for this study. The type of sampling is nonprobability samples using those who are at convenience and accessible (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). Convenience sampling can be deemed as bias however it is an

efficient way of gathering the information needed (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2013; McDaniel and Gates, 2008).

3.8.2 Sample Size

Qualitative data makes use of a small sample size due to the type of data being collected therefore in this study 3 focus groups took place with 6 participants in each (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). This was the chosen sample size because of the degree of in-depth data which was required for this study. By having a small group of participants it allowed for opinions to be voiced and listened to and kept the focus of the focus group together. Focus groups can consist of as little as 5 members however the ideal group size is dependent on the set up of the location and researchers' style and approach (Wells, 1974; Sampson, 1962 both as cited in Fern, 1982).

3.9 Data Coding and Analysis

Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data collected as it is a foundational method within qualitative data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). This style of analysis is easily understood by learners in the field as it does not rely on any other particular theories (Howitt and Cramer, 2011). It is made up of transcription, analytic study and theme establishment (Howitt and Cramer, 2011). It helps to arrange and organise the data collected in great detail (Braun and Clarke, 2006). An example of this can be found in appendices 5.

3.9.1 Research Questions

The following questions were asked in the focus groups.

1. Do you donate to charities by any means (monetary, time, belongings)?

If yes, what/how do you donate?

If no, why?

2. Who do you donate too?
Why?
3. Do you regularly donate to charities?
If so, how often? And who too?
4. When considering donating to a charity, what can influence your decision?
Why?
5. Are there barriers which stop you from donating?
If yes, what are they? And why?
6. How can you be persuaded to donate to a charity?
7. Does the amount of involvement/commitment involved in the donation process effect your decision to give to charities?
Why?
8. Are you influenced by the marketing of charities in regards to your likelihood to donate?
Why?
9. How often do you see marketing communications of charities?
Please list any marketing communications from charities.
10. How do you usually react to marketing communications from charities?
Do they influence your likelihood to donate? If so why?
If no response is had, why?

3.10 Ethics and Confidentiality

In order to ensure that the study remained ethical throughout, issues of confidentiality were addressed at the start of the study. The research is perceived to have a duty to the participants in regards to the protection (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). All participants have a right to choose, safety, privacy and to be informed (McDaniel and Gates, 2008).

A consent form was given to all participants stating their rights, the confidentiality of the research and their ability to withdraw at any chosen time. This was also verbally communicated at the start of each of the focus groups in order to remind and reassure participants. All participants were given anonymity to ensure protection is secured.

3.11 Tests for Validity and Reliability

Reliability is connected to the research findings and makes up the credibility of the research along with validity (Collis and Hussey, 2009). It regards whether the observations which are made can be justified and understood (Collis and Hussey, 2009). It assesses the degree to which the data is consistent through free measures (McDaniel and Gates, 2008).

In order to ensure that the methods used were reliable, the questions for the focus group were connected to the existing literature and studies.

Validity is concerned with whether the research was striving to measure what was truly measured (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). It assesses the extent to which the measurement tool and procedure carried out are free from sporadic and/or systematic error (McDaniel and Gates, 2008).

This was tested by the focus group questions being given to Dr Nicola Williams-Burnett for comments and feedback, which were then integrated into the study along with the transcripts of the focus groups in order to identify the findings.

3.12 Methodological Critique

Focus groups can allow for the development of new ideas and thoughts as a result of the interactions taking place between the participants (McDaniel and Gates, 2008). However according to McDaniel and Gates (2008), some participants may not speak out and share their views due to the group setting whilst others may dominate the

discussions. This is a disadvantage to the methodology because it can influence the reliability of the data collected if not monitored and controlled.

Thematic analysis “does not allow the researcher to make claims about language use, or the fine-grained functionality of talk” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 28). This is a disadvantage of the analysis method because it can affect the interpretation of the data collected from the groups. However it can identify the key similarities and differences across the data collected which is therefore an advantage to this study and the style of qualitative analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

3.13 Limitation of the Study

A limitation of the study is that participants may misunderstand the research process/aim and objectives. Furthermore to overcome this a consent form with the research description will be given to all participants in focus groups accompanied by verbal clarification. This will also give the participant the chance to ask any questions with regards to the study and withdraw from the process. Another is the participants' knowledge of their ability to withdraw from research process and data collection at any given point. To overcome this it will be explained to the participants that they have the right to withdraw from the research at any point without any questioning.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This chapter aims to meet the research aim and objectives through discussing the findings which have been gathered from the data and have been thematically analysed.

4.1 Objective 1

Objective 1 seeks to identify the main motivations which are connected with millennials giving behaviour towards charities. Through carrying out thematic analysis on the 3 focus groups, 5 main themes within the motivations of millennials were identified; empathy, convenience/ease, trust, personal values and self-benefitting.

4.1.1 Empathy

The first and most dominant theme was empathy, which occurred 53 times within the motivators of millennials giving behaviour. It is the emotional awakening in an individual prompted by another's emotional expression (Aronfreed, 1968; Berger, 1962; Shelton and Rogers, 1981 as cited in Sargreant, 1999). Such feelings can be the cause of selfless behaviour in an individual according to Davis (1994). 4 themes were identified within the theme of empathy; family connection, emotionally affected by the cause, who the charity is including the cause and the work completed and guilt.

4.1.1.1 Family Connection

Family connection is highlighted as a theme within empathy due to the relationship that individuals can build with charities over time as a result of the work they do which benefits families and those close to them. From the data it can be identified that millennials are motivated to donate if the charity has a personal connection to them and affects those in their immediate surroundings. An example of this taken from the findings is

FG3P4: "Close to my heart, those which effect my family members and benefit them, those which are close to home"

This suggests millennials motivation to donate to a charity can stem from the beneficial work that they do which directly and indirectly benefits the individual donating. It can be thought that donations are a personal action which stems from an individual's emotional reaction to the cause as a result of the data collected. This links to Sargeant *et al* (2006) as he states that an individual's likelihood to donate can increase when they have an empathy to the cause, proposing that millennials experience motivation to donate when they have empathy such as a family connection to a cause.

4.1.1.2 Emotionally Affected by the Cause

Millennials being emotionally affected by the cause is the second theme which regularly occurred. Individuals can become motivated to donate to a cause as a result of pity and emotional upset from viewing and learning about a charity. Respondents stated that they donate to charities because they see

FG1P1: "People who are in need"

The participants feel they have a duty to reach out to those who would benefit from their aid and support. The cause can pull on the heart strings of an individual who holds no personal connection to it however holds a feeling of empathy towards the charity. An example of this is

FG1P1: "Makes you upset"

Participants suggested they are moved by the charity as a result of the appeals being promoted. The emotional affect and feelings felt by the millennials can trigger their motivation to give. According to Fultz *et al* (1986) charity appeals can extract feelings

of empathy from individuals suggesting that this can then influence their motivation correlating to the findings.

4.1.1.3 Who the Charity is Including the Cause and the Work Completed

Who the charity is, the cause and the work being completed including sponsorship of events and the type of event the individual is taking part in is the third theme within empathy. From the data it can be suggested that the type of charitable organisation can influence millennials motivations dependent on personal opinion and preference according to the findings. Examples of this are

FG1P5: "because it's quite a small charity"

FG2P5: "Local charities as well, so it makes a difference where we are"

FG3P3: "A well-known charity I may donate but if I don't recognise them and I don't have the time to learn about them then I won't donate"

This suggests that empathy can be felt by individuals regardless of the charities position in society. Participants felt empathy in donating to the cause once they knew more about it or what extent others were going for it. Being provided information about who their donation is benefiting or supporting, including the individual taking part in an event in aid of charity was identified as a motivation for millennials sponsoring. Examples of this are

FG1P1: "type of event"

FG1P1: "person who is doing the fundraising"

FG2P6: "the charity it's for"

Learning about the cause or event taking place in aid of a charity can persuade individuals to donate however they personally interrupt the information and establish

what results in motivation to donate and what creates a barrier. Milne and Gordon (1993) state that donors are increasingly particular as to which charities they chose to support suggesting individuals require specific information about the charitable organisation or event taking place to form a decision as to whether they wish to have an association with the charity. To an extent this supports the data collected however the findings suggest that it is not just supporting a given charity which influences millennials motivation.

4.1.1.4 Guilt

Guilt is the final theme within empathy. Davis (1994) states that guilt can increase the pressure to donate to charity. Findings corroborate Davis's (1994) work as it is suggested that millennial giving behaviour can be motivated by the feeling of pressure and guilt to donate to charity as they are sometimes influenced by their peer's resulting in a pressure to donate. An example of this is

FG3P3: "I sponsor friends because I feel I have too"

The participant feels they have an obligation to donate and personal relationships enhance this. Participants suggested that they have feelings of guilt if they chose to not donate and therefore are motivated to do so. During the data collection it was found that participants donated as a result of the following example

FG3P2: "Pressure and guilt"

Respondents suggested their likelihood to donate developed from the guilt of not doing so and the pressure they feel at the time of donation. Both guilt and empathy are feelings believed to cause selfless behaviour such as charitable giving, according to Davis (1994) and furthermore this supports the findings gathered in the data collection.

Millennials can be perceived to give due to the internal emotions they feel from the external pressure placed.

4.1.2 Convenience/Ease

Convenience/Ease is the second theme which occurs 18 times in the data collected in regards to the motivators of millennial giving behaviour. It can be described as the availability and the opportunity to donate as well as the simplicity of the process of doing the donation itself. 2 themes have been highlighted within the theme of convenience/ease; local and ease of process.

4.1.2.1 Local

Local charities are identified as an influence towards charitable giving because they provide individuals with the convenience. It can be stated that by having a local charity will result in an increase in the likelihood a relationship will be developed. It was identified in the data collection that millennials like to support local charities through monetary, voluntary and donation of goods. Examples of this are

FG1P2: "I donate my own clothes to the local charity shop"

FG3P5: "I'll donate my clothes to my local charity shop, like BoBath but that's only because it's round the corner from my house"

Respondents suggested they would utilise their local charity shops because it simplifies the process of donating as it is convenient for them yet also helping the local community. They do not have to travel far and is a quick and simple process for the donor which adds to their motivation to donate. Millennials donate at ease due to their intrinsic motivation of self-interest (Sargeant, 1999).

4.1.2.2 Ease of Process

The accessibility of donating can encourage millennials charitable giving behaviour. According to the data collected, if the process of donating is complex or time consuming, it can deter individuals from giving. However, it was identified that making the process simple, quick and easy can motivate millennials to donate within the fast-paced world which they live in. Examples of the data collected are

FG3P4: "I'm out and about and there is a collection then I'll give then too"

FG1P4: "So I'll do that because it's easy"

It was identified that respondents will actively donate money at till points and collection buckets on the street; both are easy places to donate requiring little attention and consideration. According to the findings, it was suggested that participants would rather donate monetary values as it is easier than that of voluntary which requires more attention and time. From the data collected it is suggested that taking part in an event can also increase millennials motivation to donate as it is convenient and no extra hassle.

4.1.3 Trust

Trust is the third theme to be identified as a motivator of millennials charitable giving behaviour and it is suggested to be one of the main determinants in boosting donations (Iwaarden *et al.*, 2009; Ranganathan and Sen, 2012). This theme occurred 16 times within the findings and 2 themes were identified within the theme of trust; evidence/explanation and reputation.

4.1.3.1 Evidence/Explanation

When deciding whether to donate to charity, millennials are thought to consider the evidence which is available to them with regards to the work which has/is being carried out by the charity and the benefits of it and so forth a theme within trust is evidence/explanation. Respondents stated seeing where their money is going and how it will benefit the cause motivated them to give. An example of this is

FG2P2: “People who are open and honest about why their getting money and how they are receiving it and what they are doing with it”

Participants suggested when a charity is honest and truthful whilst providing evidence of what they say, their likelihood to donate would increase because they are able to develop their knowledge. It gives evidence to the donor of the good which is being done and that they could be a part of; this then relates to the motivation of self-benefitting and the intrinsic motivation taken form the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999). Charities can improve their relationship with individuals by sharing information about the company, including where donations are spent (Sargeant and Lee, 2004; Margolis, 2001; Persons, 2003, 2007 as cited in Opoku, 2012). Furthermore the literature supports the findings and data collected as they both stress the importance of evidence and proving information in order to build trust.

4.1.3.2 Reputation

The reputation of a charity can influence millennials behaviour towards charitable giving due to the knowledge the individual has about the cause. Examples of this are

FG3P3: “A well-known charity I may donate but if I don’t recognise them and I don’t have the time to learn about them then I won’t donate

FG3P1: “Smaller charity and I don’t know much about it, I’m interested to find out more and then that could influence me to donate if I then felt a connection to the charity”

FG2P5: “Local charities as well, so it makes a difference where we are”

Well-known charitable organisations with an established reputation and position in the market are suggested to motivate millennials to donate as they have knowledge of the cause and have established a level of trust. However, small-scale organisations can encourage millennials because they are perceived to benefit from the donation more than that of a well-known charity who receive numerous donations on a regular basis. This suggests that less well-known charities have the ability to develop trust from individuals despite their reputation due to the cause they are benefiting and the empathy which they extract from the individual. Michaelidou *et al* (2015) suggests charities with lower levels of publicity and awareness can gain new donors through donor rational actions.

4.1.4 Personal Values

Personal values are identified as the fourth theme as a motivator of millennials giving behaviour and occurred 13 times within the data collected. Millennial’s motivation to donate can stem from their personal values (Keyt *et al.*, 2002; Bennett, 2003; Francia *et al.*, 2005). 3 themes were identified within personal values; social group, habits and opinion/attitude.

4.1.4.1 Social Group

Social group is those individuals that you interact with and have an influence upon your decision making behaviour and motivations. From the data it can be suggested that there

is a pressure to conform which results in motivation to donate but also a positive influence to gain new experiences. For example

FG1P1: "My friends on Facebook will be doing an event"

The participants suggests that the reasoning towards their motivation to donate is down to their friends raising awareness and bringing the possibility of donation to their attention. From the data it is evident that the value of charitable giving is being instilled onto individuals from their social grouping. Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) stated that the possibility of social advancement can influence millennials charitable giving behaviour suggesting that they will donate to see themselves gain a social advancement in the eyes of their social group.

4.1.4.2 Habits

Habits are a personal value because each individual develops their own routine practices and traditions influenced by external factors such as family and friends. It was identified in the findings that participants would donate to charity in a specific way because they regularly do so and have been taught this as they grew up. Examples taken from the data collected are

FG3P1: "Mainly when I have some old clothes to go the charity shop"

FG1P2: "Religious beliefs"

It can be suggested that these values are instilled from learning and sharing the experience of others donating in this way. The respondents identified that religious teachings can influence an individual's outlook on donating and motivate them to give because of the values they deem to be right. Todd and Lawson (1999) state that those who hold a level of religious belief place an increased significance on the strength of

society and modifying unfairness compared to that that of others, suggesting that this is a motivating factor for millennials charitable giving.

4.1.4.3 Opinion/Attitude

Opinion/attitude is a personal interpretation of information influenced by personal values. Within the data collected it was identified that an individual's interpretation is subjective and can influence their motivation levels towards charitable giving due to their attitude, opinions and values. Examples of from the findings are

“FG1P2: I think it depends if its personal to you, do you know that charity, have they helped your family members

FG1P1: Yeah

FG1P2: It's when you can see that it actually helps someone

FG1P3: Like loads of people raise money for Macmillan cancer care because they help so many families

FG1P4: I think it's better giving to a charity like that than a donkey charity. But I suppose it's just personal opinion”

FG3P3: “Type of event I'm sponsoring them to do”

This suggests that millennials decide when to donate to a charity, of what form and to which charity as a result of personal opinions and attitudes. Respondents indicated that what one perceives as a worthy cause, another disagrees suggesting millennials are motivated to donate by their own attitudes, opinions and personal interpretation towards the donation at hand. This links to Sargeant (1999) as he states that intrinsic variables such as attitude/opinion and personal values can aid an individual to decipher between the appeals they wish to support and are most suited to themselves.

4.1.5 Self-benefitting

Self-benefitting is the fifth theme to be identified from the findings and appeared 10 times as a motivator towards millennials charitable giving behaviour. Millennials can donate for selfish reasons (Opoku, 2012) and to benefit their self-esteem (Sargeant, 1999). 2 themes have been identified within the theme of self-benefitting; feel good and rewards.

4.1.5.1 Feel Good

Feel good is an emotion had by millennials after donating to a charity. They experience a satisfaction within themselves that they have carried out a good activity and feel happiness with themselves for doing so according to the data. Examples of this are

FG1P1: "Makes you feel better about yourself"

FG3P4: "I just like benefitting others"

Respondents state that they feel pleasure from donating and therefore are motivated to donate to feel better about themselves for self-interest purposes. Participants suggested they enjoy the feelings of knowing that they have benefited someone who is in need and the knowledge that they have helped a good cause. Feelings of self-interest can encourage an individual's behaviour to donate to a charity according to Sargeant (1999), suggesting individuals may be motivated to donate in order to benefit themselves and their ego as well as the cause they are donating too.

4.1.5.2 Rewards

Rewards are the benefits which an individual receives, both tangible and intangible, from donating to a charitable organisation and therefore it can motivate them from the outset to donate. From the data it can be suggested that millennials can be encouraged

to donate to a charity if they are benefiting others as well as themselves. An example of this is

FGIP5: "Cardiff Half Marathon this year was sponsored by Barnardo's and they give you discounted entry if you signed up to do it with them"

The participants suggested that charities will advertise the rewards available in return for donations to help entice individuals. It encourages charitable giving behaviour because the donor will receive a benefit from the experience and it can be suggested that it is then in their interest to do so in order to reap the rewards available to them. Webb and Mohr (1998) found in their study that participants showed selfish reasons for their interaction with organisations. By millennials becoming motivated by the rewards on offer to them, they are interacting with charities and donating for selfish purposes. Furthermore there is a correlation between the findings in the data and the literature.

4.1.6 Summary of Objective 1

To summarise, based on the findings the main motivators for millennials charitable giving behaviour are empathy, convenience/ease, trust, personal values and self-benefitting. Within each of the themes, sub-themes have been identified. All of the themes identified relate to the favourable feelings of the individual or those experienced during their interaction with the charity. The findings are supported by a range of literature, especially Sargeant's (1999) intrinsic variables which form part of the decision making process.

4.2 Objective 1b

Objective 1b seeks to explore the effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation to give to charities. Through the data collected and analysis carried out 4 main themes were identified; relationship, transactional, informational and reaction.

4.2.1 Relationship Marketing

The first and most dominant theme identified was relationship marketing as it occurred 43 times within the findings. Relationship marketing can be defined as the development of a long-term and more established relationship between an organisation and its customers (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005). 2 themes were highlighted with the theme of relationship; long-term and short term interaction.

4.2.1.1 Long-term Interaction

Long-term interaction inside relationship marketing relates to the consistency of communication which takes place between an organisation and the customers. If an organisation is regularly in contact with their customers then they are building a strong relationship which proposes to improve millennials motivation to donate. Examples of this are

FG1P2: “Do it through say Macmillian, they will pay for your entry along as you raise over £500”

FG1P1: “Adopt a polar bear and they send you things, so you know that your money is helping. They send you photos”

FG2P5: “Go to Waitrose and they give you a green coin”

This suggests that establishing a relationship can be assisted by offering the donor something in return. The data suggests the customer is feeling fulfilled that their donation is not only benefitting the cause but themselves as they gain satisfaction out of the activity also. These forms of marketing communications are fixed-term with benefits continuing for the long-term for both parties involved. According to Berry (1995) this type of marketing is significant for charities because they are offering a

customer experience indicating that it helps to motivate individuals towards charitable giving.

4.2.1.2 Short-Term interaction

Short-term interaction within relationship marketing was identified by participants as interaction with charities and establishment of a relationship with them however not including consistent and regular forms of communication. Examples taken from the data collected are

FG1P3: "People who stand on the street"

FG2P6: "Children in need"

FG3P3: "Knock at my door"

Respondent's interaction with charities on a one to one basis can be suggested to create a barrier with regards to their motivation. However through commercial events, millennials are able to donate to the cause and establish a relationship with the organisation through their tailored marketing which can result in them making repeat donations. Relationship marketing enables charities to focus on delivering a high level of service (Chad *et al*, 2013) although, not all approaches to relationship marketing are received by individuals as a high level of service but instead a disruption, according to the data collected. The effects of short-term relationship marketing on millennials motivation to give to charities can be identified as both positive and negative.

4.2.2 Transactional Marketing

Transactional marketing is the second theme identified within marketing communications effect on millennials motivation to giving and was present 20 times within the data. This form of marketing can be known as a single piece of impersonal

communication to the mass market from an organisation (Coviello *et al*, 1997). Inside this theme, 2 additional themes were acknowledged; convenience and impersonal.

4.2.2.1 Convenience

Convenience is an influence within transactional marketing because individuals will acknowledge the marketing if it is available to them at the right time. An illustration of this is

FG1P3: "Go to McDonalds, I'll put 2p in the charity box by the counter"

This is evidence that millennials are willing to give as long as they do not have to go to any extended lengths which are not part of their planned agenda in order to do so. The respondents stated that with this type of marketing communication, they are not influenced by who the charity is, but are motivated to donate due to the acknowledgement of the marketing and the convenience to them of the process. However, convenience was also found to deter millennials from the donation process. An explanation of this is

FG1P5: "The TV and the adverts say text £3? I don't like that, I'd rather decide what I give"

Donating is down to the individual and their personal decision to donate, who to and by what means however this type of transactional marketing removes aspects of the individuals' decision making. Respondents suggested that there is a pressure placed on the donation, furthermore the convenience of the marketing communications does not always motivate millennials to donate.

4.2.2.2 Impersonal

Impersonal marketing communications are targeted to the mass market with no intended personal message to the receiver. It can be identified that the respondents witness impersonal marketing communications on a regular basis which then effects their motivation to donate although not in a positive sense. Examples of the data are

FGIP2: "You see billboards"

"FGIP3: Blank them out

FGIP4: Yeah, especially when you see them all the time, it can be overwhelming and then it just phases into the background then

FGIP3: When you see an advert at first you are like oh wow that terrible but 3rd or 4th time you just ignore it"

Respondents indicated that they stop identifying the communications because they have no direct relationship to themselves and furthermore lose their attention resulting in there being no influence on millennials to donate to charity. However Bennett and Barkensjo (2005) suggest that organisations use transactional marketing as a way of gaining new customers on a regular basis. According to the data collected this is not a successful strategy due to the lack of attention the marketing grasps.

4.2.3 Informational

Informational occurs 13 times within the data and is identified as a theme for marketing communications effect on millennials giving motivation. Informative marketing communications influence millennials motivation as they are able to develop their understanding allowing them to make an informed decision on whether to donate or

not. 2 themes were acknowledged within informational; evidence and explanation of the cause.

4.2.3.1 Evidence

Evidence of the work a charity does, how donations are used and the work which is carried out can influence millennials motivation to donate. For example, take the information gathered in the data collection

FG1P2: "Proof where the money goes"

FG3P5: "Show the good my money is doing"

The participants suggested that there is a lack of trust between themselves and the organisations as the majority do not currently provide evidence of how the donation is spent and furthermore this led the participants to become sceptical in regards to charity motives with the funds collected. This links to the literature as it was stated that charities can develop their relationship with individuals by sharing financial information supporting where their donations are being utilised (Sargeant and Lee, 2004; Margolis, 2001; Persons, 2003, 2007 as cited in Opoku, 2012). Kim (2014) indicated that making use of altruistic pleas and those who have benefitted from the charity is also beneficial in encouraging people to volunteer. Both the literature and the findings suggest that providing evidence within marketing communication would motivate millennials to donate.

4.2.3.2 Explanation of the Cause

Providing a clear explanation of the cause and those in need within the marketing communication can effect millennials motivation towards charitable giving. From the data collected it was identified that the participants appreciate being informed of the

cause and the help that is required which they can be a part of. Examples from the data in relation to this theme are

FGIP2: "Like the British Heart Foundation where it's the bride and her bridesmaid in the advert? It makes me want to be an organ donor because you just can't imagine that happening to someone that close to you"

FGIP3: "I hate the animal ones where they look ill, I just change the channel"

It is suggested from the data collected that millennials want an increased level of information provided to them however at a censored level so to motivate them instead of discourage. This links to Sargeant *et al* (2006) who stated that ill targeted appeals can result in individuals feeling dis-encouraged to donate to a charitable cause. This proposes millennials are motivated to donate when the marketing communication provides a level of explanation however it is highlighted that information presented in the wrong way can deter their donation.

4.2.4 Reaction

Reactions towards marketing communication is the final theme behind the effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation towards charitable giving and occurred 13 times in the data. Within reactions, 2 subsequent themes were highlighted; negative and positive.

4.2.4.1 Negative Reactions

Negative reactions can occur towards marketing communications because respondents stated they see a large number of communications daily from both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations and are overwhelmed resulting in a loss of concentration. Examples from the findings are

FG1P4: "Phases into the background"

FG2P6: "The ones that are mainly advertised are always the same with the same slogans so you just ignore it because you've seen that before"

FG3P5: "Too many around to give 100% attention and support to all of them"

It is identified by the respondents that it becomes difficult to divide their attention and commitment amongst all the different causes resulting in a barrier to donate being created. According to Bendapudi *et al* (1996) individuals can overlook marketing communications if they view the organisation at hand to have an indistinct image. This could suggest a reason as to why millennials have negative reactions towards marketing communications harming their motivation to give.

4.2.4.2 Positive Reactions

Positive reactions towards marketing communications can stem from how they are delivered which then effects millennials motivation to donate. Examples of this are

FG1P1: "Send you things, so you know that your money is helping"

FG2P5: "Easy to ignore if it's on a wall, but if someone's coming up to you it's difficult sometimes too ignore them and blank them"

It has been identified that millennials like to receive benefits from their charitable behaviour and therefore by sending marketing communication directly to individuals can be suggested to extract a positive reaction. It is identified that it allows the respondents to feel pleasure from developing an understanding of the work the charity are doing whilst the charities are able to target their marketing efficiently keeping themselves in the mind of the individual. In the findings it is indicated that the respondents would find it difficult to dismiss a person unlike they would other of forms

of marketing suggesting that this may increase motivation to donate as it is convenient however also pressured as you are left on a one-to-one basis which has been stated as a barrier to donating.

4.2.5 Summary of Objective 1b

In summary, the main effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation to give to charities are relationship marketing (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005), transactional marketing (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005), informational and reaction. Relationship marketing is an effective form to be taken by charitable organisations which would allow for detailed information and feedback to be acknowledged by the organisations (Chad *et al*, 2013). An example of this type of marketing is the process of sending information about the charities progress to an individuals' home; Animal adoption charities utilise this. However transactional marketing can be identified as useful for generating unplanned donations and promoting the brand to the mass market (Coviello *et al* 1997). Charity collection boxes at till points in retailers, such as McDonalds, are an example of this style of marketing communication.

4.3 Objective 2

Objective 2 strives to determine the main factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influence millennials charity giving. From the findings 5 main themes have been recognised; financial, self-benefitting, empathy, evidence and personal values.

4.3.1 Financial

Financial is identified as the leading theme and occurred 8 times within the findings. It is understood as the financial position and income of an individual which in this case

hinders or assists their ability to donate. 1 theme was highlighted, the lack of financial availability.

4.3.1.1 Lack of Financial Availability

Lack of financial availability is an influence upon the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) because millennials have a limited financial availability and have developed their own opinion on how to prioritise the income they have, according to the data. From the data, the following examples were taken

FG2P4: “Well it depends if I’ve got any loose change, but then that could be another drink for me”

FG3P3: “Money plays a massive factor. We are students”

FG3P2: “It affects me because of the financial factors involved. Like I couldn’t set up a standing order because I might not have the money available every month”

These examples suggest that millennials do not have the financial stability to regularly donate to charitable organisations and therefore it is indicated that their donations, if any, are sporadic. According to Stossel and Kendall (2006) young people continue to donate to charitable organisations because of a relationship with someone who could benefit from the work complete. However, Kang *et al* (2011) stated that limitations can occur in relation to their giving behaviour as a result of higher education, career searching and preparation for marriage. This therefore illustrates a direct link between the literature and the findings.

4.3.2 Self-benefitting

Self-benefitting is the second highest occurring theme within the factors effecting millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) towards donating, appearing 7 times within the findings. Sargeant (1999) states the significance of self-esteem and self-recognition are seen to be vital motives for giving behaviour. 2 sub-themes were identified; pleasure and rewards.

4.3.2.1 Pleasure

Pleasure is the feeling of happiness and satisfaction an individual experiences by carrying out the donation process which can affect millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999). Examples are

FG1P1: "Feel better about yourself"

FG3P5: "Yeah, show the good my money is doing"

Participants stated that they want evidence of the help they are giving. It can be suggested that this is to benefit their ego as they will be able to establish the details of the benefits they provide allowing them to distinguish the degree of pleasure and satisfaction to feel. According to Opoku (2012) millennials have been thought to donate to benefit their egos which Sargeant (1999) identifies as an extrinsic motivation. This indicates the feelings of pleasure can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) towards donating to charities.

4.3.2.2 Rewards

From the findings it was established that gaining a reward for charitable behaviour would influence the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) of millennials because they would also benefit from the procedure. An example of this is

“FGIP5: Cardiff Half Marathon this year was sponsored by Barnardo’s and they give you discounted entry if you signed up to do it with them

FGIP1: Yeah, when I did tough mudder if you raised about a certain amount then you wouldn’t have to pay to do the event

FGIP2: Iron man does that. It cost like £400 but if you do it through say Macmillan, they will pay for your entry along as you raise over £500”

The data indicates that self-interest, relating to the benefits an individual can receive for themselves, plays a factor in influencing giving behaviour. Webb and Mohr (1998) established during a study that half of participants showed selfish reasoning for interacting with firms utilising cause-related marketing. Goodden (1994) also stated the younger generation are concerned with obtaining benefits for themselves when giving to charity instead of others. This presents a relationship between the literature and the findings in relation to the factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influence millennials giving.

4.3.3 Empathy

The third dominant theme which occurred 5 times in the data collect is empathy. According to Fultz *et al* (1986) charities appeals must be effective in order to extract empathy from an individual yet not overly powerful that it becomes personally troubling for them. 3 themes were highlighted within empathy; emotional response, family connection and scale of charitable organisation.

4.3.3.1 Emotional Response

Emotional response is an aspect of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) because individuals can have emotions such as upset and compassion triggered from the experience of learning about a cause, influencing their charitable giving behaviour.

According to the data, respondents were found to be influenced after an emotional response towards a cause. An example taken from the findings are

FG1P1: "People who are in need really...Makes you upset"

Respondents indicated that it can motivate them to donate if they are emotionally touched by an appeal as they want to help those in need. Furthermore triggering altruistic motives towards giving behaviour. Davis (1994) states empathy can cause selfless behaviour, which to an extent correlates with the findings. It can be suggested that millennials emotional response towards a charity can be negative creating a barrier to donating. An example is

FG1P3: "I just don't like people coming to your house and asking for money"

Respondents identified that they can become frustrated by the marketing of charities in the bid to gain donations and suggested that this can result in the marketing having the opposite effects; instead of encouraging charitable giving, it can prevent millennials. Furthermore the emotional response plays a part in the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influences millennials charity giving behaviour.

4.3.3.2 Family Connection

Family connection can effect millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) as individuals can develop a relationship with a cause as a result of the beneficial work they do for those close to them. An example taken from the findings is

FG3P4: "Close to home and affect me"

It is suggested that participants feel obligated to support those charities who benefit and assist them directly or indirectly through those close to them. During the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999), participants highlighted the importance of having a

personal connection to the cause in order to aid the process. This links with Batson (1990) and Fultz (1986) who specified there is a direct link between a donor's degree of sympathy for a cause and their likelihood to donate.

4.3.3.3 Scale of Charitable Organisations

The scale of the charity can either motivate or deter millennials towards donating. The findings suggest that individuals interrupt the size of a business as being reasoning within their decision making. Examples from the data collected are

FG2P4: "Unknown and smaller"

FG3P3: "A well-known charity I may donate but if I don't recognise them and I don't have the time to learn about them then I won't donate"

This suggests that millennials can favour less familiar charities because they do not receive as much publicity which is likely to be reflected in the number of donations received. The individual can develop empathy towards the cause. However, respondents also indicated that they are inclined to donate towards popular charities as they have already developed a knowledge of the cause making it convenient with little consideration required as to whether to donate. Individuals may have developed feelings of empathy previously for the charity therefore affecting their decision making process towards donating (Sargeant, 1999).

4.3.4 Evidence

Evidence is the fourth theme and occurred 5 times with the findings. From the data collected it was identified that the respondents took into consideration the evidence of charitable work available to them in order to assist their decision making process (Sargeant, 1999).

An example is

FG3P3: “Evidence of where my money is going and who it is helping”

The respondents stated they would become motivated to donate towards a charity if they had proof of their spending and how their donation would be spent. This suggests there is a lack of trust between charitable organisations and millennials. The literature suggests that charitable organisations can improve relationships by sharing their financial information to support how donations are used (Sargeant and Lee, 2004; Margolis, 2001; Persons, 2003, 2007 as cited in Opoku, 2012).

4.3.5 Personal Values

Personal values is the final theme within the factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influences millennials charity giving and was found on 4 occasions within the data. It can be defined as an intrinsic variable which can assist an individual in establishing the most appropriate charitable organisation for them to support (Sargeant, 1999). With this theme, 1 additional theme was identified; opinion/attitude.

4.3.5.1 Opinion/Attitude

Opinion/attitude is a main factor within millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) because personal interpretation can impact upon their charitable giving behaviour. The data suggests that an individual’s thought process and judgements can play a part in deciding when they donate, who to and of what format; time, money, physical goods. Examples are

FG1P4: “If they enjoy running, then it’s just something they can do. It’s just more personal for them”

*FG1P3: "I hate the animal ones where they look ill, I just change the channel.
I can't help everyone"*

It was identified from the respondents that their own attitude and values can influence how they perceive situations and different experiences. This links to Gecas, Schenkler and Markus and Wurf (1982;1985;1787 as cited in Ko *et al*, 2011), as they state an individual can be influenced by a charity if their beliefs align with the organisation furthermore suggesting that this can be seen to be an intrinsic factor within their decision making process (Sargeant, 2000).

4.3.6 Summary of Objective 2

In summary, it can be identified based on the data collected, the main factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influences millennials charity giving are financial, self-benefitting, empathy, evidence and personal values. This is supported by Sargeant's (1999) decision making process which is influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic determinants. The themes identified correlate with those of objective 1, demonstrating that motivation can influence the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999).

4.4 Objective 3

The third objective seeks to explore whether different types of donations can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivation to give to charities. 2 themes were highlighted from the findings; low-involvement and high-involvement.

4.4.1 Low Involvement

Low involvement is the leading theme occurring 32 times in the findings. According to the data low involvement is when a donation requires little decision

making/consideration and low commitments. There are 2 themes highlighted within low involvement; motivations and barriers.

4.4.1.1 Motivations

Motivations for low involvement donations by millennials were suggested to stem from the convenience and ease of the process. The data indicated that participants can require the donation process to be quick as to not consume their time. Examples from the findings are

FG2P5: “Go to Waitrose and they give you a green coin and then when you leave you can read a little bit about their selected charities and pick one”

FG3P3: “Collection with a person holding the box”

This suggests that the respondents have little connection to the cause and are donating due to the convenience and opportunity. From the data it is identified that there is little responsibility to be taken by the donor as after they have made their donation, which can be suggested to be a rational decision, no further action or communication is required. This can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivations to giving.

4.4.1.2 Barriers

Barriers towards low involvement can occur, according to the findings, because millennials can perceive low involvement donations to be impersonal and less satisfying due to the level of interaction and commitment.

“FG1P6: I’d rather do something myself than just give money. Like actually help a charity

FG1P4: Like you’d rather go to soup kitchen?

FG1P6: Yeah, I'd rather do that than just give money"

Respondents identified that the type of donation can influence their self-interest motives and pleasure which are considered during the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999). This correlates with Sargeant (1999) who indicates that there are self-interest motives for individuals giving behaviour. So forth, different types of donations can be viewed to influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivation to give to charities.

4.4.2 High Involvement

The second theme, high involvement, occurred 28 times within the findings and was identified to show a commitment towards donating. From the data it was highlighted that respondents take part in a range of charitable activities in order donate and some display a greater engagement than others. 2 themes was identified with high involvement; motivations and barriers.

4.4.2.1 Motivations

Motivation to donate can stem from an individual's personal motives for donating according to the data. It is suggested that millennials will go out of their way to give.

Examples are

FG1P5: "I did the half marathon, I raised money for the charity MIND"

FG1P1: "People who won't donate money to homeless but will give food and things instead"

Respondents indicated that they form a connection with the cause and therefore are encouraged to make high-involvement donations. An individual's personal values was also identified by the respondents as an influential factor. Reed *et al* (2007 as cited in

Kim, 2014) stated that those with high morality chose to donate their time rather than money because it can be perceived as a more moral action. Furthermore this can motivate millennials' donation behaviour and decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and corroborates the findings.

4.4.2.2 Barriers

High involvement donations can also prevent millennials from donating according to the findings. An example is

FGIP1: "I wouldn't want to commit to going volunteering"

This indicates that the inconvenience, of the donation and its complexity deters millennials. Respondents suggested high-involvement donations are time-consuming and therefore a type they would rather avoid. Participants indicated they have a lack of financial availability linking to Kang *et al* (2011), who identified that there can be limitations towards donating due to higher education and other areas consuming incomes. Furthermore the type of donation can influence millennials' decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and motivation to donate.

4.4.3 Summary of Objective 3

In summary based on the data collected, the main themes are low involvement and high involvement. Both the individuals' decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and the motivations toward donating were suggested to be influenced as to how the individual viewed the type of donation; low or high. Both types of interaction can motivate and deter dependent on the individuals' personal opinions and attitude towards donating. It can therefore be concluded that individual perception influences them and their donation patterns.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

To conclude the aim of this thesis was to identify and explore the factors influencing millennials, and their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 1999) toward charity giving. This has been achieved through qualitative data collection in the form of 3 focus groups which intended to answer the objectives of this study.

Sargeant (1999) was the main area of literature used within the study in order to understand millennials behaviour. Bennett and Barkensjo (2005) assisted in the understanding of charities marketing communications and how they can influence individuals.

Objective 1 seeks to identify the main motivations which are connected with millennial giving behaviour towards charities. From the data collected it had been identified that the main motivators are empathy, convenience/ease, trust, personal values and self-benefitting, supported by Sargeant (1999). Objective 1a strives to explore the effects of marketing communications on millennials motivation to give to charities. The most dominant effects were acknowledged as relationship marketing (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005), transactional marketing (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005), informational and reaction. Objective 2 is to determine the main factors of the decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) which influence millennials charity giving. The key factors are indicated as financial, self-benefitting, empathy, evidence and personal values, supported by Sargeant (1999), according to the data. Objective 3 is to explore whether the different types of donations can influence millennials decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) and their motivation to give to charities. The leading themes are low involvement and high involvement in the findings.

All of the objectives of this study have successfully met and correlate with the findings. On occasions the findings form relationships with aspects of the different objectives which enhance the result due to dominant themes being produced.

From the study, it is suggested that charities should make use of both relationship and transactional marketing (Bennett and Barkensjo, 2005) so to benefit from planned and intended donations and those which are rational. Their communications should provide evidence whilst focusing on extracting empathy from millennials whilst appealing to their personal values and self-benefiting motives. By doing this it will maximise their likelihood of motivating millennials to donate to charity, according to the study.

If this study was to be repeat in the future, it is suggested that the focus groups should be of a large size with 8-12 members (Merton *et al*, 1956; Smith, 1972 as cited in Fern, 1982) to benefit the degree of rich, in-depth data gathered. It is also suggested that both millennials and the next generation should be studied. This would allow the researcher to understand how age can influence behaviour and decision making in regards to charitable giving.

The aim of this study was to identify and explore the factors influencing millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 1999) toward charity giving. The main themes which have been identified from the data and are prominent and relevant to all of the research objectives are empathy, self-benefitting, personal values and evidence. This concludes the study as the aspects influencing millennials, their behaviour and decision making processes (Sargeant, 1999) towards giving to charitable organisations have been identified.

Appendices

1. Developed Ethics Approval Application Summary

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY APPLICATION FOR ETHICS APPROVAL

DEVOLVED ETHICS APPROVAL APPLICATION SUMMARY

Student Name: Abigail Davies Student Number: 20090133

Module Name: Dissertation Module Number: BRM6003

Programme Name: Business and Management Studies Supervisor Name: Dr. Nicola Burnett-Williams

To be completed by student and supervisor before submission to Ethics Approval Panel	Student Signature;		Supervisor Signature;	
	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
Application for ethics approval	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
Participant information sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participant consent form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pilot interview/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pilot questionnaire/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Letter/s to participating organisation/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

First Submission Resubmission

Date: 01/03/17

206002311

For use by the devolved ethics approval panel:

Panel Members	Name	Signature
Module leader:	<u>J. Gallet</u>	
Supervisor:	<u>Dr N. Williams Burnett</u>	
CSM Ethics Committee Representative:	<u>W. Jones</u>	<u>1/3/2017</u>

Date: _____

Date of Reassessment: _____

Outcome:

Project Approved Reference number: _____

Project Approved in Principle

Application not ready/ incomplete (Decision deferred)

Comments for projects not fully approved:

The original to be retained by the module leader and a copy given to the student

PART ONE

Name of applicant:	Abigail Davies
Supervisor (if student project):	Nicola Williams-Burnett
School / Unit:	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Student number (if applicable):	ST 20090133
Programme enrolled on (if applicable):	Business and Management Studies
Project Title:	To identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving
Expected start date of data collection:	01/03/2017
Approximate duration of data collection:	2 weeks
Funding Body (if applicable):	N/A
Other researcher(s) working on the project:	N/A
Will the study involve NHS patients or staff?	No
Will the study involve taking samples of human origin from participants?	No

Does your project fall entirely within one of the following categories:	
Paper based, involving only documents in the public domain	No
Laboratory based, not involving human participants or human tissue samples	No
Practice based not involving human participants (eg curatorial, practice audit)	No
Compulsory projects in professional practice (eg Initial Teacher Education)	No
A project for which external approval has been obtained (e.g., NHS)	No
If you have answered YES to any of these questions, expand on your answer in the non-technical summary. No further information regarding your project is required. If you have answered NO to all of these questions, you must complete Part 2 of this form	

In no more than 150 words, give a non-technical summary of the project
This qualitative piece of research seeks to identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials behaviour and their decision making process towards charity giving. This study is being carried out to establish the motivating factors and barriers which Millennials are influenced by when considering giving to charities. Interpretivist will be the philosophical approach as it will allow the researcher to explore the information gathered. The study will involve a focus group with members of the public who are Millennials. The data collected will be analysed through using interpretative analysis. Through carrying out this research,

it is hoped that the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving is identified and explored.

DECLARATION:

I confirm that this project conforms with the Cardiff Met Research Governance Framework

I confirm that I will abide by the Cardiff Met requirements regarding confidentiality and anonymity when conducting this project.

STUDENTS: I confirm that I will not disseminate any material produced as a result of this project without the prior approval of my supervisor.

Signature of the applicant:

Date:

FOR STUDENT PROJECTS ONLY

Name of supervisor:

Date:

Signature of supervisor:

Research Ethics Committee use only

Decision reached:

- Project approved
- Project approved in principle
- Decision deferred
- Project not approved
- Project rejected

Project reference number: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Date: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Signature:

Details of any conditions upon which approval is dependant:
[Click here to enter text.](#)

PART TWO

A RESEARCH DESIGN

A1 Will you be using an approved protocol in your project?

No

A2 If yes, please state the name and code of the approved protocol to be used¹

N/A

A3 Describe the research design to be used in your project

This piece of research seeks to identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving. The research design for this study takes on subjective qualitative research which will allow for in depth information to be gathered from a consumer perspective.

Focus Group:

- The focus group will involve members of the public to discuss how they are motivated to donate to charities and what decision making processes they face.
- The researcher aims to hold a minimum of 3 focus groups involving 6-8 participants. This will provide a range of views on the topics and questions discussed. All participants will complete a consent form, agreeing to privacy and confidentiality of what is discussed.
- This focus group will be discussing the participant's interaction with charities and their motivations and barriers to charity giving. Their decision making process (Sargeant, 1999) will also be assessed through the questions asked in the focus group. The research will also see if marketing communications effects Millennials decision making process.

Convenience sampling will be used as it is a non-probability method. The participants will be friends and friends-of-friends. Using this type of sampling means that the participants will be easy to reach as a result of the proximity to the researcher.

Participants:

- The samples chosen ensure that no discrimination will occur, e.g age, gender, race, ect.
- All participants will be Millennials and over the age of 18.
- Participants will be given guaranteed anonymity throughout the research process and will have the ability to withdraw themselves and their data collected from the process at any point.

Consent Forms:

- Consent will be taken from all participants prior to the focus group and information sheets will be issued.

Analysis:

- The focus group will be audio recorded and transcribed. A thematic analysis will take place in order to analyse the data in order to successful meet the aims and objectives of the study.

¹ An Approved Protocol is one which has been approved by Cardiff Met to be used under supervision of designated members of staff; a list of approved protocols can be found on the Cardiff Met website [here](#)

A4 Will the project involve deceptive or covert research?	No
A5 If yes, give a rationale for the use of deceptive or covert research	
N/A	
A6 Will the project have security sensitive implications?	No
A7 If yes, please explain what they are and the measures that are proposed to address them	
N/A	

B PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

B1 What previous experience of research involving human participants relevant to this project do you have?

None

B2 Student project only

What previous experience of research involving human participants relevant to this project does your supervisor have?

Dr Nicola Williams-Burnett has been a research active academic for the last seven years in subject areas relating to social marketing, physical activity, influences on behaviour, place marketing, health and fitness industry and branding. Predominately her research has utilised a qualitative methods (content analysis, thematic analysis and hermeneutics), some quantitative methods and has knowledge of SPSS. To date, Dr Nicola Williams-Burnett has fourteen conference papers, 4 published articles and a book chapter.

C POTENTIAL RISKS

C1 What potential risks do you foresee?

Focus Group:

- Misunderstanding of the research process/ aim and objectives.
- Ability to withdraw from research process and data collection at any given point.

C2 How will you deal with the potential risks?

Focus Group:

- A consent form with the research description will be given to all participants in focus groups and verbal clarification will also be given. This will also give the participant the chance to ask any questions to the research and withdraw from the process.
- It will be explained to the participants that they have the right to withdraw from the research at any point without question.

Participants will be made aware that the researcher and supervisor will have sole access to the research collected. All data collected will be anonymised and their identification will therefore not be used throughout the project.

2. Participant Consent Form

Ethics Reference Number: 2016D02311

Participant Name or Student ID Number: 20090133

Title of Project: To identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving

Name of Researcher: Abigail Davies

Please complete the following by signing your initials in each box:

1. I confirm I have read and understand the participant information sheet which I was provided with by the researcher from the above study. I have also been provided the opportunity to reflect upon the information given and ask any questions which have all been answered to my satisfaction.
2. I have been informed and understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I am able to abstain at any times, without reason and no questions or consequences will be given.
3. I agree to take part in the above study and give my honest opinions and views at all times, whilst also respecting that of any other party involved.
4. I agree to the focus group being audio recorded which will then be used for the benefit of this study.
5. I agree to the use of any anonymised quotes being used in publications for the research study.

Signature of Participant

Date

Name of person taking consent

Date

Signature of person taking consent

3. Participant Information Sheet

Title of Project: To identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving

Ethics Reference Number: 2016D02311

Purpose

The purpose of this study being carried out is to identify and explore the factors influencing Millennials and their behaviour and decision making processes toward charity giving. This study is being carried out as it will allow researcher to establish what motivations effect Millennials likelihood to donate and the thought process which they face when confronted with the idea of donating to charities. It will also benefit charity marketing departments because they will be aware of the thought processes and motivations of the general public, who they are targeting.

Participation

You are invited to take part in a focus group which will include no more than 8 participants, including yourself, to discuss your thoughts on why you would choose to donate and what influences your decision making. The focus group will be approximately 1 hour long. Abigail Davies will be carrying out the research and the focus group will be audio recorded for data collection purposes. Once the data has been analysed, a copy of the results found will be sent on to yourself so that you are aware of the information being used.

You have been requested to take part because it is believed that your experience is valuable to the study and would be beneficial to the research area. Donating to charity can occur for a number of reason and therefore it is important to research as to why

people chose to donate and to who. If you change your mind at any point about your participation with this study, you are welcome to abstain with no reason needed to be given. Your decision will be respected and no further questions or consequences will occur. Your rights will be not effects if you join the study nor if you chose to abstain. Please note there are no noted risks for this study or in the focus group you will be participating in.

Results

The results gathered will be analysed by the researcher and then used along with other primary research carried to create conclusions which will there be used to benefit the researchers' Dissertation. Once analysed the data will be accessible to all participants.

Privacy

All participants' privacy will be protected through the study with all participants signing to agree to confidentiality of the topics discussed and opinions shared. The information shared will only be used to benefit this study of research and will not be shared with any third parties.

If you have any concerns about the study or your participation within it, please do not hesitate to contact:

Abigail Davies

St20090133@cardiffmet.ac.uk

4. Questions for Focus Group

1. Do you donate to charities by any means (monetary, time, belongings)?
If yes, what/how do you donate?
If no, why?
2. Who do you donate too?
Why?
3. Do you regularly donate to charities?
If so, how often? And who too?
4. When considering donating to a charity, what can influence your decision?
Why?
5. Are there barriers which stop you from donating?
If yes, what are they? And why?
6. How can you be persuaded to donate to a charity?
7. Does the amount of involvement/commitment involved in the donation process effect your decision to give to charities?
Why?
8. Are you influenced by the marketing of charities in regards to your likelihood to donate?
Why?
9. How often do you see marketing communications of charities?
Please list any marketing communications from charities.
10. How do you usual react to marketing communications from charities?
Do they influence your likelihood to donate? If so why?
If no response is had, why?

5. Focus Group Transcript 3 Coded

Codes: Purple = Different Types of Donating; Pink = Motivations to Donate; Green = Marketing Communications from Charities; Blue = Influences upon the Decision Making Process (Sargeant, 1999); Yellow = Barriers to Motivation to Donate

RESEARCHER: Thank you all for coming today. I've already given you the participant information sheet and you've all signed the consent form. Any questions have been answered but are there any further questions?

PARTICIPANTS MUMBLE NO

RESEARCHER: Okay. If anyone wants to withdraw at any point that is fine just let me know. Question 1. Do you donate to charities by any means such as monetary, time, belongings? If yes, what/how do you donate? If no, why?

PARTICIPANT 1: I donate clothes to charity shops, like local ones

RESEARCHER: Okay, why?

PARTICIPANT 1: Because it's better that they go to a good home instead just going in the bin and being wasted

PARTICIPANT 2: I sponsor people regularly, does that count?

RESEARCHER: Yes, what type of events?

PARTICIPANT 2: Charity runs, like race for life in aid of cancer research and half marathons

PARTICIPANT 3: Yeah I do that too, but I also give small donation when I'm at an event and they are shaking the buckets

RESEARCHER: Okay, why?

PARTICIPANT 3: I sponsor friends because I feel I have too, and the same with the buckets. I feel guilty just walking past when I have spare change in my pocket

PARTICIPANT 4: I do lots of events to raise money for charity, like I did the race for life last year to raise money for cancer research because it's close to my family's heart.

PARTICIPANT 5: Same as everyone else really, I just donate as and when I can but it's always money or clothes. Clothes I'll donate because I want to help others if I can and it's easy. Money I'll donate when I see boxes like in McDonalds at the till or on comic relief and events like that. It's just easy and convenient for me.

PARTICIPANT 6: I don't really donate. I used to in school on non-school uniform day or like you just said, comic relief by now I just don't really.

RESEARCHER: Why not anymore?

PARTICIPANT 6: I don't get the opportunities too, I mean I would if faced with it but I just rarely see chances to donate anything.

RESEARCHER: Okay, anyone else?

PARTICIPANT MUMBLE NO

RESEARCHER: Okay, who do you chose to donate to? And why?

PARTICIPANT 5: I'll donate my clothes to my local charity shop, like BoBath but that's only because it's round the corner from my house.

RESEARCHER: Okay

PARTICIPANT 1: Yeah same here, or I'll use one of the bags that come through my door, think that is usually the British Heart Foundation. But I'm not bothered about which charity, just that I am doing good and helping

PARTICIPANT 2: When I sponsor my friends, the charity does influence me. Like if its cancer research say, I may give more because I'm effected by that charity whereas, others I don't have a connection or relationship with

PARTICIPANT 3: Yeah same, and the type of event I'm sponsoring them to do as well. It's got to be challenging

PARTICIPANT 2: Yeah same here

PARTICIPANT 4: I donate to the charities which are close to my heart, those which effect my family members and benefit them, those which are close to home.

RESEACHER: Okay, so do you regularly donate to charities? If yes, how often and who too?

PARTICIPANT 6: No, I don't

RESEARCHER: Why?

PARTICIPANT 6: Just don't get the chance. Probably time, I'm too busy

PARTICIPANT 1: Probably like once a month. Not that often really mainly when I have some old clothes to go the charity shop

PARTICIPANT 2: Yeah, I'd agree. I probably donate more in the summer because there seems to be loads more events which people do that need sponsoring

PARTICIPANT 4: I'd say I donate 2 times a month

RESEARCHER: Who too?

PARTICIPANT 4: It depends really. Usually charity close to home but if I'm out and about and there is a collection then I'll give then too

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah same really. Maybe a couple of times a month

RESEARCHER: Who too?

PARTICIPANT 5: Mainly those who effect my family. I also favour donating to those in the UK because I can actually you know see the difference

PARTICIPANT 3: I agree with that, I prefer donating to children in need when that's around

RESEARCHER: A mixture of how often you all donate then?

PARTICIPANT 4: Yeah, it just depends really if I'm in a situation where the opportunity is there to donate

RESEARCHER: Okay, when considering donating to a charity, what can influence your decision? And why?

PARTICIPANT 5: Like I just said, who the money is benefitting and what change I will see

PARTICIPANT 1: For me, it's if I feel a personal connection, I mean there is so many good causes but I can't afford to support them all

PARTICIPANT 4: I completely agree. I favour those close to me and my family and so I guess it's because the charity effects those close to me that I favour them.

RESEARCHER: Okay

PARTICIPANT 2: It depends whether I can afford to donate that week, like if I've got a spare change when I'm passing a collection or not

PARTICIPANT 6: Yeah

PARTICIPANT 4: Yeah my financial situation can affect me too

PARTICIPANT 3: Religion can influence people too can't it, like certain religions will meet and donate on a weekly basis

PARTICIPANT 4: I have to feel empathy for the cause, like there has to be that bond there between me and them. I can't really describe it

RESEARCHER: Anything else?

PARTICIPANT 2: It can be pressure and guilt as well. Like if my friends ask me to sponsor them I'll feel guilty for saying no

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah, almost peer pressure

RESEARCHER: Okay, next question is, are there barriers which stop you from donating? If yes, what are they? And why?

PARTICIPANT 3: If it's a collection with a person holding the box, I hate it if they are too pushy or if they knock of your door. It just puts me off

PARTICIPANT 4: Yeah, or if they try and guilt trip you

PARTICIPANT 2: I won't donate if it's complicated. Like I'm happy to give just would rather it doesn't consume too much time. I don't have lots of spare time so it's got to be quick and easy

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah, I donate when it's easy. Convenient. I'd say

PARTICIPANT 1: I don't like it when charities try get more money out of you than what you are willing to give

RESEACHER: What do you mean?

PARTICIPANT 1: It's like when you say you'll give £5 say then they want you to create a standing order. It just annoys me

PARTICIPANT 6: It can just be not having enough money

PARTICIPANT 3: Yeah, money plays a massive factor. We are students

RESEARCHER: Okay, cool. How can you be persuaded to donate to a charity?

PARTICIPANT 1: Personal stories from like people who the charity benefits can help persuade me. It like shows how the charity works and who it benefits it

PARTICIPANT 5: Proof they are doing good work

PARTICIPANT 3: Yeah, I agree. I want evidence of where my money is going and who it is helping. You hear all the time that the money just pays the employees' wages so I want evidence that isn't helping

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah, show the good my money is doing

PARTICIPANT 4: I donate sometimes because I'm taking part in an event, so I guess that persuades me to donate

PARTICIPANT 2: Yeah same as everyone else really

RESEARCHER: Okay, does the amount of involvement/commitment involved in the donation process effect your decision to give to charities? Why?

PARTICIPANT 1: Not really, no

RESEARCHER: Why?

PARTICIPANT 1: I'll give as and when I can, no matter what

PARTICIPANT 4: Yeah same really. I'll give what I can when I can. No reason why, I just like benefitting others I guess

PARTICIPANT 5: It does for me. I just want it to be quick and easy

PARTICIPANT 6: Same, if I am going to do donate, it's got to be convenient

PARTICIPANT 2: It affects me because of the financial factors involved. Like I couldn't set up a standing order because I might not have the money available every month but then I could give me time up yet I don't have much time available either because of uni and work

PARTICIPANT 3: It's just got to be easy I think these days because we live in a fast paced world so people expect everyone to be quick and easy so they can move on to the next thing

RESEARCHER: Okay, are you influenced by the marketing of charities in regards to your likelihood to donate? Why?

PARTICIPANT 4: Not really, I chose the ones that are close to home and affect me so I don't pay attention I guess to the marketing

PARTICIPANT 2: I see so many adverts every day on billboards, in the post, on TV and so they don't really shock me enough anymore to influence me

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah same here, and they aren't telling you where your money goes show I just switch off

PARTICIPANT 1: I think it depends, if the charity is well known I don't pay attention and it won't influence me however if it's a smaller charity and I don't know much about it, I'm interested to find out more and then that could influence me to donate if I then felt a connection to the charity

PARTICIPANT 3: It's hard to read about every single charity though and learn about them all so. I'm probably the opposite because if I see marketing for a well-known charity I may donate but if I don't recognise them and I don't have the time to learn about them then I won't donate

PARTICIPANT 5: Yeah, it's hard to give all charities your attention and support. Especially financially

RESEARCHER: Okay, how often do you see marketing communications of charities? List any marketing communications from charities you can think off too

PARTICIPANT 4: I see a few on TV, usually for animal charities or cancer research

PARTICIPANT 1: I see them all the time. Walking back and forth to uni I see posters and we get lots of leaflets through the door

PARTICIPANT 2: Yeah same here, I get sent pens all the time usually from deaf charities but I don't know why

PARTICIPANT 5: I guess now I've thought about it I see them all the time but I don't realise. I just block them all out. It gets to a point that you see so many you stop recognising them But that's the same with all forms of advertising I guess

PARTICIPANT 6: Yeah I agree, they are everywhere

PARTICIPANT 3: I see them all the time too, you just don't realise it. But I've not had anyone knock at my door in a while and that really annoys me

RESEARCHER: Why does that annoy you?

PARTICIPANT 3: It's too personal. A stranger knocking the door asking for money, usually a standing order, for a charity I normally know nothing about. I just don't like it

RESEARCHER: Okay, finally then, how do you usual react to marketing communications from charities? Do they influence your likelihood to donate? If so why?

PARTICIPANT 1: I don't really react to them. Only ever would if there was a personal connection to the charity because it pulls on the heart strings then doesn't it

PARTICIPANT 5: Like I said, just block them out. Too many around to give 100% attention and support to all of them

PARTICIPANT 4: Yeah, I agree

PARTICIPANT 3: There is so many, that if anything it puts me off donating because I can't help everyone

PARTICIPANT 6: Yeah, it's almost too overwhelming

PARTICIPANT 3: Yeah completely

PARTICIPANT 2: I see so many I can't react to them all so they don't influence me to donate because it's impossible to help every single one. I haven't got enough money as it is

PARTICIPANT 5: *Laughs* Yeah I agree

RESEARCHER: Okay, great. Anyone else?

PARTICIPANTS MUMBLE NO

RESEARCHER: Okay. Thank you all for coming. The data will be used by only me

and my supervisor and all of your identities will be fully protected. Any problems or questions, please let me know. Thank you all for your time.

6. Findings for the Theme of Motivations towards Charitable Giving

	Motivators	Themes
FG1P1	I had a family member suffer from cancer so it was personal to me	Empathy
FG1P2	rather my clothes be sold and have someone else buy them	Personal Values
FG1P2	I am giving and doing good	Self-benefitting
FG1P1	Convenient	Convenience/Ease
FG1P3	Yeah, it's convenience	Convenience/Ease
FG1P4	So I'll do that because it's easy	Convenience/Ease
FG1P5	Just because it's quite a small charity	Empathy
FG1P1	People who are in need	Empathy
FG1P1	It sort of makes you upset	Empathy

FG1P2	More personal	Empathy
FG1P2	Help people in the UK compared to people in other countries because we've got so many people in need here	Empathy
FG1P2	Relative effected	Empathy
FG1P3	See them doing something good	Trust
FG1P1	Makes you feel better about yourself	Self-benefiting
FG1P1	Makes me feel good	Self-benefiting
FG1P1	My friends on Facebook will be doing an event	Personal Values
FG1P1	Type of event	Empathy
FG1P3	Who it affects	Empathy
FG1P6	See where it is going	Trust
FG1P3	Ty Hafan, you can see where it goes and with the air ambulances	Trust
FG1P2	Personal to you	Empathy

FG1P2	See that it actually helps someone	Empathy/Trust
FG1P3	Help so many families	Empathy
FG1P4	But I suppose it's just personal opinion	Personal Values
FG1P1	Person who is doing the fundraising	Empathy
FG1P1	Personally effected by something a charity did and they really helped then I would give to them	Empathy
FG1P1	Family	Empathy
FG1P2	Proof where the money goes	Trust
FG1P4	It's easy	Convenience/Ease
FG1P6	Do something myself than just give money	Self-benefitting
FG1P2	It makes me want to be an organ donor because you just can't imagine that happening to someone that close to you	Empathy
FG1P5	Personal things	Empathy
FG1P2	On Instagram, the smear selfies and like the ICE bucket challenge, that can really influence	Empathy

FG1P5	Cardiff Half Marathon this year was sponsored by Barnardo's and they give you discounted entry if you signed up to do it with them	Self-benefitting
FG1P1	If you raised about a certain amount then you wouldn't have to pay to do the event	Self-benefitting
FG1P4	If anything really bad happened to me then that day may completely change my mind on donating to charities	Self-benefitting
FG1P3	I give blood, and I expect others to in case I need it	Self-benefitting
FG1P4	It's not costing you anything and not taking much of your time	Convenience/Ease
FG1P2	Religious beliefs	Personal Values
FG2P2	I wanted to watch a friend get beat up	Personal Values
FG2P3	Helping a friend but also helping a charity at the same time	Empathy/Personal Values
FG2P4	I got pressured by the school	Empathy
FG2P5	Feel pressured to	Empathy
FG2P6	If they are like explaining the reasons	Trust

FG2P2	People who are open and honest about why their getting money and how they are receiving it and what they are doing with it	Trust
FG2P1	Donate to those that are in Britain	Empathy
FG2P4	Donating to lesser charities	Empathy
FG2P5	Local charities as well, so it makes a difference where we are	Empathy/ Convenience/Ease
FG2P6	Where it's going too	Trust
FG2P6	The charity it's for	Empathy
FG2P2	Other people and friends	Empathy/ Personal Values
FG2P5	Feel pressure to do it yourself	Empathy
FG2P6	Personal experience with the issue	Empathy
FG2P2	If you're close to someone who has had that illness, to then help them and the cause	Empathy

FG2P5	Celebrity or famous person endorsing that charity	Personal Values/ Trust
FG2P5	See for yourself the impact it is having	Trust
FG2P6	Personal experience can persuade you	Empathy
FG2P2	If a friend was there I would be more inclined to donate	Empathy
FG2P5	Something you can all do for fun	Personal Values
FG2P5	More likely to donate to a smaller charity, a local one	Empathy/ Convenience/Ease
FG2P5	I'm more likely to donate if someone is there and talking to me	Empathy/ Trust
FG2P5	It's not your money	Convenience/Ease
FG2P6	More involved with that charity	Empathy/ Personal Values
FG3P1	Better that they go to a good home instead just going in the bin and being wasted	Personal Values
FG3P3	I sponsor friends because I feel I have too	Empathy

FG3P4	Close to my family's heart	Empathy
FG3P5	Because I want to help others	Empathy
FG3P5	It's easy	Convenience/Ease
FG3P5	Easy and convenient for me	Convenience/Ease
FG3P5	It's round the corner from my house	Convenience/Ease
FG3P1	Doing good and helping	Self-benefitting
FG3P2	I'm effected by that charity	Empathy
FG3P3	Type of event I'm sponsoring them to do	Personal Values
FG3P4	Close to my heart, those which effect my family members and benefit them, those which are close to home.	Empathy
FG3P1	mainly when I have some old clothes to go the charity shop	Personal Values
FG3P4	Charity close to home	Empathy

FG3P4	I'm out and about and there is a collection then I'll give then too	Convenience/Ease
FG3P5	Effect my family	Empathy
FG3P5	Donating to those in the UK because I can actually you know see the difference	Empathy
FG3P5	Who the money is benefitting	Empathy
FG3P1	I feel a personal connection	Empathy
FG3P4	Those close to me and my family	Empathy
FG3P3	Religion can influence people too	Personal Values
FG3P4	Empathy for the cause	Empathy
FG3P2	Pressure and guilt	Empathy
FG3P5	Peer pressure	Empathy
FG3P2	Quick and easy	Convenience/Ease

FG3P5	I donate when it's easy. Convenient	Convenience/Ease
FG3P1	Personal stories from like people who the charity benefits	Empathy
FG3P1	Shows how the charity works and who it benefits it	Trust
FG3P5	Proof they are doing good work	Trust
FG3P3	Evidence of where my money is going and who it is helping	Trust
FG3P5	Show the good my money is doing	Trust
FG3P4	I'm taking part in an event, so I guess that persuades me to donate	Convenience/Ease
FG3P4	I just like benefitting others	Self-benefitting
FG3P5	Quick and easy	Convenience/Ease
FG3P6	Convenient	Convenience/Ease
FG3P3	It's just got to be easy	Convenience/Ease
FG3P4	Close to home and affect me	Empathy

FG3P1	Smaller charity and I don't know much about it, I'm interested to find out more and then that could influence me to donate if I then felt a connection to the charity	Empathy
FG3P3	Well-known charity	Trust
FG3P1	Personal connection	Empathy

Reference List

- Baines, P., Fill, C. and Page, K. (2013). *Essentials of marketing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Batson, C.D. (1990) 'How Social an Animal? The Human Capacity for Caring'. *American Psychologist*, 45, pp. 336-346.
- Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. and Bendapudi, V. (1996). 'Enhancing Helping Behaviour: An Integrative Framework for Promotion Planning'. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3), pp. 33-54.
- Bennett, R. (2003). 'Factors Underlying the Inclination to Donate to Particular Types of Charity'. *International Journal of non-profit and voluntary sector marketing*, 8(1), pp. 12-29.
- Bennett, R. and Barkensjo, A. (2005). 'Relationship Quality, Relationship Marketing, and Client Perceptions of the Levels of Service Quality of Charitable Organisations', *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 16(1), pp. 81-106.
- Bennett, R. and Savani, S. (2004). 'Managing Conflict between Marketing and Other Functions within Charitable Organisations'. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), pp. 180-200.
- Berry, L. (1995). 'Relationship Marketing of Services – Growing Interest, Emerging Perspectives'. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), pp. 236-45.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). 'Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology'. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77-101.
- Braud, P. (1994). 'Will Baby Bloomers Giev Generously'. *American Demographics*, 16 (7), pp. 48.
- CAF (2016). *CAF: World Giving Index 2016*. Available at: https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/personal-giving/caf_ukgiving2015_1891a_web_230516.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (Accessed: 19th March 2017).
- Chad, P., Kyriazis, E. and Motion, J. (2013). 'Development of a Market Orientation Research Agenda for the Nonprofit Sector'. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 25(1), pp. 1-27.
- Clarke, P.W., Martin, C.C. and Bush A.J. (2001) 'The effect of role model influence on adolescents' materialism and marketplace knowledge'. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9(4), pp. 27-36.
- Collis, J. and Hussey, R. (2009). *Business research*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Connaway, L. (2015). 'The Library in the Life of the User: Engaging with People Where they Live and Learn', p.84. Available at: <http://www.wip.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-library-in-life-of-user.pdf#page=98> (Accessed: 2nd March 2017).

- Coviello, N., Brodie, R. and Munro, H. (1997). 'Understanding Contemporary Marketing: a Classification Scheme'. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 13(6), pp. 501-22.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *'Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design'*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Davies, G., Whelan, S., Foley, A. and Walsh, M. (2010) 'Gifts and Giving'. *International journal of management reviews*, 12(4), pp. 413-434.
- Davis, M.H. (1994) *'Empathy: A Social Psychological Approach'*. Brown & Benchmark Publishers: Madison, WI.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (1998). *'Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry'*. 1st ed. Thousands Oak, California: SAGE Publications.
- Eisenberg, N. and Miller, P.A. (1987). 'The Relation of Empathy to Prosocial and Related Behaviours'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, pp. 91-119.
- Erickson, E., Erickson, J. and Kivnick, H. (1986). *'From Vital Involvement in Old age'*. Norton: New York.
- Falco, N., Fopma, W., Maxwell, S., Stoller, M. and Turnell, N. (1998). 'Planned Giving: Is Philanthropy a Learned Behaviour?'. *Fundraising Management*, 29(7), pp. 36-37.
- Fern, E. (1982). 'The Use of Focus Groups for Idea Generation: The Effects of Group Size, Acquaintanceship, and Moderator on Response Quantity and Quality'. *Journal of Marketing Research*.
- Francia, P.L., Green, J.C., Herrnson P.S., Powell L.W. and Wilcox C. (2005). 'Limousine Liberals and Corporate Conservative: The Financial Constituencies of Democratic and Republican Parties'. *Social science quarterly*, 86(4), pp. 761-778.
- Fultz, J.C., Batson, D., Fortenbach V.A., McCarthy, P. and Varney L.L. (1986). 'Social Evaluation and the Empathy Altruism Hypothesis'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, pp. 761-769.
- Goodden, H. (1994). 'An Enormous Inter-Generational Transfer of Wealth is Imminent: How Can Charities Benefit?' *Front and centre: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy*, 1(3), pp. 17-18.
- Howitt, D. and Cramer, D. (2011) *'Introduction to Research Methods in Psychology'*. 3rd edn, Pearson, Harlow.
- Iwaarden, J.V., Wiele, T.V.D., Williams R. and Moxham C. (2009). 'Charities: How Important is Performance to Donors?' *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 26(1), pp. 5-22.
- Johnson, E.J. and Russo, J.E. (1984). 'Product Familiarity and Learning New Information'. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11, pp. 542-550.
- Joireman, J. and Mulder, M. (2016). 'Encouraging Charitable Donations via Charity Gift Cards: A Self-Determination Theoretical Account'. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 28(3), pp. 234-251.

- Kang, C., Handy, F., Hustinx, I., Cnaan, R., Brudney, J.L., Haski-Leventhal, D., Holmes, K., Meijs, L., Pessi, A.B., Ranade, B., Smith, K., Yamauchi, N. and Zrinscak, S. (2011). 'What Gives? Cross-national Differences in Students' Giving Behaviour'. *The Social Science Journal*, 48(2), pp. 283-294.
- Keyt, J.C., Yavas, U. and Riecken, G. (2002). 'Comparing Donor Segment to Cause-based Charity: The Case of the American Lung Association'. *Journal of Non-Profit and Public Sector Marketing*, 10(2), pp. 117-134.
- Kim, N. (2014). 'Advertising Strategies for Charities: Promoting Consumers' Donation of Time versus Money'. *International Journal of Advertising*, 33(4).
- Ko, Y.J., Gibson, H. and Kim, M. (2011). 'Understanding Donors: A Case of University Performing Arts Programme in the USA'. *International Journal of Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16, pp. 166-182.
- Kottasz, R. (2004). 'Differences in the Donor Behaviour Characteristics of Young Affluent Males and Females: Empirical Evidence from Britain'. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, 15(2), pp. 181-203.
- Krueger, R. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Lee, Y. and Chang, C. (2008). 'Intrinsic or Extrinsic? Determinants Affecting Donation Behaviors'. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 8(1), pp. 13-24.
- Lichtenstein, D.R., Drumwright M.E. and Braig B.M. (2004). 'The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits'. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), pp. 16-32.
- McDaniel, C. and Gates, R. (2008). *Marketing research essentials*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley.
- Michaelidou, N., Micevski, M. and Siamagka, N.T. (2015). 'Consumers' Intention to Donate to Two Children's Charity Brands: A Comparison of Barnardo's and BBC Children in Need'. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(2), pp. 134-146.
- Midlarsky, E. and Hannah, M.E (1989). 'The Generous Elderly: Naturalistic Studies of Donations Across the Life Span'. *Psychology and Ageing*, 4 (3), pp. 346-351.
- Milne, G.R. and Gordon, M.E. (1993). 'Direct Mail Privacy Efficiency Trade-Offs Within an Implied Social Contract Framework'. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 12, pp. 206-215.
- Nichols, J.E. (1992). 'Targeting Older America'. *Funding Raising Management*, 23 (3), pp. 38-41.
- Noble, J. and Wixley, S. (2014). *Matter of Trust: What the Public Thinks of Charities and how it Affects Trust*. 1st ed. (Ebook) *New Philanthropy Capital*. Available at: http://www.thinknpc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Matter-of-trust_24-10-2014_FINAL.pdf (Accessed: 25th April 2017).
- O'Sullivan, T. (1993). 'Goodwill Gestures'. *Marketing Week*, pp. 17-21.

- Opoku, R.A. (2012). 'Examining the Motivational Factor Behind Charitable Giving Among Young People in a Prominent Islamic Country'. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18, pp. 172-186.
- Ormstedt, D. (1994). 'Government Regulation of Fundraising: A Struggle for Efficacy'. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising: Financial Practices for Effective Fundraising*, (3), pp. 129-141.
- Ranganathan, S.K. and Henley, W.H. (2008). 'Determinants of Charitable Donation Intentions: A Structural Equation Model'. *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 13(1), pp. 1-11.
- Ranganathan, S.K. and Sen, S. (2012). 'Examining Charitable Donation Process in South India: Role of Gender'. *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(2), pp. 108-121.
- Rothschild, M. (1979). 'Marketing Communications in Non-business Situations or Why It's So Hard to Sell Brotherhood like Soap'. *Journal of Marketing*, 43(2), pp.11-20.
- Ryan, R. and Deci, E. (2000). 'Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classical Definitions and New Directions'. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, pp. 54-67.
- Sargeant, A., Ford J. and West D.C. (2000). 'Widening the Appeal of Charity'. *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 5(4), pp. 318-332.
- Sargeant, A. and Woodliffe, L. (2007). 'Gift Giving: An Interdisciplinary Review'. *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, pp. 275-307.
- Sargeant, A. (1999). 'Charitable Giving: Towards a Model of Donor Behaviour'. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4), pp. 215-238.
- Sargeant, A. (2009). *Marketing Management for Nonprofit Organizations*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press.
- Sargeant, A. and Ewing, M. (2001). 'Fundraising Direct: A Communications Planning Guide for Charity Marketing'. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 9(1-2), pp. 185-204.
- Sargeant, A., Hilton, T. and Wymer, W. (2006). 'Bequest Motives and Barriers to Giving: The Case of Direct Mail Donors'. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 17(1), pp. 49-66.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2013). *Research Methods for Business Students*. 3rd ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Savani, S. and Bennett, R. (2003). 'Predicting the Accuracy of Public Perceptions of Charity Performance'. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 11(4), pp. 326-342.
- Silver, M. (1980). *From Affluence, Altruism and Atrophy*. New York University: New York.

- Simpson, J.C. (1986). 'Baby Bloomers Have 60s Heritage but Charities Say They're Cheap'. *Wall Street Journal*, p.33
- Stossel, J. and Kendall, K. (2006). 'Who Gives and Who Doesn't?' Available at: <http://abcnews.go.com/2020/story?id=2682730> (Accessed 25th April 2017).
- 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 Demographic'. *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 4(3), pp. 235-244.
- Van Dick, R. (2001). 'Identification in Organisational Contexts: Linking Theory and Research from Social and Organisational Psychology'. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(4), pp. 265-283.
- Warwick, M. (1994). *Raising Money by Mail: Strategies for Growth and Financial Stability*. 1st ed. Berkeley, CA: Strathmoor Press.
- Webb, D. J. and Mohr, L.A. (1998). 'A Typology of Consumer Responses to Cause-Related Marketing: From Skeptics to Socially Concerned'. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 17 (2), pp. 226-238.
- Yankelovich, D. (1985). *The Charitable Behaviour of American*. Management Survey, Independent Sector, Washington, DC.