Understanding the Correlates of Donor Intention: A comparison of Local, National and International Charity Destinations

Andrew Robson*[1] and David John Hart*[1]

[1] Newcastle Business School

Northumbria University

Newcastle upon Tyne

England

NE1 8ST

andrew.robson@northumbria.ac.uk (+44 191 243 7428)

david.hart@northumbria.ac.uk (+44 191 227 4259)

* Corresponding author

Abstract

The United Kingdom is generous towards charitable donations and this commitment appears robust against a background of economic uncertainty. Whilst prior work has identified a clear preference for domestic over international causes, research has yet to identify the range of variables that significantly correlate with this important element of charitable choice.

A survey of 1004 UK residents was designed to assess willingness to donate to local, national and international causes. For each destination, stepwise multiple regression analysis identified the key variables that correlate to an individual's willingness to donate.

Findings suggest that donor willingness correlates with levels of trust, preferred types of charitable cause and donation channels. In contrast, the role of donor demographics is relatively limited. The findings suggest some commonality in the variables that associate most significantly with willingness to donate locally and nationally, but those relating to international donation intention are relatively distinct.

Andrew Robson is a Professor in the Department of Marketing, Operations and Systems at Northumbria University. His teaching focuses on business modelling and associated quantitative methods, with research interests spanning across marketing, pedagogy and management.

ORCID: 0000-0001-7367-1161

David Hart is an Associate Professor in Marketing in the Department of Marketing, Operations and Systems at Northumbria University. His primary research interests are charitable marketing, customer loyalty and customer complaint behavior.

ORCID: 0000-0003-4198-8150

LinkedIn: https://uk.linkedin.com/in/david-hart-phd-08a47433

Introduction

The increasingly competitive landscape faced by charities is widely acknowledged (e.g. Ein-Gar & Levontin, 2013; O'Hara, 2014). In the last decade, the UK has experienced the global economic recession followed by economic austerity, with many of its citizens being subject to wage freezes or sub-inflation salary increases. Such trends put charities under greater pressure to understand not just why people donate (see Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a), but also how donors choose between the ever-increasing numbers of alternatives. Work focusing on what correlates with donations to certain types of charity is surprisingly limited (Bennett, 2003).

A common technique used by donors to segment charities is to distinguish between home and overseas causes (Breeze, 2013). Although national level charities may also provide local services (Hall *et al*., 2013), there are calls to distinguish between causes which are local, national and international in nature (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988; Grau & Folse, 2007). In addition to social distance (which refers to the physical and emotional distance between donors and recipients: Strombach *et al*., 2014), choosing which charity to support is further complicated by the plethora of causes actively seeking donations, ranging from medical research through to animal welfare, poverty alleviation and environmental projects.

The current study provides a comprehensive analysis of the correlates of donation intention to local, national and international charities (we term this *donation destination*). This builds upon recent calls for a greater understanding of how donors choose between charities based upon destination (Hart, 2016) and previous work on domestic versus international giving (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009; Casale & Baumann, 2015; Knowles & Sullivan, 2017). Existing research provides an understanding of why donors support charitable causes (with

reasons straddling personal values and experiences, faith, sense of moral obligation and warm-glow effects: Ottoni-Wilhelm, Vesterlund & Xie, 2017), but research on preferred donation destination is largely lacking (a recent exception being Knowles & Sullivan, 2017). This study investigates whether the specific correlates of donation intention (proven to play a significant role in actual donation behaviour: Kashif, Sarifuddin & Hassan, 2015) differ by local, national or international destination.

The study draws from the psychological literature on the theory of planned behaviour (TPB: Azjen, 1991) and social identity theory (SIT). These two theoretical perspectives have previously been brought together to understand health behaviours (Chatzisarantis *et al*., 2009) recycling (Terry, Hogg & White, 1999) and sustainable agriculture engagement (Fielding *et al*., 2008). TPB has been found to predict pro-social behaviours, be it more traditional forms of charitable giving like financial donations (Smith & McSweeney, 2007) or volunteering (Warburton & Terry, 2000). In the current study, we will assess an individual's donation intentions for local, national and international charities. Previous TPB studies have consistently indicated that donation intentions are powerful predictors of actual donations (France, France & Himawan, 2007; Smith & McSweeney, 2007).

As donations to these three categories of charities allude to issues of group membership, this study also contributes to our broader understanding of SIT in a charitable context. First developed by Tajfel (1974), SIT considers how an individual's identify based upon their group membership, be they friendship, sports team affiliation or nationality. SIT relates to issues such as prejudice, ethnocentrism and discrimination (Hogg, 2006), all of which are potentially relevant to donating to beneficiaries in different geographical locations. Our social identities refer to issues of 'us' and 'them' (Fielding *et al*., 2008) that are determined by two

processes; social categorisation (where boundaries between groups are established) and self-enhancement, where norms are shaped to benefit in-group members. These social identities result in groups wishing to minimise in-group differences and maximise inter-group differences (Terry, Hogg & White, 1999). In a charitable context, this would result in donors prioritising charities that aid fellow in-group members (i.e. local and national charities). Of course, the distinction between charities which assist in-groups versus out-groups is complicated by the fact that many serve both (Erlansson et al., 2019).

Research suggests higher levels of trust and support for domestic causes (Casale & Baumann, 2015; Charity Commission, 2016). We extend the consideration of trust by assessing to what extent trust for specific destinations correlates with donation intention. Equally, the demography of donors represents a core driver of giving. There is evidence that those with higher education and income are more likely to support overseas causes (Bennett, 2003). Further work in this area may aid fundraisers in the effective targeting of donors.

The final two variables considered represent areas of charitable giving notably underrepresented in research, the type of charitable causes supported and the use of specific donation channels. We argue that the types of charitable cause a donor supports will correlate with their donation destination (for example, those who support charities for ex-military personnel may prefer domestic causes). Equally, certain donation channels (e.g. entering raffles) rely on localised community networks (Schlegelmilch, Love & Diamantopoulos, 1997).

The paper will next introduce the extant knowledge on donation destination before providing a review of literature covering the variable sets introduced above. The paper outlines a quantitative methodology, which leads to the development of separate regression models for

local, national and international charities. The conclusions will summarise the core findings

and discuss implications for fundraisers.

Literature Review

Donation Destination

We use 'donation destination' to describe the location of the recipients of charitable donations relative to the donor, and categorise these as local, national or international. The literature suggests that donors typically display a preference for more local causes in line with the principles of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1974). Focus group research across the UK and Australasia suggests that donors consider local causes more relevant than causes further afield irrespective of seriousness (Dalton *et al*., 2008), partially as they represent causes that may be utilised by the donor in the future (Hall *et al*., 2013). National level charities are often preferred because of a moral obligation to tend to the needs of co-nationals (Stevenson & Manning, 2010). This links closely to Kessler and Milkman's (2018) investigation into donor identity. Across two experiments they concluded that charity appeals which centre on a donor as a member of a local community generate greater donations.

Micklewright and Schnepf (2009) interrogated Office for National Statistics data to uncover that whilst international causes often receive higher individual donations, these tend to be less frequent than domestic donations. Knowles & Sullivan (2017) provide evidence for preference for national over international causes with data from New Zealand, with 71.6% opting for domestic alternatives. The opposite emerges from an Australian perspective, where Lwin, Phau & Lim (2014) used survey data to conclude that donors have more positive attitudes toward national and international charities than local alternatives. Based on this literature, the underlying premise of SIT and the view of Bekkers (2010, p. 370) that "people

will be more strongly attracted to collective goods in the local community than to the problems of a third world country", hypothesis H_1 suggests:

H_1:   *There is a greater level of donation intention towards UK-based charities, either locally or nationally focussed, compared with donation intention towards those operating internationally.*

Donor Demographics

Donor demography encapsulates numerous variables associated with donor intention. For age, various perspectives emerge. Knowles and Sullivan (2017) indicate no significant association, in contrast to Lwin *et al*. (2014) who indicate a positive association between age and donation intention. Bekkers and Wiepking (2011b) suggest the association is non-linear, with donations starting to decline in donors aged 65 and over.

There is an equally varied picture relating to gender. Micklewright and Schnepf (2009), Lwin *et al*. (2014) and Knowles and Sullivan (2017) all reported no statistically significant differences in domestic versus international preferences between gender groups. Interestingly (and after accounting for earnings, educational attainment and household composition) Piper and Schnepf (2008) used the same ONS dataset as Micklewright and Schnepf (2009) and concluded women are more generous in both financial contribution and frequency of donation, with particular dominance in causes relating to animal welfare, education and the elderly.

Educational participation and attainment are important demographics in understanding donation behaviour. Bekkers and Wiepking (2011b) indicate greater donation intention amongst the more highly educated, driven by enhanced information access and confidence-based trust in charitable organisations. Bennett (2003) suggests less-educated donors demonstrate greater affinity with domestic concerns, with Micklewright and Schnepf (2009) recognising that higher educational attainment resonates with international giving. Income also plays a significant role in charitable giving, correlatting with higher levels of donation (Lwin *et al*., 2014).

Supposition exists that political attitudes may partly explain charitable giving, especially towards international causes (Rajan, Pink & Dow, 2009). For example, those with a left-wing political orientation are more predisposed to supporting international causes (Wiepking, 2010) and specifically international disaster relief (Manesi et al., 2019), with the opposite true of Conservative donors (a statistically significant finding from Chapman, Louis & Massey, 2018). Based on this collective body of evidence, hypothesis H$_2$ proposes:

H$_2$:   *Donor demographics correlate with donation intentions towards support for the three charitable destinations.*

Trust

Trust can be considered at both a sector (where charity regulation breeds confidence: Hogg, 2018) and also at individual charity level. Bekkers (2003) notes that trust (often assessed through formal accreditations or testimonies) correlates significantly with giving. In their Dutch-US comparative study, Beldad, Snip and van Hoof (2014) identified that donor

affinity, cause reputation and donor trust combine to explain repeat donation behaviour. Similarly, Naskrent and Siebelt (2011) employed structural equation modelling to identify trust and commitment as the two strongest predictors of donor retention.

A cross-national study conducted by Nfp Synergy (2019) found that fewer people trust overseas aid charities than domestic causes, and this distinction was particularly acute in the UK (where only 36% trusted international causes). As trust levels have been found to be critical to future donation intentions (Charity Commission, 2018), this may explain the general preference for domestic causes demonstrated thus far. Collating the above arguments, hypothesis H_3 proposes:

H_3: *Levels of trust in local, national and international charities correlate positively with donation intention towards the three respective charitable destinations.*

Charitable Choice

Research focusing on which charities people choose to donate to remains limited (Wiepking, 2010). Good causes range from small-scale local charities through to global projects (Daly, 1997), however donors tend not to share their generosity equally across all causes (Strombach *et al*., 2014). UK donors display preferences for charities in the fields of medical research, animal welfare and children, whilst religious organisations are one of the most popular categories across North America (Charities Aid Foundation, 2017). Bennett (2003) has previously underlined the critical role of personal experience in charitable choice. The experiences of close family or friends may result in support for relevant causes (referred to as 'friends of victims' by Small & Simonsohn, 2007).

The current study uses 13 charitable categories that were adapted from typologies used by the Charities Aid Foundation (2014) and Mintel (2012). Whilst some categories align to local or national level interests (e.g. military and local development), others clearly have a more global reach (e.g. international disaster relief). It follows then that those charitable causes preferred by individuals will relate to their inclination to support local, national and international charities. Therefore, H_4 proposes:

H_4:   *Particular charitable choices have positive correlations with donation intentions towards the three respective charitable destinations.*

Donation Channel

An area under-assessed within charitable giving research is the preferred means of donation. Donors face numerous channels ranging from traditional cash donations through to direct debits, mobile giving and engagement with charity retail stores (Shier & Handy, 2012). In the UK, cash donations, donating to charity stores and buying raffle tickets are the most preferred channels, whereas online and mobile forms of giving are most common in North America (Charities Aid Foundation, 2017). Peloza and Hassay (2007) developed a typology of charity support behaviour that distinguished between high and low involvement forms of support. Citizenship behaviours such as volunteering represent highest involvement owing to the necessary time commitment, with donating to charity stores and buying raffle tickets being examples of lower involvement behaviours that also brought personal benefits to the donor.

Donation channel research tends to focus on one specific channel rather than investigating donor preferences across channels. For example, sponsorship of individuals to take part in charity events has become a notable growth area, with one-fifth of all Canadian charitable donations originating from event sponsorship (Higgins and Lauzon, 2003). Charity store donations are a common means of giving (e.g. Hibbert, Horne & Tagg, 2005). However, these are distinct from other channels as the donor arguably benefits from the act of either donating products (removing clutter) or buying from charity stores. Finally, the internet is a particularly attractive channel for charities because of its cost-effectiveness (Shier and Handy, 2012) and viral capability (as evidenced through successful campaigns such as the ALS Ice Bucket Challenge: Pressgrove, McKeever & Jang, 2018). Recent work from Herzog and Yang (2018) demonstrated that having contacts on social media who engage in pro-social actions (either giving to charity or asking others to do so) increases donation intention.

We argue here that the donation channels preferred by individuals will correlate to some extent with their destination preferences. Donation channels such as sponsoring a friend or buying raffles tickets involve either face-to-face contact or have focus in local community institutions (Schlegelmilch *et al.*, 1997), and as such are likely to associate with interest in causes that serve local beneficiaries. Digital forms of giving and direct debits are not constrained by the same geographic boundaries, are less likely to be utilised by smaller charities (Shier & Handy, 2012) and may correlate with more national and international level giving. Therefore, H$_5$ proposes:

H$_5$:   Particular donation channel access positively correlates with donation intentions towards the three respective charitable destinations.

Differences in variable sets displaying association with donation destination

There are certain variables that associate more strongly with enhancing international donation intention. These include trust, political beliefs and exposure through travel to developing countries. Certain demographic characteristics also correlate with international preferences (Bennett, 2003; Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009). Combining this evidence with the suite of variables examined in this study, hypothesis H_6 proposes:

H_6:   *The ranges of measures relating to donor demographics, trust, charitable choice and donation channel differ in their associations with donation intentions towards local, national and international charities.*

Method

Study Design

An online survey captured data on donor intention by charitable destination, trust perceptions, charitable choice and channels of charitable donation. The survey instrument first addressed various demographic variables (including age, gender, geographical location, education, income and voting behaviour). The instrument then utilised a battery of items addressing charitable giving, trust levels, preferred causes and donation channels, utilising a combination of 7-point scales and multiple-choice questions (Table 1). A pilot survey with 112 participants helped to refine the instrument.

[Please insert table 1 here]

Data collection took place between March-April 2017 utilising a consumer panel accessed through the market researcher Pickersgill Consultancy and Planning. Respondents were required to be aged 18 years and older and be resident in the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales). They were not required to be active donors as the study sought to generate a representative sample. According to the Charities Aid Foundation, 60% of the UK population donated money to charity in 2018, with a further 59% donating products and 35% sponsoring a charitable activity. Our approach allowed us to capture data from donors and non-donors, following the premise that fundraisers may be equally interested in the donation intentions of those who do not currently support charitable causes.

The sampling frame included individuals who have previously signed up to take part in online surveys via consumer panels deployed by Pickersgill Consultancy and Planning. Emailing consumer panel members achieved agreed quotas, with 1,141 responses received, 137 of which being rejected through incompletion, missing data or straight-lining (Johnson, 2016). To ensure respondents were considering items fully, a time check for completion was undertaken. The pilot survey indicated the average completion time was 6 to 7 minutes. To ensure data validity, we removed responses from individuals who completed the survey in under 5 minutes. In return for full survey completion, panel members receive points redeemable for shopping vouchers.

Data Analysis

Three separate assessments of the measures assessing local, national and international donation intention involved using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis. There are three respective statements to assess willingness to donate to these respective destinations. For example, "*I am likely to donate to a charity that helps my local community in the next month*", assesses local donation intention. For the three separate models, the dependent variable is the relevant 7-point individual Likert Scale.

The decision to utilise donation intention as the dependent variables in each multiple regression model reflected two considerations. Firstly, we were concerned with recall accuracy. Respondents indicated their aggregate donations to all charities across the previous three months; this longer time-period was utilised to minimise the effects of any seasonal fluctuations in donation patterns as identified by the Charities Aid Foundation (2018). The down side of such a timeline is difficulty for respondents in accurately recalling the exact

charities supported. We felt this was particularly acute for ad-hoc lower-involvement forms of

donation such as street collections. Secondly, if respondents could recollect the charities they

supported, we were concerned they may struggle to suitably categorise these as either local,

national or international in scope (in particular as national level charities often provide

services at a local level: Hall *et al*., 2013). Therefore, asking respondents to indicate future

intentions across these three categories, rather than relying on potentially erroneous historical

behaviour, appears a more robust approach to grouping future donations by destination.

There is a general acceptance of the value of donor intention as a predictor of actual donations

(Kashif *et al*., 2015), evidenced with financial donors in the UK (Smith & McSweeney,

2007), mainland Europe (Verhaert & Van den Poel, 2011) and blood donors in the US

(France, France & Himawan, 2007). Lee, Piliavin and Call (1999) had earlier demonstrated

that intention was a powerful predictor of future behaviours spanning the three major forms of

giving (money, time and blood).

For all three multiple regression models, the potential predictor variables consisted of trust,

charitable choice, donation channels and donor demographics. The first three variable groups

were measured on a 7-point scale from 1 = "*very unlikely*", through 4 = "*neither unlikely nor

unlikely*" to 7 = "*very likely*". Multiple-choice demographic questions were prepared for the

respective multiple regression models by converting them into appropriate (1, 0) dummy

variables. The respective numbers of dummy variables for each were gender (1), age (7),

geographical location in the UK (12), voting behaviour at the June 2016 European Union

referendum (4 – including did not vote and preferred not say), level of qualifications (9),

social-class by employment role (7), ethnicity (4) and annual income-band (9).

There are potentially 77 independent variables covering trust, charitable choice, donation channel and demographics presented in appropriate dummy variable form. To assist in developing a suite of parsimonious regression models and limiting the potential for multicollinearity, a stepwise process of variable selection was adopted. The forward method of stepwise was actioned starting with no independent variables, with sequential variable entry, and based on correlation with the dependent measure donation intention and partial correlation thereafter until further variable addition ceases to improve the module in a statistically significant way. The assessment of each model considers the overall model significance using the ANOVA test, model fit by adjusted R^2 and a residual analysis. For all three models, issues of multicollinearity involves examination of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each retained independent variable. Guided by Berenson, Levine and Krehbiel (2002) variables with a VIF exceeding 5 were removed,

Survey Findings

Sample Overview

The sample comprises 1004 UK respondents, demonstrating some resonance with the wider UK population (Table 2). In summary, 51.7% of respondents were female, 92.0% reported their ethnicity as white, with the most commonly read national newspapers being the Mail, the Sun and the Mirror. 51.2% voted to leave the European Union in the 2016 referendum. The breakdown by age band is 18-24 (8.6%), 25-34 (16.5%), 35-44 (16.7%), 45-54 (18.9%), 55-64 (15.6%), and 65 and over 23.6% (of which 3.4% of the total data set were aged 75 or older). Gender and age-band are representative of the wider population data (Office for National Statistics, 2017), as is referendum voting declaration. The profile based on ethnicity

represents an under-representation of participants from the black and minority ethnic groupings, whilst there is some over-representation of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland in the sample. Around half of the sample indicated earnings between £10,001-30,000 per annum, which is in line with wider economic data.

[Please insert table 1 here]

Over 80% of the sample reported donating to charity within three months of data collection, the majority of these supporting two or three charities. The most common donation amounts in the time-period were £11-20 (17.5%), £6-10 (14.2%), £1-5 (13.9%) and £21-30 (13.7%). The most common charitable causes supported by the sample were health, children's and animal causes. The most common forms of assisting charities were donating to / buying from charity stores, cash donations and sponsorship, aligning closely with CAF (2018) giving report.

Assessment of donor intentions

The means for donation intention to local, national and international concerns are 4.36, 4.58 and 3.61 respectively (Table 3). The first two statistics are significantly greater in value than the mid-point of 4.0, the converse being the case for the item assessing international donation intention (for each, $p < .001$). For the pairwise assessment of donation intention, significant differences between the pairs of donation destination were statistically significant (each $p < .001$). The strongest level of donation intention relates to country-level alternatives, followed by local charities, which in turn are significantly more likely to receive donations than international charities.

[Please insert table 3 here]

Regression Models by Donation Destination

Local Charities

The stepwise multiple regression model developed to explain local donation intention comprises 16 predictor variables being statistically significant in combination (Table 4).

[Please insert table 4 here]

There is a significant correlation for each of the predictor variable groups identified (trust, charitable choice, donation channels and donor demographics). The predictor variables indicate the multiple role of trust. This points to positive correlation with trust in local causes x_1 ($b = 0.26$, $t = 7.59$, $p < .001$), trust in national causes x_4 ($b = 0.21$, $t = 6.12$, $p < .001$), but a negative association with trust in international causes x_5 ($b = -0.11$, $t = -3.80$, $p < .001$). Trust developed for causes close to home has a positive association on local intentions compounded by a lack of trust for causes based more remotely.

Various charitable causes also contribute to local donation intention. These comprise local development charities x_2 ($b = 0.24$, $t = 7.76$, $p < .001$) and education training charities x_6 ($b = 0.16$, $t = 5.00$, $p < .001$). There is a negative correlation with each of health charities x_7 ($b = -0.10$, $t = -3.42$, $p = .001$), international disaster relief charities x_{10} ($b = -0.06$, $t = -2.19$, $p = .029$) and environmental charities x_{14} ($b = -0.06$, $t = -2.23$, $p = .026$). This shows some

intuitive resonance with commitment to local issues through local development and education, with a more negative perception of concerns further afield.

Channels of donation support local donation intention through buying raffle tickets x_3 (b = 0.11, t = 4.36, p < .001), donating items to charity x_9 (b = 0.09, t = 3.28, p = .001) and through employer salary deductions x_{11} (b = 0.07, t = 2.66, p = .008). Finally, demographics contribute to the prediction of local donation intention. Those resident in the West Midlands x_{12} (b = 0.42, t = 2.61, p = .009) and Wales x_{13} (b = 0.21, t = 2.29, p = .022), skilled employees x_{15} (b = 0.20, t = 2.20, p = .028) and those with uncertain job status x_{16} (b = 0.40, t = 2.12, p = .035) all correlate positively. The converse is true for those aged 55 to 64 years-old x_8 (b = -0.25, t = -2.47, p = .014).

The model is statistically significant ($F_{(16,987)}$ = 53.90, p < .001). The level of fit is moderate with an adjusted R^2 value of 45.8%, albeit based on a large data set. Further analysis of the model's residuals shows no departure from Normality, constant variance and randomness. Only 10 cases recorded high-value standardised residuals, outside of the range ±3 (< 1% of the sample). In terms of assessing multicollinearity, none of the 16 independent variables introduced into the multiple regression model have a VIF value above 5 (values range from 1.02 to 2.42 – Table 4), and are therefore retained within the model.

National Charities

The second model developed to explain national donation intention comprises nine predictor variables that are statistically significant in combination (Table 5). Consistent with local

donation intentions presented above, there is a role to play for each of trust, charitable choice, donation channels and donor demographics.

The multiple role of trust mirrors that presented in the explanation of local donation intention. There is a positive correlation with trust in national causes x_1 (b = 0.30, t = 8.72, p < .001), trust in local causes x_4 (b = 0.22, t = 6.74, p < .001), but a negative correlation with trust in international concerns x_6 (b = -0.15, t = -5.74, p < .001).

Various charitable causes also contribute positively to national donation intention. These include armed forces and emergency services charities x_3 (b = 0.09, t = 3.45, p = .001), education and training charities x_7 (b = 0.07, t = 2.80, p = .005) and health charities x_9 (b = 0.07, t = 2.47, p = .014), all of which appear nationally focussed. Two donation channels also correlate positively with increasing national donation intention, these are donating items to charity x_2 (b = 0.14, t = 5.63, p < .001) and direct debit x_5 (b = 0.08, t = 4.81, p < .001), the former again being a channel with potentially high levels of visibility in the donor's immediate locality.

In contrast, associations with demographics is limited, based only on respondents located in the West Midlands x_8 (b = 0.47, t = 2.98, p = .003).

The model for national donation intention is statistically significant ($F_{(9.994)}$ = 97.76, p < .001). Like the model for local intention, the level of fit is moderate with an adjusted R^2 value of 46.5%, with assessment of the model's residuals again showing no concerns around

Normality, constant variance and randomness, with nine cases recording high-value standardised residuals outside of the range ±3 (< 1% of the sample). Multicollinearity is of no concern, none of the nine independent variables have a VIF value above 5 (values range from 1.01 to 2.16 – Table 5).

International Charities

This final model comprises 13 predictor variables that are statistically significant in combination (Table 6). Trust, charitable choice, channels of donation and demographics again combine to correlate with attitudes towards international donation destination, although there is a more distinct suite of individual predictor variables identified here compared with the local and national alternatives.

[Please insert table 6 here]

The only dimension of trust acting as a significant correlate with international donation intention is that involving international causes x_2 (b = 0.31, t = 12.48, p < .001), with no significant association in either direction for trust in local or national equivalents. Charitable choice also has a greater combined role to play. In a positive sense, these comprise international charities x_1 (b = 0.16, t = 4.93, p < .001), international disaster relief charities x_3 (b = 0.23, t = 7.47, p < .001), religious charities x_6 (b = 0.09, t = 3.95, p < .001) and social services charities x_{11} (b = 0.08, t = 2.55, p = .011), three of which have an explicit international remit. There is a negative association involving armed forces and emergency services charities x_5 (b = -0.11, t = -4.76, p < .001), which have a much stronger national focus.

Donation channels make multiple contributions to explaining international donation intention. There is a positive correlation with salary deductions x_4 (b = 0.06, t = 2.43, p = .015), direct debit x_7 (b = 0.07, t = 3.68, p < .001) and donation via mobile text message x_{10} (b = 0.06, t = 2.82, p = .005). Contrasting is the negative association with the more immediate and face-to-face channel of sponsoring a friend or relative x_{12} (b = -0.05, t = -2.20, p = .028). In terms of personal characteristics, willingness to donate internationally correlates more positively with those donors earning in excess of £100,000 per year x_8 (b = 0.99, t = 3.27, p = .001). The opposite is true for Leave voters in the EU referendum x_9 (b = -0.20, t = -2.77, p = .006) and for those in the age range 75 years and above x_{13} (b = -0.39, t = -2.02, p = .044).

The model of international donation intention is statistically significant ($F_{(13,990)}$ = 138.25, p < .001). In comparison with the previous two models, the level of fit is better with an adjusted R^2 value of 64.0%, with no concerns around Normality, constant variance and randomness emerging from the residual analysis, with eight cases recording high-value standardised residuals, outside of the range ±3 (similar to models 1 and 2). Multicollinearity is again unproblematic, the VIF values for the 13 independent variables range from 1.02 to 3.22 (Table 6), leading to variable retention.

Discussion

The relative preference for national causes mirrors prior work in this setting (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009) and supports hypothesis H_1. The additional contribution made here is the delineation between national and local alternatives, with respondents seemingly more positive

towards donating to national level causes (which we acknowledge may also provide services on a local level).

The association between donor demographics on willingness to donate to the three distinct destinations is limited. The lack of gender association has some support in the literature (Einholf, 2011; Lwin *et al*., 2014; Knowles & Sullivan, 2017), although the absence of qualification contrasts with previous research (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a; Neumayr & Handy, 2019). Those with higher incomes displayed higher donation intention for international causes, which contradicts recent work from Neumayr and Handy (2019) who instead concluded that income was positively associated with domestic giving. As indicated by existing literature (e.g. Chapman, Louis & Massey, 2018), older respondents and donors with more right-wing political views appear less likely to support international causes. With these limited associations identified, there is only partial support for hypothesis H_2.

Donor trust in both local and domestic causes correlates positively with donation intentions towards local and national charities, with donors reporting lower levels of trust in international alternatives. Willingness to donate internationally correlates positively with trust in international causes. Therefore, one or more of the assessments of trust is significantly associated with intention for each donation destination, supporting hypothesis H_3. The positive role of trust accords with various previous studies (Bekkers, 2003; Naskrent & Siebelt, 2011).

Charity choice is associated with donation destination in an intuitive manner. Local donation willingness correlates with increased likelihood to donate to local development charities;

nationally donation willingness associates positively with greater attachment to armed forces and emergency services charities, whilst international donation intention increases with support for international disaster relief and religious charities. Whilst many of the associations are arguably unsurprising, the data clearly demonstrates that the role of charity choice correlates positively with donation intention across all three destinations, supporting hypothesis H_4.

Donation intention by destination also associates with preferred channels of donation. Donating items to a charity store and buying raffle tickets from family or friends have a positive correlation with donating to local charities. For national charities, donating items has a role, as does the opportunity to set up a direct debit. This visibility also correlates with willingness to donate to international concerns, with salary deductions, direct debit and donation via mobile device all having a positive marginal association. With the various donation channels offering significant associations across the three destinations, this supports hypothesis H_5.

The willingness to donate to local and national charities share various common significant associations across the variable sets considered. Willingness to donate to both destinations correlates positively with trust in both local and national concerns wisely, but for both, they are less likely to trust international alternatives. Like all destinations, the donation is independent of gender, donor qualifications or ethnicity. In this study, it is worth remembering that 92% of the study participants belong to a single ethnic group (a clear sampling limitation), offering no opportunity to differences by ethnic groups.

A distinct set of variables correlate significantly with willingness to donate to international charities. Whilst trust locally and nationally play no significant part, willingness to donate outside the UK correlates significantly with trust in international charities to use the donations wisely. Those supporting international disaster relief, social services and religious charities are more likely to donate internationally, with the same individuals less likely to support armed forces and emergency charities. These donors are more likely to favour the technological/banking channels of donation and exhibit distinct demographics relating to higher income, being anti-Brexit and being relatively younger. Combining these findings, there is evidence to conclude that the suite of variables differ according to donation destination, thereby supporting hypothesis H_6. Table 7 summarises the similarities and differences between the variables that correlate significantly with donation willingness by destination.

[Please insert table 7 here]

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

Donation destination intention appears only marginally associated with donor demographics, with gender, ethnicity and qualifications playing no part whatsoever. Age and social class (defined by income and employment category) play some role, with the younger and more affluent tending to be more international in their donation focus. Such findings suggest that charities may wish to limit their dependence on classic demographic data as a means of identifying potential donors. Voting behaviour in the European Union membership referendum suggests that political voting data may provide a useful alternative means of targeting potential donors. The accessibility of charities to donors' voting behaviours and

record is unlikely, but there are indirect means to targeting (or avoiding) potential donors based on such measures, e.g. through specific newspapers or targeting certain geographical regions).

Respondents appear loosely segmented into two groups; those willing to support local or national level causes and those with a predisposition towards international concerns. This aligns with the principles of SIT, whereby individuals possess an inherent desire to minimise inequality between group members and will subsequently support charitable (i.e. domestic) causes that enable this. Previous research has indicated that out-groups are typically less trusted (Tanis & Postmes, 2005) which aligns with the trust levels reported for international charities in this study. SIT recognises the role of power and status in intergroup relations and suggests that members of a group with greater power will act to maintain the status quo (Fielding et al., 2008).

Education and training causes appear to resonate locally, in contrast to environmental causes and international disaster relief. Nationally, education and training have a positive role, as do initiatives focusing on the armed forces and emergency services. Those who report intention to support international causes typically identify preferences for disaster relief, social services and religious causes (but also national options relating to social services). In summary, a donor's preference for donation destination correlates significantly with the type of charitable causes they opt to support. The findings suggest that donation channels may be associated with donation preferences. Face-to-face channels tend to appeal more to those respondents favouring local and national level causes, whilst more remote forms of giving such as mobile applications relate more to international charities.

The role played by trust is central to donation intention across all destinations. Both local and national charities can leverage higher levels of public trust in their future fundraising efforts and may benefit from the fact that many people hold a more cynical view towards international charities. Conversely, those individuals with higher trust in international causes are in turn more likely to support them independent of whether they trust local or national charities.

Limitations and Future Research

Whilst we are content that the sample is broadly representative of the UK population for particular measures, this study group may not reflect donor preferences in other parts of the world. More comparative research across nations (particularly those characterised by varying levels of nationalistic and patriotic tendencies) would facilitate a more global picture of preferred donation destination. ne specific sampling limitation identified was the representation of donors from black and minority ethnic groups (8.0% of the sample presented compared with 14.0% of the UK population, Office for National Statistics, 2017). Given the increased mobility of various populations there exists a need to understand the giving patterns of migrant populations and their attitudes to supporting causes based in their home and host countries.

Notwithstanding our prior justification of basing our multiple regression models on future donation intentions, we acknowledge that collecting data on past giving patterns would add further nuance to the research area. In this study, our rationale for opting for intentions accounted for accurate recall and categorisation of donations by respondents over a three-month period. Future work may wish to address this issue by capturing intentions and

behaviours via a more longitudinal format. Research which builds upon Fajardo, Townsend and Bolander's (2018) work, which calls for a distinction between charitable choice and amount donated, also appears worthwhile given previous assertions that international charities receive fewer but higher value donations (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009). It would also be beneficial to add context to the findings through qualitative work, particularly amongst those predisposed to local and national concerns who self-report greater nationalistic tendencies. Such research may add further insights from those who support domestic over international causes and will aid fundraisers in producing appropriate campaign messaging.

The key message emerging from this study is that an individual's intention to support local, national and international causes is significantly associated with a range of issues spanning trust, charitable type and donation channel. The finding that demographic variables largely fail to correlate with preferred destination donations highlights the need for further work to help fundraisers truly understand how donors feel about charitable causes in different parts of the world.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *50*(2), 179-211.

Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, Accreditation and Philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 596-615.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764003258102

Bekkers, R. (2010). Who gives what and when? A scenario study of intentions to give time and money. *Social Science Research*, 39(3), 369-381.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.08.008

Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2011a). A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927

Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2011b). Who Gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part One: Religion, education, age and socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365.
https://doi.org/10.1332/204080511X6087712

Beldad, A., Snip, B. & van Hoof, J. (2014). Generosity the Second Time Around: Determinants of Individuals' Repeat Donation Intention. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(1), 144-163.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012457466

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 12-29.

https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.198

Berenson, M.L., Levine, D.M. & Krehbiel, T.C. (2002). *Basic Business Statistics. Concepts and Applications*. 8th Edition, Prentice Hall International Editions.

Breeze, B. (2013). How donors choose charities: The role of personal taste and experiences in giving decisions. *Voluntary Sector Review*, *4*(2), 165-183.

https://doi.org/10.1332/204080513X667792

Casale, D. & Baumann, A. (2015). Who gives to international causes? A sociodemographic analysis of US donors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(1), 98-122.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013507141

Chapman, C. M., Louis, W. R., & Masser, B. M. (2018). Identifying (our) donors: Toward a social psychological understanding of charity selection in Australia. *Psychology & marketing*, *35*(12), 980-989.

Charities Aid Foundation (2014). *UK Giving 2014*. Available at:

https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/personal-

giving/caf_ukgiving2015_1891a_web_230516.pdf (Accessed: 23 February 2017).

Charities Aid Foundation (2017). *Charitable Giving in the USA 2017*. Available at:

https://www.cafonline.org/about-us/publications/2017-publications/charitable-giving-in-the-

usa-2017 (Accessed: 15 October 2017).

Charity Commission (2016). *Recent charity register statistics*. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/charity-register-statistics/recent-charity-

register-statistics-charity-commission (Accessed: 23 February 2017).

Charity Commission (2018). Trust in Charities 2018. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/trust-in-charities-2018

(Accessed 12 March, 2019).

Chatzisarantis, N.L., Hagger, M.S., Wang, C.J., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). The

effects of social identity and perceived autonomy support on health behaviour within the

theory of planned behaviour. *Current Psychology*, 28(1), 55-68.

Dalton, S., Madden, H., Chamberlain, S., Carr, S. & Lyons, C. (2008). 'It's gotten a bit old,

Charity': Young Adults in New Zealand talk about poverty, charitable giving and aid appeals.

Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 18(5), 492-504.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.966

Daly, G. (1997). "Charity begins at home: A cross-national view of the voluntary sector in Britain, Canada, and the United States." *International critical perspectives on homelessness*: 168-184.

Ein-Gar, D. & Levontin, L. (2013). Giving from a distance: Putting the charitable organization at the center of the donation appeal. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *23*(2), 197-211.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2012.09.002

Einholf, C.J. (2011). Gender Differences in the Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6), 1092-1112.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010385949

Erlandsson, A., Nilsson, A., Tinghög, G., Andersson, D., & Västfjäll, D. (2019). Donations to Outgroup Charities, but Not Ingroup Charities, Predict Helping Intentions Toward Street-Beggars in Sweden. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *48*(4), 814-838.

Fajardo, T. M., Townsend, C., & Bolander, W. (2018). Toward an optimal donation solicitation: Evidence from the field of the differential influence of donor-related and organization-related information on donation choice and amount. *Journal of Marketing*, *82*(2), 142-152.

Fielding, K.S., Terry, D.J., Masser, B.M., & Hogg, M.A. (2008). Integrating social identity theory and the theory of planned behaviour to explain decisions to engage in sustainable agricultural practices. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 23-48.

France, J.L., France, C.R., & Himawan, L.K. (2007). A path analysis of intention to redonate among experienced blood donors: an extension of the theory of planned behavior. *Transfusion*, *47*(6), 1006-1013.

Grau, S.L. & Folse, J.A.G. (2007). Cause-related marketing (CRM): The influence of donation proximity and message-framing cues on the less-involved consumer. *Journal of Advertising*, 36(4), 19-33.
https://doi.org/10.2753/joa0091-3367360402

Hall, D., Jones, S.C., Andrews, K. & Cridland, L. (2013). Community perceptions of and suggested fundraising strategies for local charities. In R. Brodie (Ed.), *ANZMAC 2013 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1-7). New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Hart, D.J. (2016). Charity begins at home? Setting a future research agenda for national identity and charitable ethnocentrism. *Social Business*, 6(2), 125-151.
https://doi.org/10.1362/204440816x14715138381621

Herzog, P. S., & Yang, S. (2018). Social networks and charitable giving: Trusting, doing, asking, and alter primacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *47*(2), 376-394.

Hibbert, S. A., Horne, S. & Tagg, S. (2005). Charity retailers in competition for merchandise: Examining how consumers dispose of used goods. *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(6), 819-828.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.09.011

Higgins, J.W. & Lauzon, L. (2003). Finding the funds in fun runs: Exploring physical activity

events as fundraising tools in the nonprofit sector. *International Journal of Nonprofit and*

Voluntary Sector Marketing, *8*(4), 363-377.

https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.226

Hogg, E. (2018). What regulation, who pays? Public attitudes to charity regulation in England

and Wales. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *47*(1), 72-88.

Hogg, M. A. (2006). Social identity theory. *Contemporary social psychological theories*, 13,

111-1369.

Johnson, J.S. (2016). Improving online panel data usage in sales research. *Journal of Personal*

Selling & Sales Management, *36*(1), 74-85.

Kashif, M., Sarifuddin, S. & Hassan, A. (2015). Charity donation: intentions and behaviour.

Market Intelligence & Planning, 33(1), 90-102.

https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-07-2013-0110

Kessler, J. B., & Milkman, K. L. (2018). Identity in charitable giving. *Management*

Science, *64*(2), 845-859.

Knowles, S. & Sullivan, T. (2017). Does Charity Begin at Home or Overseas*? Nonprofit and*

Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 46(5), 944-962.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764017703710

Lee, L., Piliavin, J.A., & Call, V.R. (1999). Giving time, money, and blood: Similarities and differences. *Social psychology quarterly*, 276-290.

Lwin, M., Phau, I. & Lim, A. (2014). An Investigation of the Characteristics of Australian Charitable Donors. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 26:4, 372-389. https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2014.965074

Manesi, Z., Van Lange, P. A., Van Doesum, N. J., & Pollet, T. V. (2019). What are the most powerful predictors of charitable giving to victims of typhoon Haiyan: Prosocial traits, socio-demographic variables, or eye cues?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *146*, 217-225.

Micklewright, J. & Schnepf, S.V. (2009). Who Gives Charitable Donations for Overseas Development? *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(2), 317-341. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279408002869

Mintel (2012). *Charitable Giving Report*. Available at: http://academic.mintel.com/display/622630/ (Accessed: 15 September 2016).

Naskrent, J. & Siebelt, P. (2011). The Influence of Commitment, Trust, Satisfaction, and Involvement on Donor Retention. *Voluntas*, 22, 757-778. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-010-9177-x

Neumayr, M., & Handy, F. (2019). Charitable giving: What influences donors' choice among different causes?. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *30*(4), 783-799.

Nfp Synergy (2019) Fundraising around the World. Available at: https://nfpsynergy.net/free-report/charity-fundraising-around-the-world#downloads (Accessed: 12 March 2019).

Office for National Statistics (2017). Overview of the UK Population. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/articles/overviewoftheukpopulation/july2017.

O'Hara, M. (2014). *Austerity Bites: A Journey to the sharp end of cuts in the UK*. Policy Press, Bristol.
https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt13x0q6t

Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Vesterlund, L. & Xie, H. (2017). Why do people give? Testing pure and impure altruism. *American Economic Review*, *107*(11), 3617-3633.
https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20141222

Peloza, J. & Hassay, D. N. (2007). A typology of charity support behaviors: Toward a holistic view of helping. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *17*(1-2), 135-151.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J054v17n01_07

Piper, G. & Schnepf, S.V. (2008). Gender Differences in Charitable Giving in Great Britain. *Voluntas*, 19, 103-124.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-008-9057-9

Pressgrove, G., McKeever, B.W. & Jang, S.M. (2018). What is Contagious? Exploring why content goes viral on Twitter: A case study of the ALS Ice Bucket Challenge. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1586

Rajan, S.S., Pink, G.H. & Dow, W.H. (2009). Sociodemographic and personality characteristics of Canadian donors contributing to international charity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(3), 413-440. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764008316056

Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A, & Diamantopoulos, A. (1997). Responses to different charity appeals: the impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations. *European Journal of Marketing*, *31*(8), 548-560. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569710176574

Shier, M. L. & Handy, F. (2012). Understanding online donor behavior: the role of donor characteristics, perceptions of the internet, website and program, and influence from social networks. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *17*(3), 219-230. https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1425

Small, D.A., & Simonsohn, U. (2007). Friends of victims: Personal experience and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *35*(3), 532-542.

Smith, J.R., & McSweeney, A. (2007). Charitable giving: The effectiveness of a revised theory of planned behavior model in predicting donating intentions and behavior. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 363-386.

Stevenson, C. & Manning, R. (2010). National Identity and International Giving: Irish Adults' Accounts of Charitable Behaviour. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 20(4), 249-261.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.1029

Strombach, T., Jin, J., Weber, B., Kenning, P., Shen, Q., Ma, Q. & Kalenscher, T. (2014). Charity begins at home: Cultural differences in social discounting and generosity. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 27(3), 235-245.
https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1802

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, 13(2), 65-93.

Tanis, M., & Postmes, T. (2005). A social identity approach to trust: Interpersonal perception, group membership and trusting behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(3), 413-424.

Terry, D.J., Hogg, M.A., & White, K.M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British journal of social psychology*, 38(3), 225-244.

Varadarajan, P.R. & Menon, A. (1988). Cause-related marketing: A coalignment of marketing strategy and corporate philanthropy. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58-74. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251450

Verhaert, G.A., & Van den Poel, D. (2011). Empathy as added value in predicting donation behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *64*(12), 1288-1295.

Warburton, J., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Volunteer decision making by older people: A test of a revised theory of planned behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *22*(3), 245-257.

Wiepking, P. (2010). Democrats support international relief and the upper class donates to art? How opportunity, incentives and confidence affect donations to different types of charitable organizations. *Social Science Research*, 39, 1073-1087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.06.005

Table 1: Scales and multiple-choice questions adopted in the study

DONATION INTENTION
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps my local community in the next month
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps causes in my country in the next month
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps other countries in the next month
CHARITABLE CHOICE
Culture and Recreation charities (e.g. The National Trust, Sports Aid)
Education and training charities (e.g. any school charity, Duke of Edinburgh's Award)
Health charities (e.g. British Heart Foundation, Alzheimer's Society)
Social Services charities (e.g. Shelter, Trussell Trust Foodbanks, Samaritans)
Environmental charities (e.g. Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth)
Animal Welfare charities (e.g. RSPCA, World Wildlife Foundation)
Armed Forces and Emergency Services charities (e.g. Help for Heroes, St. John's Ambulance)
Religious charities (i.e. any religious institution)
Political, Legal or Human Rights charities (e.g. Legal Action Group, Amnesty International)
International charities (e.g. UNICEF, Oxfam)
Local development charities (i.e. community projects)
Children's charities (e.g. NSPCC, Barnardo's)
International Disaster relief charities (e.g. Disaster Emergency Committee Earthquake appeal)
CHARITY DONATION CHANNEL
Direct Debit
Cash donation (e.g. street collection, collection box)
Donation via mobile text message / online
Sponsoring a friend / relative in an event
Buying items from a charity store
Salary deductions via employer
Buying raffle tickets / entering competitions
Donating items to charity (e.g. clothing)

ASPECTS OF TRUST IN DONATION DESTINATION
I trust local charities to use my donation wisely
I trust national charities (that serve the United Kingdom) to use my donation wisely
I trust international charities to use my donation wisely
DEMOGRAPHICS
Gender – Female, Male
Age Band – 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+
Geographic Location in the UK – East Midlands, East of England, London, North East England, North West England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, South East England, South West England, Wales, West Midlands, Yorkshire and Humberside
Voting behaviour in the EU referendum – Remain, Leave, Did not vote, Preferred not to say
Level of qualifications – None, O Levels (and equivalents), A Level (and equivalents), NVQ Level 2 (and equivalents), NVQ Level 4 (and equivalents), Bachelor Degree, Higher Degree(s), Qualifications from outside of the UK
Social class by employment role – Professional, Middle Management, Junior Management, Skilled manual workers, Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers, Unemployed, Not sure.
Ethnicity – White, Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups, Asian/Asian British, Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
Annual Income Band – Under £10k, £10-20K, £20-30K, £30-40K, £40-50K, £50-75K, £75-100K, over £100K, Prefer not to say

Table 2: Sample comparison with the UK population

Characteristic	No. respondents	% respondents	UK Population	t-value	Level of Significance
Sample Size	1004				
Gender					
Males	485	48.3%	49.3%	-0.63	.526
Females	519	51.7%	50.7%	0.63	.526
Age-Group					
18-24	86	8.6%	8.3%	0.35	.730
25-34	166	16.5%	17.7%	-1.00	.319
35-44	168	16.7%	16.5%	0.17	.864
45-54	190	18.9%	18.3%	0.49	.623
55-64	157	15.6%	15.4%	0.18	.861
65 and over	237	23.6%	23.7%	-0.08	.941
Ethnicity					
White	924	92.0%	86.0%	5.48	<.001
BME groups	80	8.0%	14.0%	-5.48	<.001
UK Country of Residence					
England	500	49.8%	84.2%	-29.88	<.001
Northern Ireland	101	10.1%	2.8%	14.02	<.001
Scotland	200	19.9%	8.2%	13.51	<.001
Wales	203	20.2%	4.7%	23.21	<.001
Vote - EU Referendum					
Remain	500	49.8%	49.2%	0.38	.704
Leave	514	51.2%	51.8%	-0.38	.704
Intention to					

Donate					
Yes	809	80.6%	89.0%	-8.501	<.001

Table 3: Donation intention for local, national and international charities – percentage of responses and summary statistics

	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Somewhat Unlikely (3)	Neither Unlikely nor Likely (4)	Somewhat Likely (5)	Likely (6)	Very Likely (7)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Difference in mean from 4.0
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps my local community in the next month	9.0%	14.1%	18.2%	39.6%	7.6%	4.2%	7.3%	4.36	1.53	†††
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps causes in my country in the next month	11.4%	16.8%	20.3%	36.6%	5.7%	3.2%	6.1%	4.58	1.52	†††
I am likely to donate to a charity that helps other countries in the next month	6.9%	8.5%	10.6%	35.5%	9.9%	8.9%	19.9%	3.61	1.78	‡‡‡

Mean - significantly lower than 4.0 -‡ - 5% level, ‡‡ - 1% level, ‡‡‡ - 0.1% level

Mean - significantly greater than 4.0, - † - 5% level, †† - 1% level, ††† - 0.1% level

Table 4: Multiple regression model: Local Donation Intention

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	VIF
Trust local charities to use donations wisely	0.26	7.59	<.001	1.98
Donate to local development charities	0.24	7.76	<.001	2.34
Buy raffle tickets/enter competitions	0.11	4.36	<.001	1.87
Trust national charities to use donations wisely	0.21	6.12	<.001	2.09
Trust International charities to use donations wisely	-0.11	-3.80	<.001	1.91
Donate to education and training charities	0.16	5.00	<.001	2.42
Donate to health charities	-0.10	-3.42	<.001	2.16
55 to 64 years-old (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	-0.25	-2.47	<.014	1.04
Donating items to charity	0.09	3.28	<.001	2.10
Donate to International Disaster relief charities	-0.06	-2.19	<.029	2.32
Salary deductions via employer	0.07	2.66	<.008	1.50
West Midlands (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.42	2.61	<.009	1.03
Wales (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.21	2.29	<.022	1.03
Donate to environmental charities	-0.06	-2.23	<.026	2.02
Skilled Manual Workers and Equivalent (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.20	2.20	<.028	1.04
Uncertain about employment status (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.40	2.12	<.035	1.02

$F_{(16,987)} = 53.90$, p < .001. Adjusted R^2 = 45.8%, Standard Error of the Estimate = 1.12

Y = willingness to donate to local causes

x_1 = Trust local charities to use donations wisely

x_2 = Donate to local development charities

x_3 = Buy raffle tickets/enter competitions

x_4 = Trust national charities to use donations wisely

x_5 = Trust international charities to use donations wisely

x_6 = Donate to education and training charities

x_7 = Donate to health charities

x_8 = 55 to 64 years-old (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

x_9 = Donating items to charity

x_{10} = Donate to International Disaster relief charities

x_{11} = Salary deductions via employer

x_{12} = West Midlands (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

x_{13} = Wales (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

x_{14} = Donate to environmental charities

x_{15} = Skilled manual workers and equivalent (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

x_{16} = Uncertain about employment status (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

Table 5: Multiple regression model: National Donation Intention

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	VIF
Trust national charities to use donations wisely	0.30	8.72	<.001	2.09
Donating items to charity	0.14	5.63	<.001	1.62
Donate to armed forces and emergency services charities	0.09	3.45	<.001	1.80
Trust local charities to use donations wisely	0.22	6.74	<.001	1.91
Donate using direct debit	0.08	4.81	<.001	1.19
Trust international charities to use donations wisely	-0.15	-5.74	<.001	1.57
Donate to education and training charities	0.07	2.80	<.005	1.78
West Midlands (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.47	2.98	<.003	1.01
Donate to health charities	0.07	2.47	<.014	2.16

$F_{(9,994)} = 97.76$, $p < .001$. Adjusted $R^2 = 46.5\%$, Standard Error of the Estimate = 1.11

Y = willingness to donate to national causes

x_1 = Trust national charities to use donations wisely

x_2 = Donating items to charity

x_3 = Donate to armed forces and emergency services charities

x_4 = Trust local charities to use donations wisely

x_5 = Donate using direct debit

x_6 = Trust international charities to use donations wisely

x_7 = Donate to education and training charities

x_8 = West Midlands (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

x_9 = Donate to health charities x_{16} = Uncertain about employment status (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

Table 6: Multiple regression model: International Donation Intention

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	VIF
Donate to international charities	0.16	4.93	<.001	3.22
Trust international charities to use donations wisely	0.31	12.48	<.001	1.63
Donate to International Disaster Relief charities	0.23	7.47	<.001	3.09
Salary deductions via employer	0.06	2.43	<.015	1.78
Donate to armed forces and emergency services charities	-0.11	-4/76	<.001	1.66
Donate to religious charities	0.09	3.95	<.001	1.70
Donate using direct debit	0.07	3.68	<.001	1.40
Annual income of £100,001+ (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	0.99	3.27	<.001	1.02
Vote Leave in the EU referendum (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	-0.20	-2.77	<.006	1.15
Donate via mobile text message/online	0.06	2.82	<.005	1.73
Donate to social services charities	0.08	2.55	<.011	2.46
Sponsoring a friend/relative in an event	-0.05	-2.20	<.028	1.47
Aged 75+ years-old (1 = Yes, 0 = No)	-0.39	-2.02	<0.44	1.06

$F_{(13,990)} = 138.25$, $p < .001$. **Adjusted R^2 = 64.0%, Standard Error of the Estimate = 1.07**

Y = willingness to donate to international causes

x_1 **= Donate to international charities**

x_2 **= Trust international charities to use donations wisely**

x_3 **= Donate to International Disaster relief charities**

x_4 **= Salary deductions via employer**

x_5 **= Donate to armed forces and emergency services charities**

x_6 **= Donate to religious charities**

x_7 **= Donate using direct debit**

x_8 = **Annual income of £100,001+ (1 = Yes, 0 = No)**

x_9 = **Vote Leave in the EU referendum (1 = Yes, 0 = No)**

x_{10} = **Donate via mobile text message/online**

x_{11} = **Donate to social services charities**

x_{12} = **Sponsoring a friend/relative in an event**

x_{13} = **Aged 75+ years-old (1 = Yes, 0 = No)**

Table 7: Difference in explanatory variables for Donation Intention by Destination

Variable sets	Local Donation	National Donation	International Donation
Trust	Positive correlation with trust in local and national charities, but negative correlation with international ones	Positive correlation with trust in local and national charities, but negative correlation with international ones	Positive correlation with trust in international charities
Charitable Choice	Positive correlation with local development charities and education, but negative association with health, environment and international disaster concerns	Positive correlation with armed forces and emergency services, education and health charities	Positive correlation with international, international disaster relief, religious charities, and social services charities, but negative association with armed forces and emergency services
Charity Donation Channel	Positive association with each of buying raffle tickets, donating items to charity and salary deductions	Positive association with donating items to charity and via direct debit	Salary deductions, direct debit and donation via mobile device each have a positive association, but sponsoring a friend/relative a negative one
Demographics	Donors located in the West Midlands and Wales, skilled workers and those of uncertain job status show a positive	Donors located in the West Midlands are more likely to donate	Donors earning over £100k per year show a positive association, but there is a negative association with voters of

	association, but there is	Leave in the EU
	negative association with	referendum and being 75
	55-64 year-olds	years-old or more
Demographics – no	Gender, qualifications and ethnicity	
significant association		