



## VALUE & IMPACT STUDY

## SUPPLEMENTARY RESEARCH

### Additional Insights on Donors, Ticket-Buyers & Audiences

Commissioned by Major University Presenters with funding support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

WolfBrown  
808A Oak St., San Francisco, CA 94117  
(415) 796-3060  
[www.wolfbrown.com](http://www.wolfbrown.com)

## Research Background

In 2004, fourteen members of the Major University Presenters (MUP) consortium - without foundation support - commissioned WolfBrown to conduct a two-year study of the values and motivations driving performing arts attendance and donation. The findings of *The Value & Impact Study* are available in three public reports, which are available for free download at [www.wolfbrown.com/mup](http://www.wolfbrown.com/mup):

- *Assessing the Intrinsic Impacts of Live Performance*
- *A Segmentation Model for Performing Arts Ticket Buyers*
- *A Segmentation Model for Donors to 12 University Presenting Programs*
- *Value & Impact Study Supplemental Research: Additional Insights on Donors, Ticket-Buyers & Audiences*

While the study concluded in 2007, much knowledge remained to be harvested from the substantial data sets that the study produced. Recognizing the opportunity, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation funded a \$50,000 proposal from the MUP consortium to extend the value of the study's two major datasets by commissioning 10 focused research papers.

WolfBrown oversaw a competitive selection process starting in October 2007 and welcomed proposals from faculty, research staff and students from all colleges and universities, and all disciplines. The proposals were evaluated based on the significance and relevance of their topic and research questions, the extent to which the research was likely to yield practical applications for the study partners – particularly in the areas of marketing and fundraising, and overall quality and rigor of the proposal.

The funded proposals went to both faculty members and graduate students; five proposals had faculty members serving as the principal investigator (PI), and five had graduate students as PI. The funded researchers represent a broad range of academic departments – public policy; sociology, tourism, recreation and sports management; arts administration; marketing; and business – and a variety of universities.

On behalf of the MUP consortium, we extend our appreciation to the Mellon Foundation for their foresight in allowing *The Value & Impact Study* to pay additional dividends. We encourage other researchers who would like to examine the original data files to be in touch with us, in the spirit of learning.

Sincerely,



Alan S. Brown, Principal



Jennifer L. Novak, Consultant

# Overview of Papers

The supported research papers fall into three general topics: Donors, Ticket-buyers & Demand, and Impact. In addition, three papers cover special areas of interest: the relationship between Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences and ticket-buying, the affect of pre-performance enhancement events on impact, and the relationship between political views and both donation and ticket-buying behavior. Below are brief summaries of each paper, which are followed by more detailed abstracts, organized by general topic.

## Donors

1. **The Influence of Marketing Messages and Benefits Received On Attributions of Donation Behavior to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations** - *Jennifer Wiggins Johnson & Bret Ellis*. This paper seeks to better understand what influenced the degree to which donors perceive extrinsic benefits as the motivations for giving.
2. **Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits** - *May Kim, Yong JaeKo & Heather Gibson*. This paper provides a review of theoretical frameworks that guide current perspectives on donor motivation.

## Ticket-Buyers & Demand

3. **Preferences and Purchase Behavior: Survey Evidence on the Relationship between Stated Interested in the Performing Arts and Ticket Purchase History** - *Sarah Lee*. This paper examines the relationship between individuals' stated preferences for performances and their actual history of ticket-buying.
4. **Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences** - *Tanya Koropecjy-Cox, Charles Gattone, William Jawde, & Deeb-Paul Kitchen*. This paper offers broader sociological perspective to the understanding of audience values and preferences, by considering the larger community contexts of the presenter-audience relationship.
5. **Anticipation: Exploring its Origins and Effects on the Live Arts Experience** - *Jara Kern*. This paper examines the causal factors and relationships underlying high levels of anticipation for performing arts programs.

## Impact

6. **How We Feel About Art: Motivation, Satisfaction, and Emotional Experience in Performing Arts Audiences** - *Shelly Gilbride & David Orzechowicz*. This paper explores performing arts audiences' self-reported emotional experiences and how they relate to reasons for attending, expectations for, and satisfaction levels with a performance.
7. **Social Influences on Intrinsic Impacts of Performance** - *Trina Rose*. This paper examines the relationships between social and emotional factors and attendance, subscription and post-performance impact.

**Special Interest Topics**

8. **Analysis of Multiple Intelligences in Understanding the Relationships between Ticket Buyers and Their Participation in Performing Arts Programs** - *Mark Creekmore & Sarah Rush*. This paper examines the validity of using the Values & Impact data to study Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences and investigates relationship between intelligences and preferences for types of performances.
  
9. **Characterizing Program Enhancement Events** - *Yael Zipporah Silk & Jordan Raphael Fischbach*. This paper profiles the enhancement event audience base, examines the impact of enhancement events on patrons who self-select to attend, and identifies characteristics that are predictive of pre- or post-performance event preferences.
  
10. **How Beliefs Matter: Views, Motives and their Relation to Buyer and Donor Behavior** - *Ximena Varela*. This paper investigates audiences political beliefs and explores the relationship between political views and both ticket-buyer and donor behavior.

# Abstracts

## Donors

### **1. The Influence of Marketing Messages and Benefits Received On Attributions of Donation Behavior to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations**

*Jennifer Wiggins Johnson & Bret Ellis*

Wiggins Johnson and Ellis examine the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of donors to performing arts organizations using the data from the 1,771 donor respondents from the *Value Study* conducted in October 2006. The authors use the twenty items measuring different motivations to donate from these respondents, along with information on their donations from 2003-2006 and their relationships with the presenters to which they had donated. This paper seeks to better understand what influenced the degree to which respondents would perceive extrinsic benefits as the motivations for their donations. Additional data on the communications messages that respondents were likely to experience and the benefits that they were likely to receive in exchange for their donations is used to establish that the messages and benefits that donors receive can influence their attributions of their donation behavior to intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. This suggests that organizations can deliberately or inadvertently influence donor motivations through their communications.

### **2. Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits**

*May Kim, Yong Jae Ko & Heather Gibson*

In this paper, the authors offer a review of theoretical frameworks that guide current perspectives on donor motivation and its influence on donor amount or donor benefits. Using this review to structure their analyses, the authors explore donor motivations, the influence of gender and age on donor motivations, the relationship between donor motivations and donor behavior, and the relationship between donor motivations and donor benefits.

In addition, these authors wrote a second paper utilizing the Value & Impact Study data entitled *An examination of factors that influence donor behavior: The case of University art museums in the US*, and is available upon request.

## Ticket-Buyers & Demand

### **3. Preferences and Purchase Behavior: Survey Evidence on the Relationship between Stated Interested in the Performing Arts and Ticket Purchase History**

*Sarah Lee*

In this paper, Lee uses the Major University Presenters' *Value Study* dataset to examine the relationship between individuals' stated preferences for performances across a variety of performance types and their actual history of purchasing tickets to performances of those

same types. The author finds that there is a substantial proportion of the arts-going population who exhibit strong preferences for various types of performances, but whose ticket purchase behavior alone would not reveal those preferences (“high-demand non-purchasers”). Lee then develops a profile of high-demand non-purchasers in each performance type, focusing on the differences between high-demand non-purchasers and purchasers in demographic and background characteristics, cultural attitudes, and motivations. This paper briefly surveys the literature on participation, audience-building, and marketing in the arts; discusses the data used for this analysis; presents simple statistical evidence on the relationship between stated preferences and ticket purchase history; profiles high-demand non-purchasers, and uses these profiles to draw conclusions about potential barriers to attendance among high-demand non-purchasers.

#### **4. Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences**

*Tanya Koropeckyj-Cox, Charles Gattone, William Jawde, & Deeb-Paul Kitchen*

This paper builds on the original *Value & Impact Study* analyses by adding two important sociological perspectives to the understanding of audience values and preferences, taking into account the larger community contexts of the presenter-audience relationship. First, focusing on social and cultural characteristics, the authors construct an alternative audience segmentation model that draws more specifically on sociological research on social capital and engagement, socioeconomic dimensions of taste, and subculture affinities. The authors examine how an audience segmentation model based on social attributes and cultural affinities can help to elucidate audience preferences and potential attendance. Second, they incorporate data on the specific community contexts of the Major University Presenters (and their potential audiences) to examine the influence of contextual dimensions on the relations of audience characteristics with preferences and attendance. Specifically, the research addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What kind of audience segmentation results from an explicit emphasis on measures of social engagement, institutional connection, and cultural affinities?
- 2) How is this socially based segmentation related to socio-demographic characteristics and to particular audience preferences and potential attendance at performances?
- 3) How does this relationship intersect with characteristics of the larger communities in which the audience members and the University Presenters are located?

The findings offer a nuanced assessment of audience preferences within their particular communities and inform strategies for planning, marketing, and outreach that take into account contextual variations. The findings also help to inform policy and arts development by considering the interrelations of communities, institutions, and audience populations.

#### **5. Anticipation: Exploring its Origins and Effects on the Live Arts Experience**

*Jara Kern*

For almost any presenter of the live performing arts, *captivation, satisfaction, and remembered value* are the gold standards of a job well done. Audience members and artists who experience a powerfully positive impact during the event, and remember the moment vividly for years to come, become the favored stories of success among most arts presenters. These remembered experiences provide the catalyst for future attendance and increasing connection to the organization and its work. Yet, despite the core importance of captivation,

satisfaction, and remembered value, precious little specific research has explored where these experiences come from, how they work, and how they might be more thoughtfully encouraged. This paper is an effort to encourage such understanding and strategy. Its particular focus is on the role and influence of anticipation on the perceived satisfaction and remembered value of a live performance experience. This paper suggests and tests a causal model, examines findings from relevant literature, and incorporates interviews with audience members, practitioners, and content experts. The paper aims to provide performing arts practitioners with actionable insights on anticipation, and its central function in fostering satisfaction and remembered value in the live performing arts. This paper focuses on the relationship between cause and effect, or the causal flow, for the creation of high levels of anticipation for cultural content.

## Impact

### **6. How We Feel About Art: Motivation, Satisfaction, and Emotional Experience in Performing Arts Audiences**

*Shelby Gilbride & David Orzechowicz*

Using data collected from the *MUPS Value & Impact Study*, Gilbride and Orzechowicz explore the dimensions of self-reported emotional experiences in performing arts audiences. Specifically, the authors look at how these emotional experiences relate to the reasons people attend productions, the expectations they bring with them, the relevance of the performing arts to their daily lives, and their satisfaction with a show. Gilbride and Orzechowicz conduct the first analyses of the qualitative emotions data available from the study and construct ten broad categories of emotional experiences, with an additional six subcategories to provide a more nuanced understanding. These categories are based on the work of Robert Plutchik's categorization of basic and secondary emotions, as well as other research on emotion typologies. The authors then explore the relationship between these experiences and audience demographics, performance genres, and reported levels of captivation and satisfaction. Much of the analysis focuses on five specific emotional experiences: anger, dissatisfaction, fear, inspiration, and joy. The research reveals that certain emotional experiences often seen as negative in most social situations, such as fear and anger, are associated with higher levels of satisfaction and repeat arts consumers. "Positive" emotions like joy, on the other hand, are associated with lower levels of satisfaction and audience members who were out of their comfort zone. The authors speculate on the meaning of these associations and their relevance to the performing arts community.

### **7. Social Influences on Intrinsic Impacts of Performance**

*Trina Rose*

There have been a number of studies regarding audiences of cultural arts. Lacking, however, is the knowledge of social and emotional factors of these audience members. What social and emotional factors predict attendance and subscription? For example, is the person or persons one attends a performance with related to their post performance impacts? The author explores this question and other gaps in the literature in more detail. To engage in this investigation, this paper uses cross-sectional data from *The Value & Impact Study* and conducts a series of path analyses to gauge whether these social factors are related with post-performance impacts, and whether these emotional factors are associated with subscription

and attendance. Results indicate that patrons' reasons for attending a performance, social factors, and ticket price were significantly related to post-performance impacts. Additionally, post-performance impacts were significantly related to attending live performances and performance discipline.

## Special Interest Topics

### **8. Analysis of Multiple Intelligences in Understanding the Relationships between Ticket Buyers and Their Participation in Performing Arts Programs**

*Mark Creekmore & Sarah Rush*

The concept of multiple intelligences (MI) has been used in educational settings, but it can also be used to differentiate arts' patrons by their different abilities, sensibilities and orientations. The hope is that this knowledge may be used to create more specific communication and marketing tools and identify ways to understand and address the preferences among different kinds of patrons. Using the Values Survey from *The Value and Impact Study*, nine forms of MI (Linguistic, logical-Mathematical, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Musical, Spatial, Naturalist, Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Existential) are examined in relation to other patron characteristics, including demographic information, inner-directed values, outer-directed values and performance preferences. A considerable portion of this research focused on validating the nine intelligences, identifying relations with performance preferences and investigating differences across the study sites.

### **9. Characterizing Program Enhancement Events**

*Yael Zipporah Silk & Jordan Raphael Fischbach*

Offering enhancement events is often viewed as a way to draw in casual audiences, provide them with knowledge they may not already have, and in turn positively impact their future participation. This paper profiles the enhancement event audience base, examines the impact of enhancement events on patrons who self-select to attend, and identifies characteristics that are predictive of pre- or post-performance event preferences. Utilizing data from two patron surveys, the authors analyze mean preference for enhancement events to create profiles of enhancement event attendees. Next, they examine mean outcomes for patrons who attended specific pre-performance events and performed a difference-of-differences analysis taking enhancement event attendance frequency into account and, finally, develop several simple prediction models to identify characteristics associated with preferences for enhancement events. The authors find that enhancement events are primarily serving patrons who are have strong allegiances to presenters, are frequent ticket buyers, and donate. Pre-performance attendance also correlates with a number of intrinsic outcome measures, though the effect appears to be greater for patrons who rarely attend enhancement events. Finally, age, appetite for new works, risk taking, personal creativity, allegiance to presenter, and seeking a connection to artists are all associated with preferences for enhancement events. These results point to an opportunity to deepen performance audiences by broadening and diversifying enhancement event audiences, which could in turn affect future participation decisions.



## **10. How Beliefs Matter: Views, Motives and their Relation to Buyer and Donor Behavior**

*Ximena Varela*

The connection between beliefs, values and the *production* of art has long been acknowledged. Whether it is the artist's intent to make a political or value statement, or whether art is used as a vehicle for political messages or channel for values, the arts convey ideas, emotions, and elicit thought, feeling, and even action. But what happens on the side of *consumption*? Can the public's value systems and political beliefs be linked to specific patterns of arts attendance or even support for the arts? Put another way; are audiences who self-identify as conservative more likely to attend a particular arts event over another? Do their motivations to provide support for the arts vary from those who are more liberal? Do liberals and conservatives expect different things in return for their support of the arts? What are the implications for arts presenters? The paper begins with an overview of the audiences surveyed for the study in terms of their political beliefs, and provides additional descriptive statistics for age and sex distributions. This is followed by an explanation of the methodology used for the analytical process. The paper then divides into two sections: the first discusses the relationship between political views and ticket buying, while the second focuses on political views and donor behavior. It concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for performing arts presenters.

**Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits**

**Paper #2**

May Kim, Yong Jae Ko & Heather Gibson

## Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits

Americans donated more than \$295.02 billion in 2006 (Giving USA, 2007). According to Giving USA, donation in arts, culture, and humanities organizations has increased 9.9% since 2000 and reached \$12.51 billion in 2006, which is the highest growth rate among nine different types of charities. In addition, 89% of households donated in 2000 and the average donation amount was \$1,620 which is 3.1% of household income (Independent Sector, 2001). Also, research showed that older people tended to give more to non-profit organizations than younger people (Edmonton, 1986). Unlike common perception that females are not serious donors (Shaw & Taylor, 1995), gift amounts and regularity of alumni to women's college are much more significant than those witnessed by co-ed colleges and universities (Staurowsky, 1996). Although numerous researchers have provided demographic data regarding donation in the United States, more research on donation and the relationship of donation with other factors is needed. Thus, in the current study, we focused on donor motivation and its influence on donor amount or donor benefits.

### *Understanding Helping/ Giving Behavior*

In the realm of fund raising and donor research understanding help or give is a major theme within the literature. Benapudi, Singh, and Benapudi (1996) explain that helping behavior exists in many forms and can range in degree from none, to token level which in the form of a nominal contribution to serious level involving a substantial level. Helping behavior can refer to donations of time, blood, organs, money and various other tangible and non-tangible gifts in response to a particular need. Benapudi et al. in the context of helping others through donating to charitable organizations define helping behavior as “behavior that enhances the welfare of a needy other, by providing aid or benefit, usually with little or no commensurate reward in return” (p. 34). It is this idea of why do people help when there is “little or no commensurate reward” that has been the focus of scholars from various disciplines including economics, sociology, social psychology, and

marketing. It appears that explanations from one discipline only provide partial explanations to explain helping behavior and several scholars have proposed interdisciplinary models to help with this dilemma.

Benapudi et al. blend theories from social psychology, marketing, sociology and economics in their model of helping behavior in relation to charities. The goal of their model is to understand donor behavior with the goal of helping charities develop better promotional strategies. They suggest that any model of helping behavior needs to understand that there antecedents that may affect donor behavior which can be controlled and are largely related to a charity's promotional strategies such as the image, messages and the nature of the request for help. These promotional factors however, are influenced by moderating variables which are largely outside of the control of the charity such as donor characteristics including motivation, financial resources and mood. Benapudi et al. also identify some macro level factors such as the state of the economy, government policies regarding tax deductions for donations and social norms. These moderating factors influence the degree of helping behavior which in turn has various consequences or outcomes for both the donor and the charity. Benapudi et al. suggest that the challenge for any charity is to take charge of the factors that they can control in an attempt to mollify those that are largely uncontrollable.

In a more recent attempt at an integrated model of understanding helping behavior Sargeant and Woodliffe (2007) proposed a comprehensive model of giving behavior generated from an extensive review of the literature across a number of disciplines including economics, clinical and social psychology, sociology and marketing specifically targeted at understanding monetary giving. They identified nine dimensions of giving behavior including the source of the fund raising request, perceptions associated with the donation requests, the influence of past experience in processing the request, the impact of external influences, constraints on giving, individual characteristics,

motivations on donation behavior and the influence of the type of feedback given to the donor. Sargeant and Woodliffe recommended that all of these dimensions need to be addressed to gain a comprehensive understanding of giving behavior. We would agree, although we would also argue that there is still a need to focus on understanding the individual dimensions of the model with the proviso that such micro analyses are interpreted in relation to all aspects of the giving process.

### *Motivations*

Various theoretical explanations as to why people give have been proffered by scholars from different disciplines through the years. Economists tend to use exchange theory and examine giving in terms of a cost-benefit analysis (Becker, 1976; Dowd, 1975). Sociologists tend to explain giving behavior in terms of social comparison in that people are motivated to behave in certain ways by social norms and the need for compliance (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990). Social psychologists tend to focus on the psychological drives or outcomes.

From a social psychological perspective, needs or motivations rooted in the basic physiological and socio-psychological wants of all humans are generally thought to underlie behavior. There are many definitions of motivation and need. Murray (1938) a classic needs theorist explained, “A need is a stimulus - a force pushing an individual in a certain direction or to behave in a certain way” (p. 123). Alderson (1955) defined motivation as “a conscious experience or subconscious condition, which serves as a factor in determining an individual’s behavior or social conduct in a given situation” (p. 6).

Findings from a range of studies in our field of leisure, sport and tourism that have used the classic needs based theories of Murray (1938) or Maslow’s (1943) theories or a combination of both have concluded that the relationship between needs and behavioral choice is quite complex (e.g., Allen, 1982; Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Iso-Ahola & Allen, 1982; Pearce, 1982; Pearce & Caltabiano, 1983; Tinsley, Barrett & Kass, 1977). Researchers today suggest that pairing a set of needs with an

activity is no longer adequate as behavior is multi-dimensional. For example, the same activity may be motivated by different needs at different times for one individual or one activity may represent different meanings to another individual at the same time (Iso-Ahola, 1999). Indeed, in the fund raising literature, Banapudi et al. (1996) suggest that it is possible for individuals to be motivated by several needs all at once and sometimes these needs may be oppositional. However, despite the complexity of the relationship, motivation theory still appears to be useful in providing us with an understanding as to why people choose certain behaviors.

Within the literature on giving and helping behavior, the common motives tend to be both intrinsic such as altruism, empathy and social justice and extrinsic such as prestige and tax relief (Andreoni, 1990; Becker, 1974; Banapudi et al., 1996; Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007). Martin (1994) explains that altruism has “the ultimate goal of enhancing the welfare of the needy.” Altruism has been debated at various times over the centuries. Indeed, even today economists such as Andreoni (1990) question whether pure altruism exists. He argues that a pure altruism model does not seem to explain donation behavior well, especially in large economies where government monies would “crowd out” any benefits or utilities donors would achieve through their giving (Andreoni, 1988). He doubts the existence of purely altruistic behavior and suggests that “social pressure, guilt, sympathy or the desire for a “warm glow” (Andreoni, 1990, p. 464) are likely to be influential in understanding donor behavior. Instead he suggests an impure model of altruism that accounts for the “warm glow” that individuals may attain from giving. Working from the premise that at the heart of all giving behavior is an evaluation of the utility to be obtained from the behavior, he suggests that rather than being motivated by pure altruism, that individuals are motivated by such utilities as being able to enjoy the continued existence of the charity and or by other benefits (utilities) associated with the giving behavior. The idea that all behavior is motivated by utility in the form of a cost-benefit analysis is at the heart of public good theory and exchange theory which tend to be

avored by economists. Walker and Pharaoh (2002) argue that such theories do not account for all behavior including anonymous donations. In fact, in a study of older adults and charitable donations both exchange theory and social exchange theory only partially explained these individuals giving behaviors. Davis (1994) suggests that if empathy with a cause is associated with altruistic motives. Perhaps as noted earlier, behavior is multi-motivated and altruism may be one of several motives behind giving behavior (Bendapudi, 1996). Batson (1991) suggests that altruism in western society seems to be rooted in the Judeo-Christian belief of “love thy neighbor” and certainly there is some empirical support that altruism somewhat underpins helping behavior for some (Fultz, Schuller & Cialdini, 1988), and appears to be associated with the act of providing serious help (i.e. significant contributions) rather than token help (Clary & Orenstein, 1991).

Another set of motives commonly identified in the giving literature are concerned with “increasing a person’s own welfare” (Martin, 1994) and are akin in many respects to the economic ideas of utility and cost-benefit. Benapudi et al. classify these as egoistic motivations and tend to be associated with gaining rewards for helping or avoiding retribution for not helping. The authors also identify a second type of egoistical motives, those associated with reducing the donor’s stress or concern for the needy either by helping or avoiding behaviors. Egoistical motives in the literature tend to include sense of belonging, career advancement, prestige, tax relief/advantage, peer pressure, political gains, fear, or guilt, and sympathy (Benapudi et al., 1996; Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007). We would suggest that some of the problems in the literature and may be some of the partial explanations of understanding giving behavior in the literature may be a result of conceptual muddling of psychological motives based on classical needs theory (e.g., Maslow, 1943; Murray, 1938) with utilitarian cost-benefit approaches favored by proponents of exchange theory. Perhaps there is a need to distinguish between motives based on socio-psychological needs such as sense of belonging and self esteem and other intrinsic motives such as social justice and the need to make a

difference or impact philanthropy (Duncan, 2004) from the benefits or extrinsic motivations such as prestige and tax advantages.

### *Donor Benefits*

Benefits research comes out of the market segmentation tradition (Hayley, 1968). Haley explained that in contrast to the traditional modes of segmentation (geographic, demographic, and volume e.g., by usage), which rely on descriptive factors that benefits could be thought of as causal factors. He went on to explain that the benefits consumers seek from a particular product provide insight into the basic or underlying reasons why they might purchase it. In the 1970s, researchers began to apply the concept of *benefits sought* to understand other types of behavior including in our field tourism behavior. Woodside and Pitts (1976) linked benefits sought to destination choice in a tourism context, Schul and Crompton (1983) examined travel planning in relation to benefits sought, and Crask (1981) looked at benefits sought in relation to motivations for vacation travel. It is this latter use of benefits sought in relation to motivation which may explain why benefits based segmentation has been shown to be a more accurate predictor or explanation of behavior (Hayley, 1968). Working from the classic needs based theories of Murray (1938) and Maslow (1943) the idea that a need drives behavior and that to understand behavior we have to identify the unsatisfied needs that are motivating the behavior can explain why benefits sought might be a good causal factor. Nonetheless, Dann (1981) questioned the ability of researchers to measure tourist motivation a priori as he suggests that many people are unable to identify why they make a particular choice. Thus, Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) suggested that a more accurate way of exploring tourist motivation is to infer motivation from actual tourist experiences. Following this line of thinking, Woodside and Jacobs (1985) suggested that examining the *benefits realized* at a destination visited recently by individuals might provide a better understanding tourist experiences. The idea of benefits realized is now more commonly used to understand the relationship between a consumer's desires



and experiences and as such are concepts that be quite readily applied to the world of the performing arts.

Based on earlier research finding, we believed that MUP donors' motivations would vary and the donation amounts and preferred donor benefits would be related to their different motivations. The research questions below were answered in the current study.

1. What are the donor motivations?
2. What is the influence of gender and age on donor motivations?
3. What is the relationship between donor motivations and donor behavior?
4. What is the relationship between donor motivations and donor benefits?

## Methods

### *Procedures*

The analyses presented in this report are the results of a secondary analysis of the *Value and Impact Study*, a data set collected by the Major University Presenters (MUP). As part of this overall study, MUP conducted an online survey of ticket buyers and donors from the 14 study partners (14 universities presenting programs). The data from the donors were analyzed and form the focus for this report.

According to information provided by MUP, 7,252 donors of the partner programs were invited to participate in the study through emails and 1,771 donors completed the survey. The response rates for the donors' surveys ranged across the 14 sites from a low of 12% to a high of 53%. The response rate of the entire donor survey was 24%.

The donor data base contains information on transaction data for each season between 2002 and 2005, the type of performances preferred, amount of donations over the past four years, affiliation with the university and the presenter, donor motivation, preferred donor benefits, donor interest and involvement in the arts and other activities and demographics. These variables are

measured in different ways on the questionnaire with the use of nominal level yes/no formats, Likert-type scales measured on 3, 4, and 7 point scales, multiple choice responses and open-ended questions (e.g., money amount).

### *Participants*

Descriptive analysis of the 1771 donors from the 14 participating university arts programs was conducted. Among the 1771 donors, 53.6% (n= 950) were females and 45.7% (n= 809) were males. Twelve respondents (0.7%) did not indicate their gender. Among the 1744 respondents who indicated their age, almost 90% (n=1557) were 45 years old or older. Specifically, 22.1% (n=386) of the respondents were between 45 and 54 years old, 34.1% (n=594) were between 55 and 64 years, and 33.1% (n =577) were 65 years old or older. However, only 1.7% (n=30) were aged between 18 and 34 years and 9% (n=157) were between 35 and 44 years. Just over 47 % (47.2%, n =821) of the respondents worked full-time and an additional 13.2% (n =229) worked part-time, while 35.3% (n=615) are retired. In addition, almost a half of the respondents' spouses worked either full-time (49%, n=670) or part-time (10.9%, n=149) and 33.7% (n=461) of them were retired. Among the donors who responded to the questions regarding affiliation with the university presenting the arts performance, 23.8% (n=422) were current or retired faculty and 17.7% (n=313) were current or retired staff. Almost 44% (43.5%, n=770) were alumni and 19.1% (n=339) were parents or grandparents of a student or alumnus, while only 1.6% (n=28) were currently students. Furthermore, 21.3% (n=375) of them had children living with them and about 17.2% (n=296) lived with their or their spouses' parents.

In terms of donor behavior, the mean of the four year donation amount from these donors was \$1456 (SD=3139.73). Based on the average four year donation amount, the annual mean donation amount was estimated at \$364. Among the respondents, approximately a quarter (24.7% n=393) of them donated more than \$1100, another quarter (24.9%, n=396) donated between \$401

and \$1100, 28.1% (n=448) of them donated between \$200 and \$400, and 22.3% (n=355) donated less than \$200 over the last four years.

### *Data Analysis*

The original authors of the donor segmentation report hypothesized five groupings of donor motivations: Civic/Demographic motivations, Social motivations, Personal or Ego motivations, Institutional motivations, and Cultural/artistic/educational motivations. To test the reliability and validity of the 20 items distributed across the five dimensions of the donor motivation scale, Cronbach's alpha using SPSS 16.0 and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 16.0 was employed. The theoretical justification of the items and dimensions was also reviewed. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed to re-categorize the items into the new dimensions after testing the validity and reliability of the original scale. Cronbach's alpha and a CFA with the newly emerged factors and items were then employed. The 20 donor motivation items were compared by gender and five age cohorts (age 18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65+). Univariate analyses of gender and the five age cohorts on the donor motivation items were separately conducted.

Further, the relationships of donor motivation with donor behavior, average donation in last four years, were explored. Newly categorized dimensions of motivation were used. Further, the relationships of donor motivation items with donor behavior were also explored. To explore the influence of donor motivation on donor behavior, the regression analyses using SPSS 16 were conducted. Also, we conducted another sets of regression analyses to explore the relationships between donor motivation factors and seven different donor benefits, priority seating, advance notice of programs, ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale, parking privileges, access to more in-depth experiences, opportunities to meet artists, opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality programs.

## Results and Discussion

The results of the analyses are presented according to the specific research questions.

### 1. What are the donor motivations?

The original analysis of the 20 motivation items by MUP revealed five motivation dimensions: Civic/Demographic motivations ( $\alpha = .79$ ), Cultural/artistic/educational motivations ( $\alpha = .72$ ), Social motivation ( $\alpha = .67$ ), Institutional motivations ( $\alpha = .56$ ), and Personal or Ego motivations ( $\alpha = .35$ ). While the alphas for the civic/demographic and cultural/artistic factors were good and the alpha for social motivations was moderate, the reliability of the other factors was poor to marginal. Thus, due to these poor reliability coefficients the psychometric properties of the pre-constructed sub-dimensions and scale items were further examined.

The results of a subsequent confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the AMOS software indicated a very poor fit (Table 1). The CFA results revealed that the chi-square per degree of freedom ratio ( $\chi^2/df = 2331.861/160=14.574$ ), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA,  $\chi_a = .088$ ), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI = .815) were all poor.

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Original Motivation Sub-dimensions as identified by MUP.

	$\alpha$	Factor loading
<i>Civic/Demographic motivations</i>	.798	
To make possible a high quality of life for our community		.575
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues		.520
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged population		.769
To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures		.715
To expend the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible		.784
<i>Social motivations</i>	.672	
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors		.713
To join with the group of people who make this community great		.617
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)		.544
So that others can see that I am contributing		.508
<i>Personal or ego motivations</i>	.355	
Because I have more money than I need		.132
Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with [presenter]		.710
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life		.617

To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level		.035
Institutional motivations	.555	
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of [presenter]		.679
To help ensure that [presenter] students can see great artists, as part of their education		.609
<i>Cultural/ Artistic/Educational motivations</i>	.718	
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience		.665
To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community		.415
To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art		.588
To provide cultural experiences for area school children		.707
Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society		.521

We tried to improve the reliability of the sub-dimensions by eliminating items with low individual alphas. However, the Cronbach’s alpha values did not improve. Thus, to examine the construct validity of the motivation dimensions an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), a principal-component factor analysis on the 20 items of the scale, was performed. Only three factors were extracted and none of these three factors was identical to any of the five sub-dimensions of the presented in the original analysis by MUP (Table 2).

From the new EFA, Factor I included four of the five original Civic/Demographic motivations items and four of the five original Cultural/Artistic/Educational motivations items. Factor II comprised six items from three different motivation dimensions and Factor III included all four of the social motivations and one of the Personal/Ego motivation items. One item did not load with any other items, which was “Because I have more money than I need.”

Table 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the 20 Motivation Items

MUP Motivation Factor		Newly Extracted Factors		
		1	2	3
Civic/Demographic	To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged population	.741		
Civic/Demographic	To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures	.727		
Civic/Demographic	To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible	.685		
Cultural/Artistic/Educational	To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art	.666		

Cultural/Artistic/Educational	To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience	.660		
Cultural/Artistic/Educational	To provide cultural experiences for area school children	.652		
Civic/Demographic	To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues	.620		
Cultural/Artistic/Educational	Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society	.580		
Personal/ego	To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of [presenter]		.779	
Civic/Demographic	To make possible a high quality of life for our community		.770	
Personal/ego	Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with [presenter]		.608	
Cultural/Artistic/Educational	To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community		.581	
Personal/ego	To help ensure that [presenter] students can see great artists, as part of their education		.534	
Personal/ego	Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life		.496	
Social	To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors			.745
Social	So that others can see that I am contributing			.720
Personal/ego	To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level			.667
Social	To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)			.654
Social	To join with the group of people who make this community great			.467
Personal/ego	Because I have more money than I need			.256

Reliability tests and a CFA with 19 items of new three scales were run. The Cronbach's alpha values of three factors were as follows: Factor I ( $\alpha = .86$ ), Factor II ( $\alpha = .78$ ), and Factor III ( $\alpha = .69$ ) were all acceptable. However, The CFA still revealed a very poor fit. The chi-square per degree of freedom ratio ( $\chi^2/df = 1774.765/149=11.911$ ), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA,  $\chi_a = .0784$ ), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI = .861) were not overly improved from those of the original scale. Also, among the 19 items, the factor loading values of 13 items on each factor were smaller than .707 (Hair et al., 2007), which implies that the items do not represent the

factor very well. In addition, many among these 13 items did not load well with other items in the factor conceptually. Specifically, the items merged in Factor II shared a theme of community and university support and the items in Factor III comprised of donor benefits. However, the items in Factor I had more than one common theme and some of these items had no theoretical relevance with other items in the factor. Also, the conceptual meanings of many items were not clearly distinguishable in three dimensions (see Table 3 for the CFA of these modified items and dimensions). Thus, the newly emerged factor structure is not also recommendable to use for further analyses without future modification of the scale and collection of new data; but, only for the beneficial use of the current data, we include the new factor structure to explore the relationships between donor motivations and donor behavior and donor benefits.. In addition to the suggested further analyses based on motivation factors, each of the individual scale items were examined (Table 4). The strongest motivations as shown by mean values on a 7 point Likert type scale were “To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability”, (M=6.09, SD=1.18), “To make possible a high quality of life for our community”, (M=5.95, SD=1.22), and “Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I’ve had with (presenter)”, (M=5.36, SD = 1.50). The weakest motivations were “To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)”, (M=1.68, SD=1.25), and “So that others can see that I am contributing”, (M=1.73, SD=1.18).

Table 3: Cronbach’s alpha and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Modified Motivation Sub-dimensions (19 items).

	$\alpha$	Factor loading
Factor I: Education, Culture, and others.	.860	
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged population		.771
To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures		.715
To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible		.775
To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art		.592
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience		.658
To provide cultural experiences for area school children		.717
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues		.534

Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society		.519
Factor II: Community and university support	.776	
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of [presenter]		.660
To make possible a high quality of life for our community		.658
Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with [presenter]		.712
To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community		.462
To help ensure that [presenter] students can see great artists, as part of their education		.679
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life		.596
Factor III: Donor benefit	.694	
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors		.787
So that others can see that I am contributing		.526
To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level		.488
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)		.543
To join with the group of people who make this community great		.541

2. What is the influence of gender and age on donor motivations?

*The influence of gender on donor motivation factors:*

The donor motivation factors were compared by gender. The multivariate analysis showed that gender was significantly related to donor motivation factors ( $F(3, 1747) = 14.75, p < .00, \eta^2 = .025$ ). Female donors were significantly higher than male donors in two factors: civic and education ( $F(1, 1749) = 16.26, p < .00, \eta^2 = .019$ ) and community and university support ( $F(1, 1749) = 2.37, p < .00, \eta^2 = .009$ ) but there was no gender difference in donor benefit motivation ( $F(1, 1749) = 45.81, p = .381$ ).

Table 4: Univariate Analysis of Donor Motivation Factors by Gender

	Gender				Univariate <i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial $\eta^2$
	F		M					
	M	SD	M	SD				
Civic and education	4.54	1.21	4.19	1.25	1749/1	16.26	.000	.019
Community and university support	5.41	1.09	5.20	1.06	1749/1	2.37	.000	.009
Donor benefit	2.71	1.14	2.75	1.10	1749/1	45.81	.381	.000

*The influence of gender on donor motivation items:*



The individual donor motivation items were compared by gender. The results of univariate tests showed that 756 females and 682 males answered all 20 donor items and 10 out of 20 donor motivation items were significantly different between male and female donors (Table 5). Female donors were significantly higher than male donors on all of these 10 items except one item, “So that others can see that I am contributing” ( $F(1, 1436) = 5.423, p < .05, \eta^2 = .004$ ). The results of the univariate tests of gender on donor motivation items indicated that female donors were significantly higher in donor motivation items related to altruism or concerns for others such as “To make possible a high quality of life for our community” (Females:  $M = 6.07, SD = 1.16$ ; Males:  $M = 5.82, SD = 1.26$ ), “To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged populations” (Females:  $M = 4.78, SD = 1.70$ ; Males:  $M = 4.17, SD = 1.77$ ) and “Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life” (Females  $M = 4.47, SD = 2.01$ ; Males:  $M = 4.27, SD = 1.85$ ). Interestingly, the strongest motivation for both males and females was “To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of (university presenter)”. While females were statistically significantly higher on this motive ( $M = 6.16, SD = 1.20$ ) compared to males ( $M = 6.04, SD = 1.15$ ), both men and women were highly motivated by the need to sustain the program itself through their donations ( $F(1, 1436) = 3.93, p < .05, \eta^2 = .003$ ).

Table 5: Motivation Items Descriptive Analysis

	N	M	SD
To make possible a high quality of life for our community	1747	5.95	1.22
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues	1704	3.30	1.77
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged populations	1722	4.50	1.74
To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures	1733	4.73	1.72
To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible	1730	5.01	1.65
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors	1727	2.80	1.79
To join with the group of people who make this community great	1728	4.44	1.90
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)	1711	1.68	1.25
So that others can see that I am contributing	1727	1.73	1.18
Because I have more money than I need	1696	2.24	1.60
Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with	1732	5.36	1.50
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life	1718	4.38	1.95

To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level	1735	2.93	1.90
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability	1751	6.09	1.18
To help ensure that students can see great artists, as part of their education	1739	4.91	1.73
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience	1714	4.14	1.73
To underwrite appearances by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community	1735	5.21	1.68
To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art	1717	3.97	1.77
To provide cultural experiences for area school children	1744	5.09	1.63
Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society	1717	4.24	1.86
Valid N (listwise)	1444		

However, overall gender explained only less than .5% of the variance in items, “So that others can see that I am contributing”, “Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life”, “To ensure the long term viability and sustainability of the (university presenter)”, and “To be part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art”. While between 1.1% and 3.1% of the variance was explained by gender in items, “To make possible a high quality of life for our community”, “To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged populations”, “To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures”, “To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible”, “Because I want others to have experiences like I have had with (university presenter)”, and “To provide cultural experiences for area school children”.

Table 6: Univariate Analysis of Donor Motivation Items by Gender

	Gender				Univariate <i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial $\eta^2$
	F		M					
	M	SD	M	SD				
To make possible a high quality of life for our community	6.07	1.16	5.82	1.26	1436/1	16.26	.000	.011
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues	3.35	1.80	3.20	1.74	1436/1	2.37	.124	.002
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged populations	4.78	1.70	4.16	1.77	1436/1	45.81	.000	.031
To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures	5.01	1.68	4.44	1.75	1436/1	39.96	.000	.027
To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible	5.25	1.60	4.73	1.68	1436/1	36.32	.000	.025
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors	2.81	1.89	2.79	1.68	1436/1	.025	.876	.000
To join with the group of people who make this community great	4.46	1.97	4.40	1.84	1436/1	.336	.563	.000
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)	1.68	1.28	1.74	1.26	1436/1	.965	.326	.001
So that others can see that I am contributing	1.67	1.17	1.81	1.20	1436/1	5.42	.020	.004
Because I have more money than I need	2.19	1.60	2.29	1.59	1436/1	1.51	.219	.001
Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with	5.51	1.46	5.20	1.52	1436/1	15.25	.000	.011
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life	4.47	2.01	4.27	1.85	1436/1	3.93	.048	.003
To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level	2.88	1.90	2.97	1.87	1436/1	.836	.361	.001
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability	6.16	1.20	6.04	1.15	1436/1	4.04	.045	.003
To help ensure that students can see great artists, as part of their education	4.97	1.71	4.80	1.76	1436/1	3.47	.063	.002
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience	4.15	1.80	4.08	1.67	1436/1	.66	.418	.000
To underwrite appearances by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community	5.18	1.78	5.26	1.58	1436/1	.64	.424	.000
To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art	4.10	1.78	3.88	1.74	1436/1	5.49	.019	.004
To provide cultural experiences for area school children	5.30	1.54	4.84	1.68	1436/1	29.21	.000	.020
Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society	4.20	1.87	4.24	1.86	1436/1	.16	.690	.000

Scale used 1= low importance 7= high importance

*The influence of age on donor motivation factors:*

The donor motivation factors were compared by age cohorts, age 18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65+. Age was significantly related to donor motivation factors ( $F(12, 1728) = 3.64, p < .00, \eta^2 = .008$ ). Two motivation factors: civic and education ( $F(4, 1730) = 5.30, p < .00, \eta^2 = .012$ ) and community and university support ( $F(4, 1730) = 7.88, p < .00, \eta^2 = .018$ ) were significantly different among different age groups but there was no age difference in donor benefit motivation ( $F(4, 1730) = 1.48, p = .206$ ). The donors in 65 + age group showed significantly higher civic and education motivation and community and university motivation than younger age groups.

Table 7: Bonferroni post-hoc Tests of Motivation Factors by Age

Dependent Variable	Age Cohort	Mean	SD	Age Cohort	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
Civic and education	45-54	4.16	1.28	55-64	4.42	1.24	.010
	45-54	4.16	1.28	65+	4.51	1.19	.000
Community and university support	35-44	5.10	1.13	65+	5.50	1.07	.001
	45-54	5.18	1.09	65+	5.50	1.07	.000
	55-64	5.30	1.05	65+	5.50	1.07	.024

*The influence of age on donor motivation items:*

To see different motivations of donors by their ages, the donors were categorized into five groups, age 18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65+. One thousand four hundred and twenty seven donors indicated their ages and answered all 20 donor motivation items. The univariate analysis of donor motivation items by age cohorts showed that 13 out of 20 items were significantly different among age cohorts. Although age cohorts explained only between 2.5% and 0.8% of the variance in these 13 items, we conducted Bonferroni post-hoc tests on these 13 items. Older donors rated each motivation items higher than younger donors, except one item “To network for business purposes

(me or my spouse/partner)”. Donors in the 35-44 age cohort (M= 1.96, SD = 1.55) were significantly higher on this item than donors in 65+ age cohort (M= 1.55, SD = 1.07,  $p < .01$ ). However, regardless of age cohorts, donors of all ages rated this item very low as a motive for donating to the programs. In addition, the 65+ age cohorts showed significantly higher motives in most items in 35-44 or 44-54 age cohorts. However, donors in 65+ age cohort (M= 5.25, SD = 1.59) were significantly higher than donors 55-64 age cohort (M= 4.86, SD = 1.76,  $p < .01$ ) in only one item, “To help ensure that [presenter] students can see great artists, as part of their education.” Further, only 27 donors between age 18 and 34 answered all 20 motivation items. However, the motivation of donors in 18-34 age cohort were not distinctive from donors in other age groups but in item “To make possible a high quality of life for our community” and “To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community”, donors in 18-34 age cohort showed significantly lower motivations than donors over 55 in “To make possible a high quality of life for our community” and over 45 in “To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community.”

Table 8: Univariate Analysis of Donor Motivation Items by Age Cohorts

	Univariate <i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial $\eta^2$
To make possible a high quality of life for our community	1422/4	4.62	.001	.013
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues	1422/4	5.59	.000	.015
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged populations	1422/4	2.87	.022	.008
To promote awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures	1422/4	1.59	.176	.004
To expand the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible	1422/4	3.15	.014	.009
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors	1422/4	4.23	.002	.012
To join with the group of people who make this community great	1422/4	5.66	.000	.016
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)	1422/4	4.07	.003	.011

So that others can see that I am contributing	1422/4	.71	.585	.002
Because I have more money than I need	1422/4	.90	.462	.003
Because I want others to have experiences like the ones I've had with	1422/4	.45	.775	.001
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life	1422/4	4.02	.003	.011
To receive the specific benefits associated with my gift level	1422/4	.72	.578	.002
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability	1422/4	4.56	.001	.013
To help ensure that students can see great artists, as part of their education	1422/4	9.20	.000	.025
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience	1422/4	4.33	.002	.012
To underwrite appearances by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community	1422/4	5.90	.000	.016
To be a part of the evolution of the art forms and the creation of new art	1422/4	.80	.525	.002
To provide cultural experiences for area school children	1422/4	2.03	.088	.006
Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society	1422/4	5.83	.000	.016

Table 9: Bonferroni post-hoc Tests of Motivation Items by Age

Dependent Variable	Age	Mean	SD	Age	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
	Cohort			Cohort			
To make possible a high quality of life for our community	18-34	5.26	1.38	55-64	6.01	1.19	.019
	18-34	5.26	1.38	65+	6.05	1.15	.010
To participate in a civic dialogue about current issues	35-44	3.00	1.82	55-64	3.35	1.75	.022
	45-54	3.00	1.78	55-64	3.35	1.75	.044
	45-54	3.00	1.78	65+	3.53	1.74	.000
To support outreach efforts towards disadvantaged population	45-54	4.25	1.85	55-64	4.55	1.69	.019
To expend the reach of the performing arts to places where it is not accessible	45-54	4.78	1.75	55-64	5.11	1.62	.049
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors	45-54	2.49	1.71	65+	3.01	1.83	.001
To join with the group of people who make this community great	45-54	4.13	1.91	65+	4.71	1.82	.000

To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)	35-44	1.96	1.56	65+	1.55	1.07	.009
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life	35-44	4.07	1.89	65+	4.64	1.85	.027
	45-54	4.16	2.01	65+	4.64	1.85	.006
To ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of [presenter]	35-44	5.83	1.30	65+	6.22	1.04	.005
To help ensure that [presenter] students can see great artists, as part of their education	35-44	4.61	1.77	65+	5.25	1.59	.001
	45-54	4.56	1.76	65+	5.25	1.59	.000
	55-64	4.86	1.76	65+	5.25	1.59	.005
To allow deeper engagement between artists and audience	35-44	3.84	1.81	65+	4.38	1.63	.015
	45-54	3.94	1.77	65+	4.38	1.63	.005
To underwrite appearance by high profile artists who otherwise might not appear in our community	18-34	4.07	1.62	45-54	5.16	1.73	.011
	18-34	4.07	1.62	55-64	5.18	1.69	.009
	18-34	4.07	1.62	65+	5.45	1.57	.000
Because I am concerned about popular culture and its effect on society	35-44	3.80	1.86	65+	4.49	1.79	.001
	45-54	3.97	1.91	65+	4.49	1.79	.001

### 3. What is the relationship between donor motivations and donor behavior?

#### *The relationship between donor motivation factors and donor behavior:*

The regression analysis of three newly constructed donor motivation factors on donor behavior, average donation from four years (seasons), three factors of donor motivation showed significant relationship with donor behavior, average donation amount over last four years although the motivation factors explained only 3% of variance in donor behavior ( $F(3, 1581) = 18.052, p < .00, \eta^2 = .033$ ). In detail, factor II (community and university support,  $t = 5.12, p < .00$ ) and factor

III (donor benefit,  $t = 3.73, p < .00$ ) were significantly related to donor behavior but factor I (civic and education,  $t = -1.936, p = .05$ ) was not significantly related to donor behavior.

Table 9: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior

	df	f	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1581	18.052			.00		.033
Factor I: Civic and education			-.068	-1.936	.053	-.049	
Factor II: Community and university support			.175	5.115	.000	.128	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.098	3.733	.000	.093	

*The relationship between donor motivation items and donor behavior:*

In addition to the regression analysis of motivation factors on donor behavior, we also conducted the regression analysis of donor motivation items on donor behavior. Twenty donor motivation items were significant related with donor behavior, average donation amount over last four years ( $F(20, 1279) = 4.029, p < .00, \eta^2 = .059$ ). In detail, only three items were positively related to donor behavior and one item was negatively related to donor item. The three items positively related to donor behavior are “To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors” ( $t = 5.28, p < .00$ ), “Because I have more money than I need” ( $t = 2.03, p < .05$ ) and “Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life” ( $t = 1.99, p < .05$ ) but “To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)” was negatively related to donor behavior ( $t = -2.35, p < .05$ ) was not significantly related to donor behavior.

Table 10: Regression analysis of donor motivation items on donor behavior

	df	f	Standardized beta	t	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	20/1279	4.029			.00		.059
To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors			.189	5.283	.000	.146	
To network for business purposes (me or my spouse/partner)			-.074	-2.353	.019	-.066	
Because I have more			.057	2.028			



money than I need					.043	.057	
Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life			.067	1.987	.047	.055	

4. What is the relationship between donor motivations and donor benefits?

*The relationship between donor motivation factors and donor benefits:*

The regression analysis result of donor motivation factors on an item, “To what extent do you consider your donations to be a transaction in exchange for specific benefits and privileges associated with your gift level?” showed that all three donor motivation factors were significantly related to the donors’ expectation for their benefits and privileges.

Table 11: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on expected level of exchange for specific benefits and privileges

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1736	249.401			.00		.301
Factor I: Civic and education			-.142	-5.042	.000	-.120	
Factor II: Community and university support			-.112	-4.059	.000	.097	
Factor III: Donor benefit			-.584	27.242	.000	.547	

The regression analyses of three donor motivation factors, civic and education, community and university support, and donor benefit, on seven different donor benefits. Donor motivation was significantly related to all seven donor benefits, priority seating ( $F(3, 1699) = 39.210, p < .00, \eta^2 = .065$ ), advance notice of programs ( $F(3, 1728) = 67.808, p < .00, \eta^2 = .105$ ), ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale ( $F(3, 1706) = 50.862, p < .00, \eta^2 = .082$ ), parking privileges ( $F(3, 1536) = 58.607, p < .00, \eta^2 = .103$ ), access to more in-depth experiences ( $F(3, 1654) = 198.167, p < .00, \eta^2 = .264$ ), opportunities to meet artists ( $F(3, 1661) = 201.612, p < .00, \eta^2 = .267$ ), and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program ( $F(3, 1415) = 100.740, p < .00, \eta^2 = .174$ ). People who are high in donor benefit-related motivation significantly

considered all donor benefits including priority seating ( $t = 9.86, p < .00$ ), advance notice of programs ( $t = 9.01, p < .00$ ), ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale ( $t = 7.85, p < .00$ ), parking privileges ( $t = 11.62, p < .00$ ), access to more in-depth experiences ( $t = 13.20, p < .00$ ), opportunities to meet artists ( $t = 14.08, p < .00$ ), and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program ( $t = 6.32, p < .00$ ). People who are high in civic and education motivation significantly considered advance notice of programs ( $t = 3.02, p < .005$ ), ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale ( $t = 2.25, p < .05$ ), access to more in-depth experiences ( $t = 9.96, p < .00$ ), opportunities to meet artists ( $t = 9.62, p < .00$ ), and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program ( $t = 8.36, p < .00$ ). In addition, people who are high in community and university support significantly considered advance notice of programs ( $t = 3.04, p < .005$ ), ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale ( $t = 2.99, p < .005$ ), and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program ( $t = 2.03, p < .05$ ).

Table 12: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, priority seating

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1699	39.210			.00		.065
Factor I: Civic and education			-.019	-.572	.568	-.014	
Factor II: Community and university support			.042	1.304	.193	.032	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.247	9.859	.000	.233	

Table 13: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, advance notice of programs

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1728	67.808			.00		.105
Factor I: Civic and education			.096	3.024	.003	.073	
Factor II: Community and university support			.095	3.043	.002	.073	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.219	9.001	.000	.212	

Table 14: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1706	50.862			.00		.082
Factor I: Civic and education			.074	2.253	.024	.054	
Factor II: Community and university support			.096	2.994	.003	.072	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.194	7.854	.000	.187	

Table 15: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, parking privilege

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1536	58.607			.00		.103
Factor I: Civic and education			.054	1.594	.111	.041	
Factor II: Community and university support			-.011	-.317	.752	-.008	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.301	11.622	.000	.284	

Table 16: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, access to more in-depth experiences

	df	F	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1654	198.167			.00		.264
Factor I: Civic and education			.295	9.961	.000	.238	
Factor II: Community and university support			.045	1.548	.122	.038	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.298	13.201	.000	.309	

Table 17: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, opportunities to meet artists

	df	f	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1661	201.612			.00		.267
Factor I: Civic and education			.285	9.619	.000	.230	
Factor II: Community and university support			.041	1.398	.162	.034	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.316	14.083	.000	.327	

Table 18: Regression analysis of donor motivation factors on donor behavior, opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality programs

	df	f	Standardized beta	T	P	Partial Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>
Donor motivation	3/1415	100.740			.00		.174

Factor I: Civic and education			.281	8.363	.000	.217	
Factor II: Community and university support			.067	2.033	.042	.054	
Factor III: Donor benefit			.165	6.321	.000	.166	

### Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to explore the various motivations of MUP donors and their relationships with donor behavior (donation amount) and donor benefits. In detail, we listed the study results under four different research topics: (1) motivations of MUP donors; (2) influence of gender and age on donor motivations; (3) relationship between donor motivations and donor behavior; and (4) relationship between donor motivations and donor benefits.

#### Motivation of MUP Donors

The motivation analysis started with the pre-hypothesized factors of donor motivation. The data included the 20 motivation items in five motivation dimensions: Civic/Demographic motivations, Cultural/artistic/educational motivations, Social motivation, Institutional motivations, and Personal or Ego motivations. However, due to the poor reliabilities of the pre-hypothesized factors, we explored the psychometric properties and statistical structures of the donor motivation items using the CFA and EFA analyses. From the EFA analysis, three factors were extracted. Factor I included eight items from Civic/Demographic and Cultural/Artistic/Educational motivations factors. Factor II comprised six items from three different motivation dimensions and Factor III included five items from the social motivations and Personal/Ego motivation items. However, one item “Because I have more money than I need” did not load with any other items. Although we used these three motivation factors (19 items) in the further analyses of the current study, the CFA results showed a very poor fit with new motivation structure and items. (see the result section for detail information regarding this issue) Thus, it is necessary to redesign a new motivation structure

with different sub-dimensions and to list new motivation items for MUP donors after a rigorous process of instrument creation such focus group or interview research with current MUP donors.

### Influence of Gender and Age on Motivation of MUP Donors

After restricting donor motivation factors and items, we explored the influence of gender and age on donor motivation. The results regarding gender influence on donor motivation in the current study partially confirmed a previous study on donor motivation. Staurowsky (1996) found in a study of athletic giving that males tended to be motivated by social motives and benefits such as preferred parking than females but male donors tended to be concerned with more philanthropic issues than male donors. In the current study, female MUP donors were significantly higher than male donors in two philanthropic factors, civic and education motives and community and university support, but female donors and males donors did not show the difference in donor benefit-related motivation factor. In addition, 10 out of 20 donor motivation items were significantly different between male and female donors and female donors were significantly higher than male donors on all of these 10 items except one item, “So that others can see that I am contributing.” These results also confirmed the previous research finding that females focused more on philanthropic causes than males when they donated money. However, overall gender explained very small variances in each item (less than 3.1%); thus, it is hard to conclude that gender has significant influence on donor motivation. More research on this issue should be conducted as well.

The donor motivation factors were compared by age cohorts used in MUP data, age 18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65+. As the influence of gender on donor motivation factors, age was significantly related to two motivation factors: civic and education factor and community and university support factor but there was no age difference in donor benefit motivation. The MUP donors over 65+ clearly showed higher civic and education and community and university support motivations than the MUP donors in 35-44 and 45-54 age groups. Also, the results regarding the

influence of age on donor motivation items showed that older MUP donors (especially, 65+) clearly showed higher motivations in most items except one donor motivation item, “to network for business purpose (me or my spouse/partner).” These results also confirmed the results of previous research. Midlarsky and Hannah ((1989) in a study of older adults and giving found that older adults were more likely to be motivated by altruism and that a linear relationship existed between age and giving, with older people more likely to donate than younger people. Midlarsky and Hannah found that as long as older people had the needed resource available, they were more likely to give it to those in need. However, interestingly, in our current study, MUP donors in 65+ age cohort were not significantly higher than MUP donors in 55-64 age cohort in most of items; thus, the existence of a linear relationship between age and donation should be reconfirmed.

#### The Relationship between Donor Motivations and Donation Amount

The study results showed that three factors of donor motivation showed significant relationship with donor behavior, average donation amount over last four years. MUP donors who were highly motivated by community and university support and donor benefit were likely to give more money. However, civic and education motivation was not significantly related to donation amount. Further, MUP donors who were highly motivated with the items “To enjoy the social opportunities provided to donors”, “Because I have more money than I need”, and “Because I want to leave a legacy that includes a vibrant cultural life” were likely to give more money than MUP donors who showed lower motivation in these three items. However, a motivation item “to network for business purposes” was negatively related to donor behavior (donation amount). Interestingly, the level of benefit-related motivation showed some type of significant relationships (either positive or negative) with donation amount; however, the amount of MUP donation was not influenced by the level of MUP donors’ true altruistic and philanthropic motives.

### The Relationship between Donor motivations and Donor Benefits

The study asked that preference of MUP donors on seven types of donor benefits including priority seating, advance notice of programs, ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale, parking privileges, access to more in-depth experiences, opportunities to meet artists, and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program. The motivation factors of MUP donors were significantly related to the donors' expectation for their benefits and privileges. As expected, people who are high in donor benefit-related motivation showed significantly positive relationships with donor benefits. People who were high in civic and education motivation significantly preferred advance notice of programs, ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale, access to more in-depth experiences, opportunities to meet artists, and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program. On the other hand, MUP donors with high community and university support significantly preferred only three benefits such as advance notice of programs, ability to purchase single tickets in advance of public sale, and opportunities to involve my children or grandchildren in quality program. These results showed that the preferred benefits of MUP donors were closely related to the motivation types of MUP donors. However, advance notice of programs and advance ticket purchasing were preferred by MUP donors regardless of their donor motivations.

### Recommendations to MUP

The results of the current research can provide very interesting information to the donor management of MUP. The results showed that the influences of gender and age on motivation of MUP donors were similar to those of other types of donors. Female donors or donors over 65 years old were more likely to possess higher altruistic and philanthropic motivation than male or younger donors. Also, for most of MUP donors, the level of their altruistic and philanthropic motivation was not significantly related to the amount of donation amount or preference in donor benefits.

However, MUP event or ticket-related benefits should continuously be provided to MUP donors as the expression of appreciation. Although it is hard to imply based on the result of the current research, it is possible that MUP donors may be unsatisfied with MUP donor management practices and stop giving money to MUP if the basic MUP event or ticket-related benefits are not provided to them.

On the other hand, for donors with high benefit-related motivation, MUP's new innovative practices can change the level of their donation amount. For example, the results of the current study showed that MUP donors highly concerning about social opportunities were likely to give more money to MUP and those people also preferred various donor benefits. Thus, MUP should provide more donor participating events which can escalate the satisfaction level of MUP donors and eventually increase their donation amount.

Although the results of the current study were quite interesting, the practical meaningfulness of the research results could be minimal (see the variance explained in each analysis). Thus, it is somewhat risky to design and place new donor management policies for MUP based on the current study results. Definitely, reliable and valid measures should be developed and used for next MUP studies (i.e., an accurate donor motivation scale, various donor behavior and benefit items). In detail, focus group and interview based studies on MUP donors and more rigorous literature reviews should be conducted to create a new donor survey.



## References

- Alderson, W. (1955). A functionalist approach to consumer motivation. Consumer behavior and motivation. In R.H. Cole (Ed). *Marketing Symposium*. University of Illinois, October, 1955, pp. 6-24.
- Allen, L. (1982). The relationship between Murray's Personality Needs and leisure interests. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14, 63-76.
- Andreoni, J. (1988). Privately provided public goods in a large economy: the limits of altruism. *Journal of Public Economics*, 35, 57-73.
- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: A theory of warm glow giving. *The Economic Journal*, 100, (June) 464-477.
- Batson, D. (1991). *The altruism question*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Becker, G. (1974). A theory of social interactions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 1063-1093.
- Becker, G. (1976). *The economic approach to human behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benapudi, N., Singh, S., & Benapudi, V. (1996). Enhancing helping behavior: An integrative framework for promotion planning. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 33-49.
- Beard, J. & Ragheb, M. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15, 219-228.
- Cialdini, R., Reno, R., & Kallgren, C. (1990). A focus of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58 1015-1026.
- Clary, G., & Orenstein, L. (1991). The amount and effectiveness of help: The relationship motives and abilities to helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17 (1), 58-64.

- Crask, M. (1981). Segmenting the vacation market: Identifying the vacation preferences, demographics and magazine readership of each group. *Journal of Travel Research*, 20, 29-34.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourist motivation: an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8: 187-219.
- Davis, M. (1994). Helping and empathy: Taking the multi-dimensional view. In C. W. Park & D. Smith (Eds). *Marketing theory and applications: American Marketing Association Winter Conference (I)*. Chicago: IL AMA.
- Dowd, J. (1975) Aging as exchange: A preface to theory. *Journal of Gerontology*, 30 (5), 584-594.
- Duncan, B. (2004). A theory of impact philanthropy. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, (9/10) 2159-2181.
- Edmonton, B. (1986) Who gives to charity? *American Demographics*, 8, 44-49.
- Fultz, J., Schaller, M., & Cialdini, R. (1988). Empathy, sadness and distress: Three related but distinct affective responses to another's suffering. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14 (2), 312-325.
- Giving USA Foundation. (2007). *Giving USA*. Retrieved June 9<sup>th</sup> from [http://www.aafrc.org/press\\_releases/gusa/20070625.pdf](http://www.aafrc.org/press_releases/gusa/20070625.pdf)
- Hayley, R. (1968). Benefit segmentation: A decision oriented research tool. *Journal of Marketing*, 32 (July), 30-35.
- Independent Sector (2001). *Giving and volunteering in the United State*. Retrieved June 9 from <http://www.independentsector.org/PDFs/GV01keyfind.pdf>
- Iso-Ahola. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing Co.

- Iso-Ahola, S. & Allen, J. (1982). The dynamics of leisure motivation: The effects of outcome on leisure needs. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 53, 141-149.
- Martin, M. (1994). *Virtuous giving: Philanthropy, Voluntary Service and Caring*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Midlarsky, E., & Hannah, M. (1989). The generous elderly: Naturalistic studies of donations across the life span. *Psychology and Aging*, 4, 346-351.
- Murray, H. (1938). *Exploration and Personality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pearce, P. (1982). *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Pearce, P., & Caltabiano, M. (1983). Inferring travel motivation from traveler's experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 21, 16-20.
- Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Giftgiving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 275-307.
- Schul, P., & Crompton, J. (1983). Search behavior of international vacationers: Travel specific lifestyle and socio-demographic variables. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22, 25-31.
- Shaw, S., & Taylor, M. (1995). *Reinventing fundraising: Realizing the potential of women's philanthropy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Staurowsky, E. (1996). Women and athletic fund raising: Exploring the connection between gender and giving. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 401-416.
- Tinsley, H., Barrett, T. & Kass, R. (1977). Leisure activities and need satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 9, 111-120.
- Walker, C., & Pharoah, C. (2002). *A lot of give*. London: Hodder and Soughton.
- Woodside, A., & Pitts, R. (1976). Effects of consumer life-styles, demographics and travel activities on foreign and domestic travel behavior. *Journal of Travel Research*, 14, 13-15.

Woodside, A., & Jacobs, L. (1985). Step two in benefit segmentation: Learning the benefits realized by major travel markets. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 24, (summer), 7-13.