Feed the World or Help the Heroes?
Exploring how Political Attitudes influence Charitable Choice

Revised Research Article submitted to Journal of Marketing Management
(2019 Academy of Marketing Conference Special Issue)

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

[1] Newcastle Business School
Northumbria University
Newcastle upon Tyne
England
NE1 8ST

* Corresponding Author

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

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

Suggested Running Head: Segmenting Donors based on Political Attitudes

Compliance with Ethical Standards: The authors can confirm that ethical approval has been ascertained at institutional level.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Feed the World or Help the Heroes?
Exploring how Political Attitudes influence Charitable Choice

Abstract

Very few examples of donor intention and donor segmentation based on individual attitudes are evident in the literature. Given the common use of the *domestic-versus-international* charity binary by donors when selecting types of charity to support, and the suggestion that political attitudes and charitable giving are potentially difficult to separate, the current study investigates if charitable choice is linked to attitudes towards immigration and military action.

Data from 398 online survey respondents using regression analysis identifies the most significant combination of donation predictors based on political and charitable attitudes. Political attitudes play only a limited role in explaining donation intention.

Further k-means cluster analysis leads to the development of four segments who vary in their donation intentions, political attitudes and preferred types of charities. This work extends existing knowledge on donor segmentation, charitable marketing and the interplay between politics and charitable giving.

Summary Statement of Contribution

This current study is one of few to focus on specific charitable types, extending knowledge of attitude-based donor segmentation and provides both academics and fundraisers with identifiable segments that are predisposed to different causes. We extend the notion of unpopular causes, with the data suggesting that appreciation of charities does not necessarily manifest itself in donations.

Keywords: Not for Profit Marketing; Political Marketing; Segmentation, Targeting and Positioning; Regression Analysis; Charitable Choice; Survey Research.

Funding: This study was funded by the Marketing Trust (no grant number available).

Word count (excluding tables and references): 7991

Feed the World or Help the Heroes?

Exploring how Political Attitudes influence Charitable Choice

Introduction

In September 2019, *The Times* (2019) criticised the Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) for funding projects in Africa after announcing UK job losses. The *Mail* (2019) followed by reporting how the charity allocates £3.3m (2%) towards various international projects to promote safe swimming. The RNLI publicly defended their overseas commitments, pointing to financial declaration, transparency and necessity for overseas spending. Within 24 hours, the *Guardian* (2019) reported how this response had generated a spike in donations prompting the RNLI website to temporarily crash.

Revelations that the RNLI engaged in international work cost them existing donors, but simultaneously opened the door for a new donor segment who aligned to a more cosmopolitan mission. Two key reflections emerge here. Firstly, the notion of charity begins at home (compatriots take priority: Schons, Cadogan and Tsakona, 2017) remains a guiding principle for many when prioritising charitable types. Secondly, issues of politics and charity are difficult to separate (Brooks, 2004). An individual's political attitudes and national identity represent key drivers in their charitable giving (Hart and Robson, 2019; Winterich, Zhang and Mittal, 2012).

The number of registered charities provides potential donors with further complexity in their decision-making; not only to consider the type of cause to support, but within each area there is an ever-increasing number of charities seeking donations. The UK has around 168,000

active charities (Charity Commission, 2018a), with the US boasting around 1.5m (National Charter for Charitable Statistics, 2019). Charities globally can be grouped into 12 categories based upon the International Classification of Non-profit Organizations (ICNPO, 2018). Whilst religious charities are dominant fundraisers in the US, health charities are particularly popular in the UK, benefitting from recent increases in legacy giving (Legacy Fundraising Market, 2019).

This study examines preferences for charities which differ by geographic location relative to the donor, drawing upon Social Identity Theory (SIT: Tajfel, 1974). According to SIT, an individual's group membership potentially leads to prejudice and discrimination when their desire to protect in-groups comes at the expense of out-groups (Hogg, 2006). Research exists identifying in-group bias when making monetary decisions (Stagnaro, Dunham and Rand, 2018). This occurs when individuals make evaluations based upon concrete construal; however, when their construal becomes more abstract this can result in decisions (donations here) not automatically favouring the in-group, based instead on other aspects of need (Costa Pinto and Borges, 2020). This paper also draws on theory concerning political identity, which concerns a person's beliefs about the underlying goals and ideals of a political system (Reyna et al., 2005). The dominant Western political identities (liberalism and conservatism) have been previously utilised to explain donation behaviour (Wiepking, 2010; Winterich, Zhang and Mittal, 2012). Not only does political identity impact charitable choice, it also influences perceptions of need. Whilst a liberal donor responds more positively to solicitations that blame external societal factors for issues such as poverty, conservatives instead prefer messages which focus on individual attribution and failings (Lee, Seo and Yoon, 2020).

Here, rather than focusing upon an individual's broad political ideology we consider upon attitudes towards specific political issues which clearly link to the liberalism-conservatism spectrum: Immigration and Military Policy.

This study assesses a nationally dispersed sample of the UK population, incorporating donor broad perceptions of charity, support for four specific types of national and international charities, donation intention and political attitudes. The work has four aims:

- To assess donor perception of work undertaken by specific types of national and international charity.
- To determine donor attitudes towards specific national and international charity categories.
- For donor intention towards these national and international alternatives, determine the significant predictors from donor perception of charity in a general sense, their attitudes towards immigration and military policy and predisposition towards the specific charity types.
- To identify potential donor segments who may be predisposed to types of charities defined by charitable and political attitudes, thereby addressing an area of charitable marketing which has received limited consideration (Andorfer and Otte, 2013).

Theoretical Background

Charitable Choice and Differences in Donation Preference

Charitable giving research traditionally focuses on reasons for donating (Andorfer and Otte, 2013; Bennett, 2003) ,although we have recently witnessed increasing outputs focusing specifically on how donors select charities to support (Chapman and Louis, 2018; Feeny *et al*., 2019; Neumayr and Handy, 2019; Van Dijk, Van Hert and Prins, 2019).

How to make donations be an economic one where the donor attempts to maximise utility, considering both beneficiary need and expected benefit (Snowden, 2019). It has been suggested that donors do not necessarily deliberate extensively when selecting charities but base their choices on heuristic cues such as the credibility of charity patrons or friendships with fundraisers (Breeze, 2013). In the UK, the most common charitable causes chosen by donors are medical research, animal welfare and children's charities (Charities Aid Foundation, 2018). In an American dictator-game style study, where respondents were asked to select a charity to support, the most popular categories supported were animal, human services and health (Kariv, Lee, List and Price, 2016). The same study also found that many of the words used by respondents to describe charities had a geographical aspect, including '*America*', '*National*' or references to specific regions or states.

Considering the role of values in charitable choice, Van Dijk *et al*. (2019) created a scale specifically tailored towards non-profits, finding compelling evidence that donors look for synergies between their personal values and those of charities they wished to support. Crucially, their data also demonstrated that such value congruence drives donations. Sneddon, Evers and Lee (2020) develop this further using US and Australian data, linking the

value of universalism with support for environmental and animal charities and tradition driving religious donations. Similarly, Chapman and Louis (2018) provide empirical support for the notion that donors will select charities which reflect the priorities of groups they personally belong to, e.g. those who are religious will in turn support charities promoted by their religious group. More broadly, Neumayr and Handy (2019) investigated if donor's subjective dispositions impacted not only choice of charity but also amount donated. Empathetic concern positively influenced likelihood to donate to causes such as international relief but did not impact on donation amount. This suggests that donor choice combines both selection of which charities to support and decisions concerning the extent of support required.

According to Breeze (2013), donors attempt to navigate the complexity of the charity sector through self-made classifications, with domestic versus international causes being a common binary utilised (Cheung and Chan, 2000; Radley and Kennedy, 1992). Studies in different parts of the world have consistently found a preference for donating to domestic over international charities (Casale and Baumann, 2015; Knowles and Sullivan, 2017; Micklewright and Schnepf, 2009). This has been attributed to obligation to assist co-nationals (Stevenson and Manning, 2010) and the possibility of benefitting from domestic charities in the future (Hall, Jones, Andrews and Cridland, 2013). In terms of supporting international causes through foreign aid, a discrete-choice experiment by Feeny *et al*. (2019) identified public priority for donation destinations where they perceived effective implementation over perceived need or their own personal interests. This reflects trust levels that are lower for international charities where the work outcomes are less visible (Charity Commission, 2018b). However, what appears lacking in such studies is a focus on specific charitable

causes that may further illuminate the domestic versus international donation dichotomy, which is central to the study presented here.

The notion of donor choice makes it inevitable that some causes will be less popular than others. Body and Breeze (2016) suggested many charities perceive themselves as unpopular with the public, with their analysis of media reports from 1994-2014 concluding that mental health, refugee/asylum seekers and ex-offenders' charities were those with the most onerous task in building supporter bases. More recently, it has been suggested that the least popular charitable causes include culture and recreation, education and training, environmental, political or religious causes (Hart and Robson, 2017), with various studies also evidencing an inherent preference for local and national over international causes (Casale and Baumann, 2015; Micklewright and Schnepf, 2009). This mirrors the 'buy local' movements observed across the globe, encouraging consumers to favour domestically sourced products (Brown, Meer and Williams, 2017). There are however two important caveats to such findings. As societal priorities change so do public perceptions of charitable worthiness (Body and Breeze, 2016). Recent years have witnessed a significant rise in awareness of mental health issues and subsequent charitable support in the UK (Charity Financials, 2017), although it is equally important to note popularity of some causes can vary notably by nation, as illustrated earlier.

This leads to hypothesis H_1 for this study:

H_1: Donation intention is greater for domestically focused charities compared with those directed internationally

Antecedents to charitable donation (and intention)

In assessing the antecedents to donation intention, it is important to note the comprehensive study into charitable choice provided by Neumayr and Handy (2019). They argued that many existing studies in this field limited themselves to one or two charitable causes, addressing this shortcoming in their work by investigating eight charitable sub-sectors across a sizeable sample of Austrian donors. Their two-stage Heckman regression analysis indicates various subjective characteristics such as empathetic concern alongside demographics including religious affiliation and education level, were related to donation intentions across the different causes. Donations to international charities related to trust, empathy and education level. Religious attendance increased propensity to donate to social services causes but reduced donations to culture, education and animal welfare charities. Their findings are noteworthy because of the differences highlighted in antecedents to donation intention emerging between domestic and international causes.

The application of regression-type approaches to the assessment of domestic versus international giving is well-established, with independent measures capturing socio-demographic characteristics of the donor (Micklewright and Schnepf, 2009; Casale and Baumann, 2015), as well as political and social attitudes (Wiepking, 2010).

This study seeks to consider the role played as predictor variables the political attitudes of the individual donor. This has merit, given research pointing to an individual's political allegiances and policy attitudes influencing donation choices (Atkinson, 2009; Brooks, 2004), with Wiepking (2010) suggesting donors with liberal, left-leaning political attitudes being inclined to support international initiatives. In contrast, feelings of national group membership identified through focused-group research (Stevenson and Manning, 2010) and personal identification with charity beneficiaries (Einolf, Philbrick and Slay, 2013) underpin

relatively greater donor support for charities with domestic outcomes, supported significantly through media exposure and investment in fundraising. Political attitudes, alongside specific sociodemographic characteristics have been identified as relevant to whether an individual chooses to support international causes ahead of domestic alternatives with 'political awareness' being highlighted (Rajan, Pink and Dow, 2009). This study will focus upon two areas of foreign political policy that concern relationships with other nations, namely immigration and military force.

In the charitable context, studies in experimental psychology have evidenced that individuals demonstrate racial bias when assessing the worthiness of recipients from differing national groups (Fong and Luttmer, 2009; Greenwald and Pettigrew, 2014). As surmised by Freeman, Aquino and McFerran (2008, p.73): 'ethnocentrism should be associated with reduced concern for the welfare of outgroups relative to one's in-group, which might be expressed by withholding donations from charities that benefit an out-group'. It is logical to assume that attitudes towards immigration and migrants may in turn shape donation behaviour, specifically the desire to donate to domestic versus international causes.

An individual's attitude to military action may affect their charitable donations. It has been noted that British shoppers are increasingly targeted with everyday items associated with the rapidly expanding number of military charities (Tidy, 2015). This, combined with the growing awareness of the complex support required to assist the 'heroic poor' (Herman and Yarwood, 2015; Stevelink, Jones, Hull, Pernet, MacCrimmon, Goodwin and Rona, 2018), suggests attitudes towards military action may relate to charitable decisions. Individuals with more bellicose views on foreign policy are likely to be more nationalist in nature and as such predisposed to supporting domestic over international causes (Bonikowski, 2016). Indeed,

Gribble, Wessley, Klain, Alexander, Dandeker and Fear (2015), through assessment of a large-scale data set from the British Attitudes Survey, identified that collecting for or donating to armed forces charities can be classified as a form of supporting military action.

This leads to hypothesis H_2 and sub-components:

H_2: For each charitable category, the significant predictors of donation intention are based on general attitudes towards charity, to specific charity types and the donor's political attitudes.

H_{2a}: Donation intention is dependent upon positive general attitudes towards charity

H_{2b}: Donation intention is dependent upon a positive attitude towards the specific type of charity

H_{2c}: Donation intention is dependent upon the donor's political attitudes

Identifying Domestic and International Causes and implications for segmentation

To understand variations in donor preferences, studies on donor segmentation have attempted to cluster donors based on propensity to donate to specific causes (Boenigk and Scherhag, 2014). Previous research has centred primarily on socio-demographic variables that are straightforward to identify and measure (Srnka, Grohs and Eckler, 2003). There is potential merit in assessing psychographic variables to explain donor preferences (Rupp, Kern and Helmig, 2014). Recent work from Denis, Pecheux and Decrop (2018) challenges the classic assumption that age and household composition as strong predictors of giving. Research which instead clusters donors based upon their political allegiances and charitable preferences has potential to inform not only theoretical knowledge of charitable choice, but also targeting strategies employed by fundraisers. Robson and Hart (2019) identified six

clusters of UK charitable donors, within which an individual's voting behaviour in the 2016 UK European Union membership referendum was a powerful predictor of segment membership and preferences for domestic versus international causes.

We seek to explore charitable choice further by identifying specific types of charitable cause that may relate to an individual's political attitudes. Our four chosen charitable cause categories are based upon the ICNPO (2018) classification outlined below, including example charities used in the primary study to ensure respondent understanding.

- Military Forces (e.g. Help for Heroes): Such charities belong to Group 4 ('Social Services') in the ICNPO classification. They work alongside Government to provide support to over six million armed forces personnel, ex-personnel and dependants (Directory of Social Change, 2014). Almost 200 new military charities have been registered since 2007 in the UK alone (Charity Commission, 2017).
- Emergency Services Charities (e.g. Great North Air Ambulance): ICNPO Group 3 ('Health') domestic causes are almost entirely dependent on public donations rather than Government funding (ACEVO, 2017). In this category, donors may be hesitant to support types of charity they feel should be subsidised by Government (Breeze, 2013).
- International Charities: Group 9 of the ICNPO index clusters all international causes, but within distinguishes between causes which are concerned with development assistance (longer-term projects) and disaster and relief (specific events requiring immediate response). We adopted this distinction here by identifying causes having long-term aspirations in the developing world (e.g. *WaterAid*) and those with specific remits to help civilians in the wake of natural or humanitarian crises (e.g. *Warchild*).

Numerous studies have treated these two sub-categories as distinct; Micklewright and Schnepf (2009) focusing on longer-term development giving, while Eckel, Priday and Wilson (2018) concentrated on donations to disaster relief causes.

Political Attitudes

Donor segmentation that extends beyond basic demographic factors are valuable to both theorists and fundraisers (Rupp, Kern and Helmig, 2014). An individual's political attitudes and support for foreign policy decisions may provide a window through which to better understand their charitable preferences. Those with conservative and liberal political tendencies hold distinct moral foundations which will result in differing donor behaviours (Winterich, Zhang and Mittal, 2012). These attitudes have potential to manifest themselves within clusters of donors, defining the resulting segments and informing approaches to marketing for these sub-groups.

Attitudes towards Immigration

Across Europe, debates around immigration and cultural diversity are regular topics of political discussion (Green, Fasel and Sarrasin, 2010). As well as the increased number of migrants heading to developed countries globally (Davidov and Meuleman, 2012), acts of terrorism and racially motivated riots bring into question the benefits of multiculturalism. Attitudes towards immigration can fluctuate based on factors such as perceived threat and the domestic economy (Coryn, Beales and Myers, 2004; Meuleman, 2011).

Data from the UK Migration Observatory suggests that although attitudes to immigrants are softening, a substantial majority of individuals would like immigrant numbers reduced (Blinder and Allen, 2018), with distinctions between different types of migrants being made. Skilled individuals from culturally similar nations are welcomed, less so immigrants from culturally distinct nations, resonating with Green *et al*. (2010) and Meuleman (2011). Various factors have been found to influence individual attitudes towards immigration, personality traits (Dinesen, Klemmensen and Nørgaard, 2016), levels of nationalism and patriotism (Green *et al*., 2010), proximity to geographic borders and media news coverage (Dunaway, Branton and Abrajano, 2010) and fear of crime (Fitzgerald, Curtis and Corliss, 2012). A review of over 100 studies by Hainmuller and Hopkins (2014) identified that immigration attitudes were based either on political economy (domestic labour market and fiscal burden impacts) or socio-psychological factors (encapsulating issues of race, ethnicity, cultural difference and threat).

Markaki and Longhi (2013) collated European-wide data showing large parts of the UK perceived higher levels of threat from immigration than the vast majority of Europe, a topic which appeared to be central in the 2016 EU membership referendum (Hobolt, 2016; Swales, 2016).

Attitudes towards Military Action

Within the last 30 years, the UK military has been deployed in an array of conflicts in various countries (Clements, 2012). Whilst the UK Armed Forces are perceived positively by the majority (Park, Clery, Curtice, Phillips and Utting, 2012), the public's approval of military inventions is erratic (YouGov, 2014) with very few perceiving the military as a budgetary

priority (Park *et al*., 2012). Hinckley (1988) asserts that public opinion influences the security and military policies adopted by Governments. However, as opinions held by the public tend to be largely influenced by cues from prominent political actors (Berinsky, 2007), there remains some debate as to the real public influence on decision-making.

Various research has sought to explore public opinion towards military action, typically using specific conflicts as case studies. A review of UK public opinion on conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan indicates public aversion to such action is heightened when the mission outcome is unclear and the public do not perceive casualties as a worthwhile sacrifice (Gribble *et al*., 2015). Reifler *et al*. (2014) have suggested that an individual's general disposition to military action is driven by rational cost-benefit calculations, moral-reasoning and elite cues (with variations evident across some demographic factors). Ringsmose and Børgesen (2011, p.505) argue that public support is largely dictated by the extent to which political elites provide 'strong narratives about the why-what and how of overseas military missions'.

This assessment of donor segmentation leads to hypothesis H_3.

H_3: Donor segmentation exists defined by donation intentions, political attitudes, charity attitudes and predisposition towards different charities.

Study Design, Data Collection and Analysis

Data capture, participant selection and ethics

The study used an online survey targeting 398 individuals across the UK. These donors were accessed via a marketing research company during March 2018, who incentivised participation through payment. Ahead of deploying the study instrument, the authors secured ethical support for this research from their University.

Instrument design

The first part of the instrument focused on respondent attitudes towards charity. This included distinct items that assessed their general disposition to, and support for, charitable work (Table 2) and explored further into their attitudes towards their selected charitable categories. There were four items covering military, five assessing emergency services and four items considering international and disaster relief. Respondents also indicated their donation intention to each of the four donation categories with a single item statement for each (Table 3). These questions, covering basic intentions to donate and attitudes towards specific types of charity, were self-developed for this study. Where the opportunity to assess these questions pre-survey was restricted to assessment of face validity, but without opportunity for a quantitative pilot assessment representing a limitation, the assessment of the constituent scale sets as part of the substantive study points to the development of four reliable scales. Table 1 indicates high levels of internal reliability for each, with an alpha value of 0.935 for the scale relating to perception of charity and a range of alpha values between 0.876 and 0.895 for the

scales that assess recognition of the specific charitable areas of military, emergency services and international concerns.

Part two of the instrument assessed the political attitudes of the respondents. It used questions already in the public arena to assess attitudes towards immigration and UK military action. Firstly, items from the British Social Attitudes Survey (2012) were employed to capture attitudes relating to immigration (five items designed to capture both the benefits and challenges of immigration. Secondly, support for UK military action was assessed using eight items that considered various forms of military involvement, ranging from utilising peacekeeping teams to physical military attacks (taken from the British Attitudes Survey, 2014).

All items presented in parts one and two of the study instrument involved 7-point Likert scales, labelled from *Very Likely*' (7) to '*Very Unlikely*' (1) for statements requesting levels of support and '*Strongly Agree*' (7) to '*Strongly Disagree*' (1) or '*Very Likely*' (7) to '*Very Unlikely*' (1) for items assessing agreement levels.

Reverse scoring of particular statements was not incorporated into the instrument design (although immigration assessment includes attitudes towards benefits and challenges), but data quality was supported through avoidance of participants responding at pace by randomising the respective statements within parts 1 and 2 of the instrument and screening out participants who completed their questionnaire below a particular allocation of time.

The final part of the instrument covered respondent demographics; gender, age-band, marital status and social class. These demographic questions were in multiple choice format.

Analysis

Initial data analysis involved percentage frequency distributions and summary measures for charitable donation perception and donation intention across our four charitable categories. The level of agreement or donation intention is assessed at item level through one-sample t-tests, as well as differences between donation intentions by means of pairwise assessment. This assessment links to study aims 1 and 2 presented earlier and evaluation of hypothesis H_1.

With various scales employing a range of items as indicated above, data simplification was beneficial to the multiple regression analysis and the cluster analysis which form the substantive analysis in this paper. This was achieved by using a mean score across the associated items for each scale. This approach is reasonable given the levels of internal reliability that are evident within each scale, assessed via Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The α-values ranged from 0.858 to 0.935 (Table 1 presents α-coefficients and number of items per scale). These results avoided item removal to enhance internal reliability, and mean scores were then used to represent each of the named variables (scales) based upon the respective constituent items.

[Table 1 here]

Correlation analysis is employed to consider how donation intention relates to various determinants (attitude towards charity in general, attitudes towards each specific charitable type and donors' political attitudes). Significance of these various tests is reported at the 5%, 1% or 0.1% significance levels, alongside the correlation coefficients.

Multiple regression analysis extended this assessment, assessing their respective relationships with each of the antecedent variables listed in Table 1. The Enter method of regression modelling allowed assessment of the various explanatory variables in combination, providing identification of which were statistically significant or not. Because each model considers only seven explanatory variables and where parsimony is not an intention of this model development (instead the models are determining which of the predictors in combination are statistically significant), it was not necessary to adapt a stepwise approach to variable selection. However, for these regression models, the potential existence of multicollinearity is assessed through examination of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each explanatory variable included in the respective models, given the potential for inter-correlation between these measures, and as observed through the correlation analysis to be presented (see Findings below). The assessment of VIF follows the guidance provided by Berenson, Levine and Krehbiel (2002), with indication of multicollinearity between the independent variables being signposted by VIF values exceeding 5.

The correlation and regression analysis presented addressed aim three stated in the paper's introduction, with the four multiple regression models permitting assessment of hypothesis H_2 (parts H_{2a}-H_{2c}) presented in the paper's theoretical background.

To consider donor segmentation, it was essential to identify a workable method of cluster analysis. Various clustering approaches exist, each accompanied by levels of judgement (Manly, 1994). The k-means method of clustering was adopted, given the relatively straightforward computation where the number of clusters identified is (potentially) small and manageable. This was based on the four areas of likely donation intention presented in Table

3. It was first necessary to determine k, the number of distinct donor clusters, achieved by means of an initial hierarchical clustering (the scree diagram and '*elbow rule*' of interpretation being employed), coupled with judgement for the number of potential clusters given the distinct areas of charitable donation. Setting the value of k to four, the k-means cluster analysis was executed using the four variables representing donation intention, and in doing so, facilitated the allocation of donors to one of the four defined clusters. Data standardisation was unnecessary given the deployment of 7-point scales, with no evident data outliers.

Post-hoc assessment comprising ANOVA helped determine which cluster variables were statistically significant in explaining cluster membership, and in turn, cluster definition through levels of statement agreement. This assessment was extended by determining relationships between cluster membership and the demographic measures measured in the study instrument, using chi-squared tests for statistical independence. Where significant association exists between cluster membership and demographic (5% or 1% significance levels), comparison of observed and expected values provides indication of the donor characteristics within each cluster. This was reinforced by assessing differences in the mean scores for each of the antecedents to donation intention (charity perception, attitude/recognition of the charity types, donor attitudes towards immigration benefits and concerns and support for UK military action) between the clusters using ANOVA. This analysis considered the (aggregated) variables in Table 1. The cluster analysis and related post-hoc assessment of the donor groupings address aim four of the study and provide assessment of hypothesis H_3.

Findings

Participant Overview

The 398 donors are weighted towards women (68.6%) compared with men (31.4%). The modal age groups were 25-34 (26.9%) and 35-44 (21.4%). Married respondents represented 53.5% of the sample, with a further 23.1% reporting as single and 15.3% cohabiting. The sample represented all UK regions, the largest groupings being South East England (17.1%) and North West England (14.6%). The most represented socio-economic groupings were AB (29.8%) and C1 (29.8%). Variation between the sample and UK adult population clearly exist across multiple measures (Office for National Statistics, 2017), particularly gender, although a healthy range of sub-groups in the UK donor population are represented in a survey sample of enough size in absolute terms.

Charity, Charitable Types and Donation Intention Perceptions

The respondents' attitudes towards charity generally is presented in Table 2. All four measures are assessed using a 7-point scale ranging from '*strongly agree*' (7) to '*strongly disagree*' (1). Assessment of mean scores and significant differences from the 'centre' value of 4.5 (mean values significantly greater represents overall level of statement agreement) suggests all four items show high levels of donor accord, with means ranging between 5.04 and 5.51. Statement agreement ranges from 59.7% to 76.0%, the standout being '*Charities do valuable work and should be supported*', with a mean of 5.51. Each mean value is significantly greater than 4.5 at the 0.1% significance level ($p < 0.001$).

[Table 2 here]

For future donation intention involving the four charitable categories considered (measured from '*very likely*' (7) to '*very unlikely*' (1)), levels of accord are not as strong as that presented for endorsement of charitable work generally. For the specific types of charity presented in Table 3, likelihood of donation ranges between 34.7% to 46.7%.

[Table 3 here]

There is relative popularity for '*an emergency services related charity*', 46.7% being likely to donate to varying degrees giving a mean of 4.48. This contrasts with '*an international crisis emergency fund*' (mean of 4.01 and 34.7% demonstrating some likelihood). Apart from the emergency services charity (where no significant difference from 4.5 is identified), the three other options have mean values (4.09, 4.14 and 4.01) which are significantly lower than 4.5 ($p < 0.001$), suggesting moderate levels of donation intention for each. Pairwise assessment of the charitable alternatives suggests a significantly greater level of donation intention for emergency services charities compared with the other options ($p < 0.0001$ in each assessment). There is also greater likelihood of donation to '*a humanitarian aid related charity that helps other countries*' compared with '*an international crisis emergency fund should one occur*' ($p < 0.01$). This allows support for hypothesis H_1.

Correlation Analysis - Donation Intention, Attitudes to Charity, Charity Types and Politics

By assessing intention to donate with predisposition to charity in general, charity recognition and political attitudes, various statistically significant correlations emerge, as presented in Table 4.

[Table 4 here]

Unsurprisingly, donation intention for military charities is correlated with positive recognition of military charities in general ($r = 0.545$, $p < 0.001$), but also with the perceived importance of emergency services charities ($r = 0.319$, $p < 0.001$) and to a smaller extent support for UK military intervention ($r = 0.283$, $p < 0.001$). From a political perspective, there is greater association with commitment to military charities rather than to either benefits or concerns relating to immigration. Donation intention for emergency services charities correlated with recognition of such charities' work ($r = 0.469$, $p < 0.001$) and military charities ($r = 0.353$, $p < 0.001$). Donation intention for humanitarian charities is strongly correlated, unsurprisingly, to recognition of the role of international charities ($r = 0.677$, $p < 0.001$) and is highly correlated to a positive perception of charity in general terms ($r = 0.414$, $p < 0.001$). With consideration of political attitudes, it is correlated in an intuitive directional sense with the perceived benefits ($r = 0.396$, $p < 0.001$) and concerns ($r = -0.189$, $p < 0.01$) of immigration. More surprisingly, there is a modest positive but statistically significant association with support for UK military action ($r = 0.184$, $p < 0.01$). The profile of correlations for international emergency crisis donation intention is very similar.

Regression Analysis - Donation Intention and their Antecedents

Table 5 presents a multiple regression model for each of the four donation destinations. The four models demonstrate overall statistical significance ($p < 0.001$ for each model), although given the focussed number of independent variables considered, each has only a modest level of fit, the respective adjusted R^2 values ranging between 26.1% and 47.7%. The F-change statistic for each model is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$ in each case) suggesting the inclusion of multiple explanatory variables in each models improves their respective ability to predict. Given that a stepwise application to the development of the models has not been considered, the step-by-step improvement to model fit is not reported here, given the alternative priority to cross-compare the four regression models across the declared hypotheses aligned to Enter method of variable selection.

[Table 5 here]

For military charity, the most significant predictor variable is the predisposition towards this specific charity area, i.e. the importance given to military charities ($\beta = 1.118$, $p < 0.001$). The importance given to other charitable areas is either non-significant, except where importance given to emergency services is significant ($\beta = -0.382$, $p = 0.003$), but in a negative sense, suggesting preference for a domestic option is in favour of one area of donation at the expense of another. The importance given to charity in general plays a non-significant role for each of the alternatives assessed here, except again for donation to military charities where its partial role is both negative and statistically significant ($\beta = -0.245$, $p = 0.007$). Interestingly, positive attitudes towards the benefits of immigration is a significant predictor for various of the charity types being assessed, including military alternatives ($\beta = 0.154$, $p = 0.022$).

For emergency services, the most significant predictor variable is the importance given to emergency service charities ($\beta = 0.687$, $p < 0.001$). Support for the benefits of immigration represents a significant predictor variable ($\beta = 0.139$, $p = 0.035$), as is recognition of the challenges relating to immigration ($\beta = 0.167$, $p = 0.008$).

For intentions towards humanitarian aid, the most significant predictor variable is the importance given to international and third world charities ($\beta = 0.801$, $p < 0.001$), alongside support for the benefits of immigration ($\beta = 0.173$, $p = 0.005$). The former is also evident for donation intention involving international crisis emergency funds ($\beta = 0.904$, $p < 0.001$), although in contrast, a further significant predictor variable can be seen in recognition of the challenges related to immigration, perhaps surprisingly, ($\beta = 0.110$, $p = 0.049$).

For political attitudes, UK military action support is a non-significant predictor in each of the four models when assessed in combination with the other explanatory variables considered.

Combining the regression analysis assessment, this suggests that hypothesis H_2 can be supported partially given the existence of various statistically significant predictors for each donation area. H_{2b} is supported given the significance of the specific areas of donor recognition, although the relatively patchy influence observed for political attitudes means H_{2c} can only be partially supported. The general support for charity by the donors in having either no significant influence (in three of the four models) or a counter-intuitively negative significance (for military charity donation) on these specific donation intentions means H_{2a} is not supported. This rejection of H_{2a} would appear to be counterintuitive, because of the high levels of correlation between general support for charity and each of four areas of donation

intention (correlations range between 0.211 and 0.414, $p < 0.001$, see Table 4). There is a high level of association between this general support and support for the three specific charitable categories (correlations range between 0.518 and 0.578), perhaps pointing to a potential for multicollinearity within the four regression models presented. However, this problem is resolved through consideration of VIF values provided in the analysis (see Table 5), which range between 1.415 and 3.157, all of which are under the threshold value of 5.

Donor Segmentation

Four clusters of charitable donors emerged from the sample. The subsequent k-means cluster analysis based on these four (donation likelihood) variables defined cluster membership for each case. ANOVA assessment for each of the cluster variables were statistically significant in terms of mean score by cluster, as indicated in Table 6 (each $p < 0.001$).

[Table 6 here]

In terms of post-hoc analysis for the antecedents to donation intention (general support for charity, specific recognition of the three types of charitable concern assessed, political attitudes relating to immigration benefits and concerns and attitudes towards UK military action), ANOVA suggests each of these antecedent measures is statistically significant. Five show differences in mean score by cluster at the 0.1% significance level ($p < 0.001$), with immigration concerns ($p = 0.001$) and support for UK military action ($p = 0.002$) showing significant differences in mean scores at the 1% level. The mean scores for each cluster variable and antecedent measures presented in Table 6 point to clear differentiation across

clusters labelled 1 to 4. In demonstrating this level of segmentation of the donor data according to charitable alternative, hypothesis H_3 can be supported.

Further post-hoc assessment involving donor demographics provides further definition to each cluster. The four clusters described and named in the section below are summarised in Table 7. Gender displays no significant association with cluster membership ($p = 0.316$), unlike age-band ($p = 0.024$), marital status ($p = 0.022$) and occupational group ($p = 0.005$).

Cluster Characteristics

Cluster one (*The Disengaged and Disapproving)* is the smallest emerging group, representing 12.1% of donors. This group exhibit very low likelihood of charitable donation, consistent across all four charities (means range from 1.38 to 1.72). In terms of antecedents, they are slightly positive in absolute terms in perception of charity role (mean of 4.76), indicating potential predisposition to other charitable concerns not explored here. Their appreciation of the roles of military, emergency services and international charities shows some variation (respective means of 4.53, 4.77 and 3.64), pointing to greater predisposition towards concerns that are domestically focussed, but also recognition levels that are not supported by willingness to donate. For the last option, this is resonant with their lack of support for the perceived benefits of immigration (mean of 3.24), and to some extent their positivity towards potential immigration concerns (cluster mean of 4.63). They are slightly more neutral in support for UK military action (cluster mean of 4.57), but overall, their political attitudes are not particularly polarised. Donors here are more likely to belong to socio-economic groups D or E.

Cluster two (*The Charitable Fence-Sitters)* represent the largest emerging cluster, capturing 44.2% of donors. They are more likely to be 25-34 or 45-54, be living with a partner and are over-represented by occupational group C1. Cluster two members are relatively neutral regarding donation intention (means ranging from 3.60 to 4.09), with the lowest level of support relating to military concerns. For antecedents, they are positive in perceptions of charity in principle (cluster mean of 5.07), alongside recognising the role of military, emergency services and international charities (cluster means of 4.79, 4.96 and 4.52). They are supportive of the role of the UK in military action (mean of 4.78), moderate in their appreciation of the benefits of immigration (cluster mean of 4.17) and likewise with its potential challenges (mean of 4.35). Whilst their political attitudes and general recognition for charity and specific concerns being assessed are not radically different to their *The Disengaged and Disapproving*, their neutral levels of donation intention represents something relatively more positive compared with cluster 1.

The third cluster (*The UK Centrics*) accounts for 14.5% of donors. They are over-represented in the 35-44s, 55-64s and 65-74s, more likely to be married or have been in a previous relationship and are highly represented in occupational groups D and E. Cluster three members typically support and exhibit higher donation intention to both military and emergency services related charities (cluster means of 5.57 and 5.34) and for donation antecedents, exhibit broad overall support for charity in general (mean of 5.02). They are negative towards humanitarian aid and international crisis related concerns which feeds into lower levels of donation intention (cluster means of 2.64 and 2.46). Cluster members demonstrate clear unease with immigration, with recognisable negativity towards the perceived benefits to UK society and high levels of agreement with the associated challenges (respective cluster means of 3.31 and 5.41). They demonstrate high levels of support for UK

military action (mean of 5.06). Their attitudes towards domestically oriented charities is strong, with respective means for military and emergency services charities of 5.85 and 5.62 (resonating strongly with respective donation intentions) but are also consistently negative in attitude towards international concerns (cluster mean of 3.40).

The fourth cluster (*The Cosmopolitan Givers*) comprises 29.2% of donors. They are over-represented in the 18-24s, the cluster also has a higher proportion of members who are likely to be married and belong to occupational group AB. They have greater propensity to give to each type of charity examined (mean scores range from 5.20 to 6.12), especially humanitarian aid related charities. In terms of antecedents to charitable donation, they display the strongest support for charity in principle (cluster mean of 6.03) and they have high levels of recognition for each of military, emergency services and international charities (means ranging between 5.19 and 5.92), with relatively stronger attitudes towards international alternatives. Cluster 4 members indicate high levels of support for both UK military action and benefits of immigration (respective means of 5.29 and 4.90). They are neutral in absolute terms about potential immigration challenges (cluster mean of 4.49).

[Table 7 here]

Discussion and Conclusions

Donation Intention and Attitudes

This study contributes to understanding of charitable choice, looking at how donors differentiate and prioritise between charities that support domestic versus international beneficiaries. The findings reveal distinct donor segments that are more responsive towards domestic charities, with certain segments (*UK Centrics*) attuned to the '*Charity Begins at Home*' mind-set. Given the rising prominence of populism in countries across the world, it may reflect a wider global perspective which prioritises the needs of fellow nationals, although clearly research conducted in other regions is required to verify this assertion.

There is clear support for emergency services charities, but also positive attitudes towards military charities and those with international and humanitarian outcomes, although the latter receive relatively less recognition. This points to greater empathy for domestic concerns supporting data from the United States (Casale and Baumann, 2015). There appears to be a perceptions-donation gap amongst respondents; individuals typically report higher levels of appreciation for specific charities than donation intention. For the four charitable categories assessed, the modal response relating to donation intention was '*neither likely nor unlikely*' at around 30% to 35%.

Donation Intentions, Charity Attitudes and Political Attitudes

Attitudes towards specific areas of charitable work (e.g. recognition of military charities and associated activity) provides the strongest respective predictor for donation intention for each

charity type considered. From a political perspective, the benefits of immigration represent the strongest predictor of donation intention for both international and crisis relief charities (i.e. donors who are positively predisposed to cultural diversity are more predisposed to supporting causes beyond the UK: Micklewright and Schnepf, 2009). Donors who are supportive of UK military action are more predisposed to supporting domestic military charities. Charities may wish to consider the population's broad attitudes to immigration as it may provide clues as to their willingness to support international causes. Data from Pew Research (2019) suggests Canada typically shows the most positive attitudes towards immigration and prioritises giving to the poor (including those located internationally: CAF, 2019).

The four regression models are consistent in pointing to the most important predictor for each charitable type being the attitude of the donor towards that specific charitable area, e.g. the most significant predictor of military charity donation is the level of recognition given to military charities by the donor. It is important to see from each model the non-significant or counter-intuitively negative role played by attitudes towards charity in general, suggesting that marketing such charities must attract the donor through the specifics of the donation cause rather than any approach generic to charity. Whilst attitudes towards UK military intervention plays no significant role in determining donation likelihood for any of the charity types, attitudes towards immigration benefits and immigration challenges act as significant predictors. Both play a significant role in predicting donation intention across the range of charities.

Implications of Four Donor Segments

Donor segmentation and targeting is complex, with few marketers able to ascertain the sort of attitudes-based data utilised in our cluster analysis. Four distinct segments have emerged that specifically address support for military, emergency services, international and crisis relief charities. In some cases, this analysis points fundraisers towards specific segments they should prioritise in future campaigns, equally, it suggests that certain charities may never resonate with certain segments and are best avoided.

The Disengaged and Disapproving are highly unlikely to donate to any of these charities beyond one-off, impulsive contributions. This is the smallest cluster and coupled with their unwillingness to donate and relatively neutral political attitudes, represent the donor group with the least giving potential. This segment is not hostile to charity *per se*, particularly those UK-centred, suggesting other charitable categories without a "*political*" flavouring may enjoy more success.

The Charitable Fence-Sitters are the largest cluster and therefore carry significant value in their pursuit, underpinned by greater propensity to donate. Cluster members demonstrate support for emergency services, humanitarian aid and international crisis relief charities, but relatively less so for military-focused concerns. The latter is not a lost cause within this segment given their relatively positive attitudes towards military-related charities. They do not hold particularly polarised political attitudes on immigration, but are slightly more predisposed to UK military policy, thereby having a relatively more progressive political outlook compared with *The Disengaged and Disapproving*. A lack of hostility towards

immigration suggests these donors will not be deterred by marketing signals that capture diversity, allowing charities positions that are either UK-specific or international in form.

The UK Centrics are positive towards military and emergency services charities, but not toward international or crisis relief charities. They are supportive of UK military action, hold strong attitudes towards immigration concerns but less appreciative of potential benefits. Given these clear preferences, marketing messages must be UK-oriented, adopting a traditionalist tone given the dominance of specific age groups. Distinct campaigns centred on positive attitudes toward military charities and emergency services charities will resonate here. The older age of this cluster links clearly with research undertaken on charitable bequests such as James III and Baker (2015), who identified from US and Australian data levels of end of life donations formalised within estate plans. This segment may be worth targeting with bequest solicitations on entering retirement age.

The Cosmopolitan Givers are typically younger and appear the most educated. They are empathetic to UK-based charities and demonstrate a positive disposition towards UK military action, with associated donation intention levels. There is also international focus to their charitable recognition and donation intention. These participants hold positive attitudes towards benefits and at most neutral attitudes about challenges associated with UK-immigration. Marketers can approach this segment with either UK-focused or internationally based messages. Despite their young age, it has been found that donors to international relief organisations do typically place higher importance on charitable bequests than supporters of more national level charities (Lehman and James III, 2019), suggesting longer-term strategies may have mileage with this group. *Cosmopolitan Givers* may well have been exposed to the need for global charities through personal travel, so countries which typically have higher

numbers of their population travelling abroad may be home to donors having the greatest potential to support international charities.

Study Strengths and Limitations

The study indicates that whilst the public have a positive disposition towards charity, the four types of charity investigated do not appear to resonate with the sample of potential charity donors. This endorses the work of Body and Breeze (2016) which argues that some causes are inherently more popular than others. The findings suggest that whilst a distinction appears between intentions to support domestic versus international charities, the emergency services perhaps bridges that gap and can secure support from donors who demonstrate both domestic and cosmopolitan outlooks. This supports the notion of abstract construal from Costa Pinto and Borges (2020), where donation decisions are not purely made to serve the in-group.

Our development of four distinct segments extends knowledge of attitudes-based donor segmentation (Rupp, Kern and Helmig, 2014) and provides practical insights on where and how fundraisers best allocate often-sparse marketing budgets. The existence of segments such as the *UK Centrics* provide further evidence of in-group preference in line with Social identity Theory (Tajfel, 1974), although the *Cosmopolitan Givers* display broader desire to assist both in-groups and out-groups.

The authors would encourage two specific streams of future research to extend knowledge of these segments. Firstly, work conducted in other countries (both those with high and low levels of private donations as monitored by the Charities Aid Foundation) should investigate if such donor segments are applicable in other parts of the world. Given varying levels of

nationalism observed across nations (Gijsberts and Hagendoom, 2017) this may lead, for example, to clusters varying in their size or attitudes. Particularly interesting contextual factors here may include the presence of governments with more socialist paradigms and differing attitudes to immigration. Secondly, further research should be undertaken with these segments to understand more on their donation preferences. Are there any forms of international charity that *UK Centrics* would be willing to support? Do the *Disengaged and Disapproving* increase their charitable engagement on the back of events which stretch the institutions they claim to appreciate (e.g. has covid-19 altered their intentions to support emergency services)? It would be especially useful if such research considered a wider range of charities rather than focusing on charities which specifically represent a domestic-international dichotomy.

The study makes various contributions to knowledge. In terms of level of donation intention, the emergency services lead the way, thereby reinforcing the idea that domestically oriented charities have relatively greater popularity than international alternatives internationally, be this focus indirect (military services) or explicit (humanitarian aid or disaster relief). However, all charitable types considered here have relatively modest levels of intention attached, confirming the idea that causes with a "political" image are perhaps less popular than charity in the more general sense. This raises interesting questions about the role of political identity, not just of donors but of the charities themselves.

The study suggests donation intention to each charitable type is explained most significantly by explicit recognition to the type of concern rather than by recognition to charity generally, the latter in some of the alternatives considered actually negates the power of the specific message, whilst politically, UK military activity and the positives of immigration play some

role. Assessing the role of political attitudes explicitly, with associated regression analysis and cluster-based segmentation, gives a new perspective on donor attitude assessment with particular reference to a suite of charity types that are contemporary and valued, but are accompanied by a particular image for the donating public. A fruitful line of enquiry from this point would be to further investigate the role of specific political attitudes on charitable giving. Once the United Kingdom is fully separated from the European Union, will the establishment of trade deals impact on donor preferences to support certain countries?. Alternatively, an interesting angle might be attitudes towards the environment, their interplay with government policy and subsequent donation intentions to green charities.

Researchers are encouraged to build upon this work by investigating charitable spaces that are becoming increasingly mainstream as societal attitudes develop (e.g. mental health charities) may provide interesting contexts for exploring donor preferences. An area that seems particularly ripe for investigation is the charitable choices of migrant populations, particularly how the domestic versus international charity dichotomy applies to such groups. Whilst many migrants may assimilate to the host culture, others retain strong links with their home country (long-distance nationalism: Skrbis, 2017), this potentially impacting on charitable choice.

We recognised the sample limitations in our study signposted earlier in the analysis section of the paper as benchmarked against the wider UK population (Office for National Statistics, 2017), although consider the assessment of the UK donor public to be a credible one, given the number of respondents assessed in an absolute sense. The case and approach for weighting data is documented in the academic literature on statistical analysis, thereby responding to issues such as non-response or under-coverage. This was not undertaken here,

primarily because of the range of demographics that would have to be addressed in the weighting process, and as such, claims for generalising the study findings are done so with care.

In designing the statements to assess donation intention, we illustrated each charitable alternative with an example well known to the UK donating public, this approach is evidenced by other research in the area of charitable giving where specific charitable cause forms the basis of the item statements deployed (Knowles and Sullivan, 2017). This is further seen more generally as acceptable practice in the development of items in survey design. It may be argued that we may have biased the statements with the characteristics of the organisations showcased in the respective items rather than representing the area of donation being assessed. This could be the true where any of the illustrated organisations may be a relatively stronger (or weaker) example within the represented sector or as perceived by the donors targeted within the study. As such, this represents a potential limitation in the development of specific items within the study instrument. The rationale for illustrating the set of statements in this way primarily to differentiate between the two international alternatives, given emergency aid and humanitarian crisis may not be immediately obvious within the broader donor public. We sought to provide clarity to the survey respondents, between the two forms of international giving, which other studies do not always do. For the donor intention statements, it was simply to provide a relatively high-profile example to ensure the respondents were certain what the terminology meant within the study, given our uncertainty that it may not resonate with some of the study participants. For example, the term "*military charities*" may steer some participants towards thinking about government led activities to support veterans. Similarly, the term "*emergency services*" may be assumed, without illustration by some donors as relating to initiatives that are also government funded.

In illustrating the four areas as best as possible for the study participants, it is perhaps debatable as to equivalence across the four examples used with respect to the direct or indirect links to the political attitudes held by the individual. In each case, it was not the intention to do this, but rather best illustrate each charity type with an identifiable example and see whether donation intention relates to attitudes held through the analysis undertaken. There are numerous examples of charities in each of the areas, the choices made represent suitability and wider donor recognition.

References

Acevo (2017). The Charity Report. Available at: https://www.acevo.org.uk/policy-representation/books-and-research-reports (Accessed 8th January 2019).

Andorfer, V.A. and Otte, G. (2013). Do contexts matter for willingness to donate to natural disaster relief? An application of the factorial survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *42*(4), 657-688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012440180

Atkinson, A. B. (2009). Giving overseas and public policy. *Journal of Public Economics*, *93*(5), 647-653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.12.001

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.

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

Berinsky, A. J. (2007). Assuming the costs of war: Events, elites, and American public support for military conflict. *The Journal of Politics*, *69*(4), 975-997.

Blinder, S., and Allen, W. (2018). UK public opinion toward immigration: Overall attitudes and level of concern. *Migration Observatory Briefing Paper, University of Oxford*.

Body, A., and Breeze, B. (2016). What are 'unpopular causes' and how can they achieve fundraising success? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *21*(1), 57-70.

Boenigk, S., and Scherhag, C. (2014). Effects of donor priority strategy on relationship fundraising outcomes. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *24*(3), 307-336. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21092

Bonikowski, B. (2016). Nationalism in settled times. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *42*, 427-449.

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

British Attitudes Survey (2014). Report on British Attitudes to Defence, Security and the Armed Forces. Available at: https://yougov.co.uk/topics/international/articles-reports/2014/10/25/report-british-attitudes-defence-security-and-arme (Accessed 10th February 2018).

British Social Attitudes Survey (2012). 'Fewer but better'? Public views about immigration. Available at: https://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/1141/bsa29_immigration.pdf (Accessed 14th February 2018).

Brooks, A.C. (2004). The effects of public policy on private charity. *Administration and Society*, 36(2), 166-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399704263474

Brown, A. L., Meer, J., and Williams, J. F. (2017). Social distance and quality ratings in charity choice. *Journal of behavioral and experimental economics*, 66(1), 9-15.

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

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 (2018). CAF UK Giving 2018. Available at: https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/about-us-publications/caf-uk-giving-2018-report.pdf (Accessed 1st December 2018).

Charities Aid Foundation (2019). Canada Giving 2019. Available at: https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/about-us-publications/caf-canada-giving-report-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=c77d9940_4 (Accessed 3rd April 2020).

Charity Commission (2017). Decision Military charities: group case report. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/military-charities-group-case-report/military-charities-group-case-report (Accessed 10th November 2018).

Charity Commission (2018a). Recent charity register statistics. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/charity-register-statistics/recent-charity-register-statistics-charity-commission (Accessed 10th January 2019).

Charity Commission (2018b). Trust in Charities. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/723566/Charity_Commission_-_Trust_in_Charities_2018_-_Report.pdf (Accessed 2nd April 2020).

Charity Financials (2017). Mental Health Charities Growing Well. Available at: https://www.charityfinancials.com/charity-financials-insider/mental-health-charities-growing-well-1717.html (Accessed 4th October 2019).

Cheung, C. K. and Chan, C. M. (2000). Social-cognitive factors of donating money to charity, with special attention to an international relief organization. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23(2), 241-253. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7189(00)00003-3

Clements, B. (2012). Public opinion in Britain towards military action in Libya: a micro-level analysis. *Politics*, *32*(2), 109-119.

Coryn, C. L., Beale, J. M., and Myers, K. M. (2004). Response to September 11: Anxiety, patriotism, and prejudice in the aftermath of terror. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, *9*(12), 165-183.

Costa Pinto, D., Borges, A., Maurer Herter, M., & Boto Ferreira, M. (2020). Reducing Ingroup Bias in Ethical Consumption. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *30*(1), 31-63.

Dalton, S., Madden, H., Chamberlain, S., Carr, S. and 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, 492-504.

Davidov, E., and Meuleman, B. (2012). Explaining attitudes towards immigration policies in European countries: The role of human values. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *38*(5), 757-775.

Denis, E., Pecheux, C., & Decrop, A. (2018). Segmenting the Belgian charitable sector: The impact of environmental factors on households' generosity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *23*(3), e1606.

Dinesen, P. T., Klemmensen, R., and Nørgaard, A. S. (2016). Attitudes toward immigration: The role of personal predispositions. *Political Psychology*, *37*(1), 55-72.

Directory of Social Change (2014). UK Armed Forces Charities. An Overview and Analysis. Available at: https://www.dsc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Sector-Insight-UK-Armed-Forces-Charities.pdf (Accessed 8th January 2019).

Dunaway, J., Branton, R. P., and Abrajano, M. A. (2010). Agenda setting, public opinion, and the issue of immigration reform. *Social Science Quarterly*, *91*(2), 359-378.

Einolf, C.J., Philbrick, D.M., and Slay, K. (2013). National giving campaigns in the United States: Entertainment, empathy, and the national peer group. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(2), 241-261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012467230

Eckel, C. C., Priday, B. A., & Wilson, R. K. (2018). Charity Begins at Home: A Lab-in-the-Field Experiment on Charitable Giving. *Games*, *9*(4), 95.

Feeny, S., Hansen, P., Knowles, S., McGillivray, M., & Ombler, F. (2019). Donor motives, public preferences and the allocation of UK foreign aid: a discrete choice experiment approach. *Review of World Economics*, *155*(3), 511-537.

Fitzgerald, J., Curtis, K. A., and Corliss, C. L. (2012). Anxious publics: Worries about crime and immigration. *Comparative Political Studies*, *45*(4), 477-506.

Fong, C.M., and Luttmer, E.F.P. (2009). What Determines Giving to Hurricane Katrina Victims? Experimental Evidence on Racial Group Loyalty. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1(2); pp. 64–87.*

Freeman, D., Aquino, K., and McFerran, B. (2009). Overcoming beneficiary race as an impediment to charitable donations: Social dominance orientation, the experience of moral elevation, and donation behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(1), 72-84.

Gijsberts, M., & Hagendoorn, L. (2017). *Nationalism and exclusion of migrants: Cross-national comparisons*. Routledge, UK..

Green, E. G., Fasel, N., and Sarrasin, O. (2010). The more the merrier? The effects of type of cultural diversity on exclusionary immigration attitudes in Switzerland. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, *4*(2), 177-190.

Greenwald, A. G., and Pettigrew, T. F. (2014). With malice toward none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist*, *69*(7), 669.

Gribble, R., Wessley, S., Klein, S., Alexander, D. A., Dandeker, C., and Fear, N. T. (2015). British Public Opinion after a Decade of War: Attitudes to Iraq and Afghanistan. *Politics*, *35*(2), 128-150.

Guardian (2019). RNLI donations surge after Tory criticism of its work overseas. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/sep/16/rnli-donations-surge-tory-criticism-work-overseas-lifeboat-charity (Accessed 4th October 2019).

Hainmueller, J., and Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *17*, 225-249.

Hall, D., Jones, S.C., Andrews, K. and 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., and Robson, A. (2017). Charity Begins at Home: Understanding the role of national identity on propensity to donate to local, national and international charities. Available at:

http://www.marketingtrust.org/downloads/Marketing_Trust_Charity_Begins_at_Home.pdf (Accessed 10th January 2019).

Hart, D. J., and Robson, A. (2019). Does Charity Begin at Home? National Identity and Donating to Domestic Versus International Charities. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(4), 865-880.

Herman, A., and Yarwood, R. (2015). From warfare to welfare: veterans, military charities and the blurred spatiality of post-service welfare in the United Kingdom. *Environment and Planning A*, *47*(12), 2628-2644.

Hinckley, R. H. (1988). Public attitudes toward key foreign policy events. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *32*(2), 295-318.

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *23*(9), 1259-1277.

Hogg, M. A. (2006). Social identity theory. *Contemporary social psychological theories*, 13, 111-1369.

ICNPO (2018). The International Classification of Non-profit Organisations. Available at: https://www.volunteergreatermoncton.com/icnpo.php (Accessed 8th January 2019).

James III, R. N., & Baker, C. (2015). The timing of final charitable bequest decisions. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *20*(3), 277-283.

Kariv, S., Lee, D., List, J., and Price, M. (2016). *The Richness of Giving: Charity Selection and Charitable Gifts in a Large Field Experiment*. Available at: https://ideas.repec.org/p/feb/artefa/00559.html (Accessed 4th October 2019).

Knowles, S. and Sullivan, T. (2017). Does Charity Begin at Home or Overseas*? Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(5), 944-962.

Legacy Fundraising Market (2019). A growing market lays the foundations for a vibrant future for legacy fundraising. Available at: https://cdn.rememberacharity.org.uk/app/uploads/2019/04/UK-Legacy-Marketplace-Summary-Report-Apr-2019-FINAL-v2.pdf (Accessed 2nd April 2020).

Lehman, J., & James III, R. N. (2019). Charitable bequest importance among donors to different types of charities. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 1-18.

Mail (2019). RNLI buys burkinis for Africans as it axes 100 UK jobs. Available at: https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7464961/How-3-3million-donations-RNLI-spent-abroad.html (Accessed 4th October 2019).

Manly, B.F.J. (1994). *Multivariate Statistical Methods – A primer*, 2nd edition, Chapman and Hall.

Markaki, Y., and Longhi, S. (2013). What determines attitudes to immigration in European countries? An analysis at the regional level. *Migration Studies*, *1*(3), 311-337.

Meuleman, B. (2011). Perceived economic threat and anti-immigration attitudes: Effects of immigrant group size and economic conditions revisited. *Cross-cultural analysis: Methods and applications*, 281-310.

Micklewright, J. and Schnepf, S.V. (2009). Who Gives Charitable Donations for Overseas Development? *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(2), 317-341.

National Charter for Charitable Statistics (2019). The Nonprofit Sector in Brief. Available at: https://nccs.urban.org/project/nonprofit-sector-brief (Accessed 2nd October 2019).

Neumayr, M., and Handy, F. (2019). Charitable Giving: What Influences Donors' Choice Among Different Causes? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(4), 783-799.

Office for National Statistics (2017). Overview of the UK Population. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/articles/overviewoftheukpopulation/july2017. (Accessed 10th January 2019).

Park, A., Clery, E., Curtice, J., Phillips, M. and Utting, D. (2012). British Social Attitudes: the 29th Report. Available at: www.bsa-29.natcen.ac.uk (Accessed 10th January 2019).

Pew Research (2019). Around the World, More Say Immigrants Are a Strength Than a Burden. Available at: https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2019/03/14/around-the-world-more-say-immigrants-are-a-strength-than-a-burden/ (Accessed 3rd April 2020).

Radley, A. and Kennedy, M. (1992). Reflections upon Charitable Giving: A Comparison of Individuals, from Business, 'Manual' and Professional Backgrounds. *Journal of Community and Applied Asocial Psychology*, 2(2); pp. 113-129.

https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2450020208

Rajan, S. S., Pink, G. H. and 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

Reifler, J., Clarke, H. D., Scotto, T. J., Sanders, D., Stewart, M. C., and Whiteley, P. (2014). Prudence, principle and minimal heuristics: British public opinion toward the use of military force in Afghanistan and Libya. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *16*(1), 28-55.

Reyna, C., Henry, P. J., Korfmacher, W., & Tucker, A. (2006). Examining the principles in principled conservatism: the role of responsibility stereotypes as cues for deservingness in racial policy decisions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *90*(1), 109.

Ringsmose, J., and Børgesen, B. K. (2011). Shaping public attitudes towards the deployment of military power: NATO, Afghanistan and the use of strategic narratives. *European Security*, *20*(4), 505-528.

Robson, A., and Hart, D. (2019). The post-Brexit donor: segmenting the UK charitable marketplace using political attitudes and national identity. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, *16*(2), 313-334.

Rupp, C., Kern, S., and Helmig, B. (2014). Segmenting nonprofit stakeholders to enable successful relationship marketing: A review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *19*(2), 76-91. https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1492

Schons, L. M., Cadogan, J., and Tsakona, R. (2017). Should charity begin at home? An empirical investigation of consumers' responses to companies' varying geographic allocations of donation budgets. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(3), 1-18.

Skrbiš, Z. (2017). *Long-distance nationalism: diasporas, homelands and identities*. Routledge.

Sneddon, J. N., Evers, U., and Lee, J. A. (2020). Personal Values and Choice of Charitable Cause: An Exploration of Donors' Giving Behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 1-24.

Snowden, J. (2019). Should we give to more than one charity? In Greaves, H. & Plummer, T. (Eds.), *Effective Altruism: Philosophical Issues*, Oxford University Press, UK, 69-79.

Srnka, K. J., Grohs, R., and Eckler, I. (2003). Increasing fundraising efficiency by segmenting donors. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, *11*(1), 70-86.

Stagnaro, M. N., Dunham, Y., and Rand, D. G. (2018). Profit versus prejudice: harnessing self-interest to reduce in-group bias. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*(1), 50-58.

Stevelink, S. A., Jones, M., Hull, L., Pernet, D., MacCrimmon, S., Goodwin, L. and Rona, R. J. (2018). Mental health outcomes at the end of the British involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts: a cohort study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *213*(6), 690-697.

Stevenson, C. and 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

Swales, K. (2016). *Understanding the Leave Vote*. Available at: https://whatukthinks.org/eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/NatCen_Brexplanations-report-FINAL-WEB2.pdf (Accessed 1st June 2018).

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

Tidy, J. (2015). Forces sauces and eggs for soldiers: Food, nostalgia, and the rehabilitation of the British military. *Critical Military Studies*, *1*(3), 220-232.

Times (2019). RNLI funding burkinis for Africans while cutting jobs. Available at: https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/rnli-funding-burkinis-for-africans-while-cutting-jobs-tnctwwl7d (Accessed 4th October 2019).

van Dijk, M., Van Herk, H., and Prins, R. (2019). Choosing your charity: The importance of value congruence in two-stage donation choices. *Journal of Business Research*, *105*, 283-292.

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(6), 1073-1087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.06.005

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., and Mittal, V. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: Insights from Moral Foundations Theory. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *29*(4), 346-354.

YouGov (2014). Report on British Attitudes to Defence, Security and the Armed Forces. Available at: https://yougov.co.uk/news/2014/10/25/report-british-attitudes-defence-security-and-arme/ (Accessed 10th January 2019).

Tables

	Charity Perception	Recognition of military charities	Recognition of international charities	Recognition of emergency services charities	Immigration Benefits	Immigration Concerns	Support for the UK in military action
α-coefficient	0.935	0.895	0.890	0.876	0.858	0.885	0.935
No. items	4	4	4	5	2	3	8

Table 1: Cronbach alpha coefficients – antecedents to charity donation

	Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Charities do valuable work and should be supported	27.7%	30.0%	18.3%	18.1%	2.3%	2.0%	1.5%	5.51	1.36
I am proud that my country has so many charities	18.4%	26.8%	14.5%	28.1%	7.1%	3.6%	1.5%	5.04	1.46
I admire people who fundraise for charity	23.8%	28.4%	22.5%	18.2%	5.1%	1.3%	0.8%	5.41	1.30
Charities make the world a better place	22.2%	30.1%	17.9%	21.4%	5.1%	2.6%	0.8%	5.32	1.36

Table 2: Donor attitudes towards charitable activities

	Highly Likely	Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neither Likely nor Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Unlikely	Highly Unlikely	Mean	Standard Deviation
A military related charity (e.g. Royal Legion/Help for Heroes)	10.6%	11.1%	17.3%	31.2%	10.6%	6.7%	12.6%	4.09	1.75
An emergency services related charity (e.g. Royal National Lifeboat Institution/Air Ambulance)	12.1%	16.0%	18.6%	33.2%	8.2%	5.4%	6.4%	4.48	1.60
A humanitarian aid related charity that helps other countries (e.g. Oxfam International/Water Aid)	11.1%	13.1%	14.1%	31.6%	11.6%	7.5%	11.1%	4.14	1.75
An international crisis emergency fund should one occur (e.g. Nepal Earthquake Appeal/Syrian Crisis Appeal)	6.4%	15.4%	12.9%	34.7%	11.3%	6.9%	12.3%	4.01	1.68

Table 3: Likelihood of charitable donation for alternative causes

	Charity Perception	Recognition of military charities	Recognition of international charities	Recognition of emergency services charities	Immigration Benefits	Immigration Concerns	Support for the UK in military action
	Antecedent Measures (single aggregate variables)						
A military related charity (e.g. Royal Legion/Help for Heroes)	0.211†††	0.545†††	0.150††	0.319†††	0.071	0.161††	0.283†††
An emergency services related charity (e.g. Royal National Lifeboat Institution/Air Ambulance)	0.284†††	0.353†††	0.284†††	0.469†††	0.163††	0.104	0.151††
A humanitarian aid related charity that helps other countries (e.g. Oxfam International/Water Aid)	0.414†††	0.179††	0.677†††	0.296†††	0.450†††	-0.189††	0.184††
An international crisis emergency fund should one occur (e.g. Nepal Earthquake Appeal/Syrian Crisis Appeal)	0.333†††	0.146††	0.682†††	0.293†††	0.396†††	-0.163††	0.121†

† - significance at the 5% level, †† - significance at the 1% level, ††† - significance at the 0.1% level

Table 4: Correlations between donation likelihood and potential antecedents to charitable donation

	Beta Coefficients								
	Likelihood of Donation -								
	Military Charity		Emergency Services		Humanitarian Aid		International Crisis Emergency Fund		Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	
Importance given to military charities	1.118	9.689†††	-0.010	-0.086	-0.065	-0.620	-0.131	-1.310	2.948
Importance given to international and third world causes	0.148	1.688	0.091	1.062	0.801	10.055†††	0.904	11.939†††	2.018
Importance given to emergency services charities	-0.382	-2.991††	0.687	5.499†††	-0.022	-0.193	0.076	0.692	3.157
Attitude towards UK military intervention	0.039	0.494	-0.052	-0.670	0.006	0.078	-0.270	-0.399	1.415
Attitude towards the benefits of immigration	0.154	2.298†	0.139	2.123†	0.173	2.842††	0.096	1.663	1.741
Attitude towards the challenges of immigration	0.096	1.504	0.167	2.663††	0.076	1.302	0.110	1.981†	1.610
Attitude towards charity in general	-0.245	-2.718††	-0.075	-0.850	0.091	1.117	-0.071	-0.908	2.071
F	23.890†††		15.964†††		38.758†††		39.632†††		
Degrees of freedom (d.f.)	(7/289)		(7/289)		(7/289)		(7/289)		
R^2 (adjusted)	35.1%		26.1%		47.2%		47.7%		
R^2 change	0.367		0.279		0.484		0.490		
F change (7,289)	23.890†††		15.964†††		38.758†††		39.632†††		

† - significance at the 5% level, †† - significance at the 1% level, ††† - significance at the 0.1% level (two-sided)

Table 5: Regression models between donation likelihood and potential antecedents to charitable donation

	A military related charity (likelihood of donation)	An emergency services related charity (likelihood of donation)	A humanitarian aid related charity that helps other countries (likelihood of donation)	An international crisis emergency fund should one occur (likelihood of donation)	Charity Perception	Recognition of military charities	Recognition of international charities	Recognition of emergency services charities	Immigration Benefits	Immigration Concerns	Support for the UK in military action
	Cluster Variables				**Antecedent Measures (post-hoc analysis)**						
ANOVA: F statistic	154.914	214.173	423.538	402.846	20.716	28.326	74.785	25.644	20.864	6.017	4.920
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002
Cluster 1	1.38	1.72	1.49	1.40	4.76	4.53	3.64	4.77	3.24	4.63	4.57
Cluster 2	3.60	4.09	4.05	4.04	5.07	4.79	4.52	4.96	4.17	4.35	4.78
Cluster 3	5.57	5.34	2.64	2.46	5.02	5.85	3.40	5.62	3.31	5.41	5.06
Cluster 4	5.20	5.80	6.12	5.81	6.03	5.19	5.63	5.92	4.90	4.49	5.29

Table 6: Defining measure mean scores – by cluster

(Variables 1-4 are the cluster variables 5-11 are the antecedents assessed as part of the post-hoc analysis)

Disengaged and Disapproving	***The Charitable Fence-Sitters***
Our smallest segment (12.1%)	The largest cluster identified (44.2%)
Show no clear-cut positivity towards military, emergency service, international or humanitarian charities	Some support for emergency services, humanitarian aid or international crisis relief charities, slightly less so military ones
Not generally hostile to charity, so may be attracted to other causes	They do not hold particularly strong views on immigration and UK military policy
Do not hold polarised views on immigration or military policy	More likely to be 25-34 or 45-54, be living with a partner and be from occupational group C1
More likely to be single and from occupational groups D or E	
The UK Centrics	***The Cosmopolitan Givers***
The second smallest cluster emerging (14.5%)	The second largest segment (29.2%)
Positive towards military and emergency services charities, but not towards humanitarian aid or international crisis relief charities	Supportive of charities based in the UK
Are supportive of UK military action	They also support charities with an international focus, particularly humanitarian aid
Negative towards immigration benefits, more persuaded by the challenges of immigration	They are positive about the benefits of immigration and are relatively more neutral about its challenges
They are more likely to be in age bands 35-44, 55-64 and 65-74	Supportive of UK military action at home and overseas
They are more likely to be married or have been in a previous relationship (divorced/separated/widowed) and from socio-economic groups D and E	Socio-economic group AB, more likely to be married, but also found in the 18-24 age band

Table 7: Key characteristics of the four donor segments