

https://dspace.org/

SOUTH AFRICAN MOTIVATIONS FOR SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Miller, Stephen

2014-01-20
http://hdl.handle.net10539/13529

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

SOUTH AFRICAN MOTIVATIONS FOR SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Stephen Miller

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in 25% fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management)

February 2013

Declaration

I declare that this report is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management) in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.



Stephen Miller

28 April 2013

Table of Contents

Chap.	Title	Page
1.	**Introduction**	**Pg. 5**
1.1	Background to the Study	Pg. 5
1.2	The Research Problem and Purpose	Pg. 11
1.3	The Research Questions	Pg. 13
1.4	Structure of the Research Paper	Pg. 15
2.	**The Literature Review**	**Pg. 17**
2.1	Introduction to the Literature Review	Pg. 17
2.2	Motivation and Giving Behaviour	Pg. 18
2.3	The Social Giving Behaviour of South Africans	Pg. 22
2.4	Individual Giving at the International Level	Pg. 29
2.5	Conclusion to the Literature Review	Pg. 31
3.	**Research Methodology and Collection**	**Pg. 33**
3.1	Reasons for Applying a Mixed methodology	Pg. 33
3.2	Data from the Literature Review	Pg. 35
3.3	The Qualitative Component	Pg. 35
3.4	The Quantitative Component	Pg. 40
4.	**Presentation and Analysis of the Research Results**	**Pg. 43**
4.1	Profile of the Interview Respondents	Pg. 43
4.2	Key Findings of the Research Interviews	Pg. 47
4.3	Key Findings of the On-Site Poll	Pg. 54
5.	**Analysis of the Research**	**Pg. 56**
5.1	Introduction	Pg. 56
5.2	The Analysis	Pg. 57
6.	**Conclusions and Implications**	**Pg. 61**
7.	**References**	**Pg. 63**

Figures and Tables

#	Title	Page
Tab. 1	South Africa's Rankings on the World Giving Index, 2011	Pg. 24
Fig. 1	Proportion of South Africans who give money, goods or time	Pg. 27
Fig. 2	Official Humanitarian Assistance: Government and Private Contributions	Pg. 29
Fig. 3	Donation profiles of the respondents	Pg. 43
Fig. 4	Racial profiles of the respondents	Pg. 44
Fig. 5	Educational achievement of the respondents	Pg. 45
Fig. 6	Origin of the respondents	Pg. 46
Fig. 7	Age of the respondents	Pg. 46
Tab. 2	The incidence of respondents giving money, time and goods	Pg. 49
Fig. 8	The primary stated motivations for donating to MSF	Pg. 51
Fig. 9	Percentage of respondents who became donors following a direct solicitation	Pg. 52
Fig. 10	Preferences for International or Local NGOs	Pg. 53
Tab. 3	"What made you decide to donate to an international cause?"	Pg. 55
Tab. 4	"Why did you decide to support MSF in particular?"	Pg. 55

Abstract

Humanitarian aid delivered during times of emergency is a critical resource not only for responding to immediate needs, but also for helping affected communities to build resilience and to combat poverty over the longer term. However, recent reductions in official humanitarian aid by many western governments have resulted in unmet financing needs being at their worst in over a decade. With limited government resources available, International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) have come to rely increasingly upon private voluntary contributions when responding to complex humanitarian emergencies.

Existing research into the social giving habits of South African citizens suggests that substantial private resources for international humanitarian work may be available for INGOs in this country, despite academic claims to the contrary. However, minimal research has thus far been conducted into the propensity for South Africans to donate to international causes.

This research paper is a preliminary investigation into the increasing internationalisation of charitable giving in South Africa. The primary data source is the self-reported motivations of South African citizens who regularly give unrestricted financial support to Médecins Sans Frontières / Doctors Without Borders (MSF) for humanitarian work that is conducted outside of South Africa's borders. The paper's findings are further based on quantitative data from an on-site poll and an extensive literature review.

The purpose is to better understand the giving behaviour of current donors to international causes, so as to inform further research into the likelihood for South Africa to become a major source of private funding for global humanitarian assistance. The research paper concludes that that there is great potential for INGOs to solicit financial support for international causes from South African donors.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

1.1.1 The Similarities Between Development and Humanitarian Aid

This research paper is concerned specifically with private contributions for humanitarian aid projects that are channelled through international non-governmental organizations (INGOs). The term 'humanitarian aid[1]' covers funding and action to save lives and to alleviate the suffering of vulnerable populations affected by emergencies (Global Humanitarian Assistance Report, 2011). Such emergencies, which include conflicts and natural disasters, serve to exacerbate poverty levels in developing countries and to impede their social and economic development. Humanitarian aid is therefore a critical resource not only for responding to immediate needs during emergencies, but also for helping affected communities to build resilience and to combat poverty over the longer term.

As such, humanitarian assistance interventions have evolved beyond the provision of rapid relief services and materials to include the rehabilitation of infrastructure as well as a number of other support services carried out by government and private agencies. For the most part, contemporary humanitarian aid agencies promote sustainability and the provision of integrated services, both previously the preserve of development assistance. In addition, a new form of 'political humanitarianism' has stretched the mandate of humanitarian assistance to include the strengthening of civil institutions, conflict resolution, and the promotion of security sector reform (Degnbol and Enberg, 2003).

This diversity of relief activities often results in an unclear distinction between 'humanitarian aid' and 'development assistance' during periods when people are exposed to prolonged vulnerability. This is because in order to reduce a population's vulnerability to conflict and disasters, humanitarian aid agencies

[1] 'Humanitarian aid' and 'humanitarian assistance' are used interchangeably in this report

are often obliged to adopt approaches and strategies quite similar to those applied by actors involved in the provision of development assistance. Humanitarian aid's distinctiveness from development assistance is thus reduced.

This has implications for academic researchers attempting to determine the exact size of the humanitarian aid sector in terms of funding flows as well as the number of implementing agencies that are engaged strictly in the provision of emergency relief services. INGOs range in size and many operate in multiple settings with multi-sector mandates. Many are involved in advocacy, policy formulation and a number of other areas that complement their core operational activities. Furthermore, there is also no single repository for information on global humanitarian aid expenditure, which complicates the accurate measurement and disaggregation of financing flows for humanitarian assistance.

1.1.2 How Humanitarian Interventions are Funded

The focus of this research paper is on the extent and growing influence of financial contributions from individuals for international humanitarian assistance interventions. Of particular interest are the personal motivations that drive these private voluntary contributions. The central question is "Why do people donate to INGOs who provide emergency assistance abroad?" However, the data that is readily available on private funding for INGO humanitarian assistance interventions is very rarely disaggregated by donor type, meaning that trends in individual giving are difficult to discern.

In INGO parlance and in much of the literature on philanthropy, 'private contributions' refers not just to voluntary donations from individuals, but also to the financial support provided by private foundations, trusts, companies and corporations (the Global Humanitarian Assistance Report, 2011). It is a complicated process for researchers to isolate information on the volume and

importance of aid that comes strictly from individuals[2]. Out of necessity the trends on the extent of private funding for humanitarian assistance discussed in this research paper therefore include contributions from all of the aforementioned sources.

Nevertheless as an indicator of the relative size of individual contributions, the most exhaustive study into global private contributions by donor type estimates that income from individuals represents over two-thirds of all private funding (Soianova, 2011). This has meant that over the decade to 2012, such private funding for humanitarian assistance assumed a growing importance for INGOs responding to complex disasters.

However, private contributions still represent a relatively minor source of funding within the total humanitarian assistance industry. Expenditure by governments, either bilaterally or multilaterally or through INGOS, still forms the bulk of today's humanitarian aid. Most analysis of financing for humanitarian interventions by INGOs focuses on this official support from governments and other multi-lateral donors rather than on the support from private individuals. This is because data on the volume and use of official humanitarian support from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members is rigorously recorded and readily available for research purposes.

The DAC is a grouping of the largest aid donors in the world, which includes the European Union and 23 rich-world countries[3]. It serves as a forum to coordinate the development and humanitarian aid efforts of these countries. Reliable reporting by the DAC in the form of regularly published statistics on aid expenditure compares favourably with the lack of consistent reporting on the flow of humanitarian assistance from private individuals. Therefore many of the institutional aid trends[4] in this report are based on DAC statistics.

[2] There are however some specialized reports that focus exclusively on individual giving. These will be discussed in section 2: Literature Review

[3] DAC member countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States

[4] Institutional' funding includes humanitarian aid from governments and multi-lateral organizations; it does not include private contributions

Levels of official humanitarian assistance fluctuate on an annual basis depending on the severity of specific disasters and on the collective response to INGO appeals in any given year (Development Initiatives, 2012). Both institutional and private expenditure tends to increase following a major disaster, and then to contract in the years immediately afterwards. However, once annual official aid levels rise in response to a major disaster, they very rarely subside to the levels recorded in the years prior.

For example, institutional and private funding for INGO activities increased significantly following a devastating earthquake in Haiti in 2010. That year official humanitarian assistance reached US$18.8 billion worldwide. However in 2011 there were fewer severe emergencies and aid fell to US$17.1 billion. Yet even though there was a reduction in expenditure in 2011 as compared to 2010, official humanitarian aid that year was still greater than the US$15.3 billion recorded in 2009 (OECD, 2012). This repeated effect resulted in a general upward trend in financing for humanitarian interventions over the decade to 2010 (UN FTS, 2012).

Nonetheless, the upward trend of official government assistance is now under threat due to the political and fiscal repercussions of the global financial crisis of 2007 / 2008 and the ongoing Euro-Zone crisis. DAC member governments have come under extreme political pressure to apply austerity measures to items such as their foreign aid budgets. As a result, in 2011 official humanitarian expenditure by DAC members declined as a percentage of gross domestic profit for the first time in 15 years (Stirk, 2012). Greece cut its total foreign aid by 39%, Spain by 32% and Belgium by 13%. Only three members of the DAC, namely Germany, Sweden and Italy, increased their official development assistance in 2011 (Mahoney, 2012).

These severe reductions in humanitarian aid by DAC members has led to unmet financing needs for humanitarian interventions being at their worst in over a decade (Global Humanitarian Assistance Report, 2012). The recent decline in government receipts has also had a considerable impact on the operations of INGOs that are reliant upon the largess of these traditional institutional donors.

1.1.3 The Growing Importance of Emerging Economies and Private Voluntary Contributions for Humanitarian Assistance

Fortunately there have been two important changes to the global aid architecture that may yet serve to sustain levels of humanitarian assistance. The first development is that official humanitarian expenditure by emerging economies such as Brazil and China has increased over the past five years (Smith, 2011). This type of humanitarian spend is somewhat erratic and regionally-focussed, but it is growing in significance as emerging economies gain political and economic prominence.

The growing influence of emerging economies such as South Africa has resulted in new ways of delivering relief and development aid, with a greater focus on innovative South-South cooperation. For example in 2011 the South African government, along with its counterparts in Brazil and India, established the 'Poverty and Hunger Alleviation Fund' to offer alternative financing arrangements for partners in the global south (Smith, 2011). The following year, in April 2012, the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA) was launched. This new agency was tasked with coordinating government aid for development and relief interventions throughout the African continent.

SADPA is expected to become fully operational in 2013 and will function along the lines of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). Although significantly smaller than these two agencies, SADPA will potentially administer a fund of up to R3 billion (Tapula, de Kock & Sturman, 2012). As in the case of many other emerging economies, this in effect establishes South Africa as a 'donor country' that is seeking to increase its involvement in the international delivery of emergency humanitarian aid.

The second major development in humanitarian funding is the unprecedented level of support from private donors, including individuals, foundations and corporations (Stoianova, 2012). Private funding provides

INGOs with the flexibility they need to respond rapidly to crises. As such, it has become increasingly sought-after in recent years. Unfortunately the growing involvement of the South African government in international humanitarianism has not yet translated into a significantly higher incidence of private South African citizens giving to international causes. However, there is anecdotal evidence that the rate of giving by South Africans to international causes is increasing rapidly due to increased fundraising activities in the country by INGOs.

This evolution of private support for international causes is occurring despite the fact that South Africa is itself a recipient of aid from abroad (OECD, 2011). South Africa receives foreign aid because the country has serious social issues to address. As a result the local Non-Profit Organization (NPO) sector is now larger in financial terms than the entire local mining sector (Barron, 2013). The NPO sector is well developed because the notion of giving in solidarity is entrenched in South African society following decades of struggle against the apartheid regime during the 20th century.

1.1.4 The Potential for South Africans to Support International Humanitarian Interventions

South Africans have been recognized as some of the most generous people in the world. Two separate studies into the giving habits of private individuals found that exactly 93% of South Africans are involved in some form of giving on a monthly basis (the State of Social Giving, 2005; the Giving Report, 2010). This includes either gifts of money or material goods, or the volunteering of time. Existing research also reveals that South African giving is developing further along non-racial lines and extending beyond a narrow focus on one's own community. These developments, along with an assessment of South African donor behaviour, will be discussed in detail in the literature review in section 2.

The degree to which South Africans are comfortable giving to international causes is still a contested area. In their seminal study into the state of social

giving in South Africa, Everatt and Solanki deduced from their interviews with donors that South Africans were not highly motivated to donate to international causes (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). However these somewhat dated findings were based on the stated giving behaviour of donors who had not yet had significant exposure to solicitations from INGOs.

The majority of South Africans have never been asked to provide financial assistance for humanitarian interventions abroad. International philanthropic studies have demonstrated that individuals are significantly more likely to donate once they are made aware of a specific humanitarian need through an effective solicitation (Hibbert & Horne, 1996; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007; Radley & Kennedy, 1995; and Hodgkinson & Wetzman, 1995). An understanding of the donor behaviour, attitudes and motivations of those South Africans who support international causes today would help to better establish the willingness and propensity for all South Africans to support international humanitarian interventions.

1.2 The Research Problem and Purpose

As discussed in section 1.1.3, private voluntary support from individuals for international humanitarian interventions has become an increasingly important source of funding for INGOs over the past decade. Such support is viewed by INGOs as a lifeline that allows them to keep responding to aid challenges when there are limited government resources available. This increase in private donations is a global phenomenon, with individuals in emerging economies such as Brazil, India and China becoming significant contributors.

Existing research into the social giving habits of South African citizens suggests that substantial private resources for international humanitarian work may be available in South Africa. In general South Africans have a proven reputation for being generous and charitable. Furthermore, the amount of private funding available for social programmes within the country has grown substantially since the transition to democracy in 1994. As a

result, a considerable body of research exists into the giving behaviour and motivations of South Africans who donate to social causes within their own country.

However, there is a dearth of information on the propensity for South Africans to donate to international humanitarian causes, as opposed to local relief and development initiatives. Furthermore there is the perception among many prominent researchers of philanthropy that South Africans are not comfortable in giving to international causes (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). It is thought that the social issues in the country are such that South Africans are concerned only with local humanitarian causes. There is also the notion that South Africans are xenophobic, evidenced by the repeated outbreaks of violence against migrants living in the country.

This research paper challenges the perception that South Africans are averse to supporting international humanitarian causes. It is a preliminary investigation into the evolving nature of charitable giving in South Africa. The purpose of the research was to better understand the giving behaviour of current donors to international causes, so as to inform further research into the potential for South Africa to become a major source of private funding for global humanitarian assistance. The findings were based on data collected from one-on-one interviews, and on-site poll, and an extensive literature review.

The research explored the self-reported motivations of South African citizens for giving unrestricted financial support to Médecins Sans Frontières / Doctors Without Borders (MSF) for humanitarian work that is conducted outside of South Africa's borders. MSF is the world's leading international medical relief organization. The organization's mandate concerns emergency relief, and it provides medical help to people affected by armed conflicts, natural disasters such as floods and earthquakes, epidemics of disease, and famines. In addition, MSF also intervenes in refugee situations, areas of chronic instability, and during periods following a conflict or disaster.

To ensure its independence to provide impartial assistance, an important part of MSF's funding for projects comes from private voluntary contributions. The

organization therefore has individual giving programmes in over twenty countries, including in South Africa. MSF currently has over 20, 000 South African donors, most of whom support the organization with small monthly donations.

A primary focus of the research was the influence of income levels on the interview respondents' stated motivations for donating. The income factor was deemed important to include because international studies on philanthropy have shown that income is one of the most significant predictors of the probability of selecting a particular motivation for giving (Frederick, 2009; Brown & Ferris, 2007; Houston, 2006; Rooney et al, 2001). There is limited knowledge about the extent to which income effects giving behaviour in South Africa. Research into this matter is relevant because South Africa is one of the most unequal societies in the world in terms of income distribution (World Bank, World Development Indicators, 2012).

The purpose of including income as a research focus was to investigate any attitudinal differences to giving based upon the respondents' economic profiles. As such, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten existing MSF donors residing in the neighbourhoods of Alexandra and Bryanston in the Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality.

These two study areas represent stark contrasts in living standards and were used as a proxy for the respondent's income levels. On the one hand, Alexandra is a relatively impoverished settlement with an average annual income of R32, 000 (Affordable Land and Housing Data Centre, 2012). On the other, Bryanston is a wealthy suburb with an average annual income of R266, 821. This is approximately eight times higher than in Alexandra (Johannesburg Archive, 2011). The selection of respondents, as well as the interview process, will be discussed in detail in section 3: Research Methodology and Data Collection.

1.3 The Research Questions

The research was based around a central question and a set of sub-questions to interrogate the motivations, attitudes and perceptions of

individual MSF donors in both the study areas of Alexandra and Bryanston. These central questions in turn informed the design of a topic guide for the one-on-one interviews.

As discussed previously, a prevailing assumption amongst researchers of philanthropy in South Africa is that South Africans are more motivated to donate to local causes than to international causes. The central question was therefore designed to probe the validity of this assumption for this particular, very diverse group of interview respondents:

- *Central question: Why do some South Africans to give to international causes when their country has extreme social problems of its own?*

The set of sub-questions were then used to further explore the preferences and motivations of South Africans for donating to international causes, despite the existence of deep-seated social issues within their own country:

- *Sub-question 1: What motivated individuals to donate to Médecins Sans Frontières / Doctors Without Borders (MSF)?*
- *Sub-question 2: How do these donors feel about giving to international causes in comparison to local causes?*
- *Sub-question 3: How do MSF's donors view local and international non-governmental organizations?*

The topic guide consisted of a set of open-ended questions to be used during the interviews. These questions were intended to guide the discussion, and were therefore modified on occasion during the interview depending on the nature of the answers and on the respondent's particular situation. The topic guide questions are set out below:

- *Topic 1: Have you donated money, goods or time to any other charity (i.e. other than MSF) over the past year?*
- *Topic 2: How did you first hear about MSF?*
- *Topic 3: What made you decide to donate to MSF?*
- *Topic 4: How do you feel about giving to international causes in comparison to local causes?*

- *Topic 5: Do you think that International NGOs are more effective than local NGOs?*

- *Topic 6: Do you believe that South Africa is worse off today than it was 10 years ago?*

Section 3 (Research Methodology and Data Collection) includes a detailed description of each of these topic guide questions.

1.4 Structure of the Research Paper

The introductory section above (**Chapter 1**) provided a background to the research topic. It addressed the distinction between *humanitarian aid* and *development assistance*, and provided a definition for *private contributions*. It described how humanitarian interventions are funded, and highlighted some recent trends in international aid including the growing importance of private funding from citizens of emerging economies.

This introductory section furthermore outlined the research problem and purpose, as well as the related research questions. The problem was identified as a lack of research into the propensity for South Africans to donate to international humanitarian causes. The purpose of this research paper was to conduct a preliminary investigation into the giving behaviour of South Africans who currently donate to international causes, so to inform further research into the potential for South Africa to become a major source of private funding for global humanitarian assistance. The central questions were posed to interrogate the behaviour and motivations of international donors, and to better understand South African attitudes towards INGOs and international humanitarian work.

Chapter 2 is the literature review. This encompasses relevant literature on a) theories of donor motivation and behaviour; b) social giving in South Africa; and c) individual giving trends at the international level. The review reveals that motivations for giving are complex. Altruism is identified as a key motivational factor for donors, and fundraising solicitations are presented as vital catalysts for securing a donation. Other factors, such as income and

education levels are shown to be key determinants of donation size and donor motivation type.

The review further investigates the extent of social giving in South Africa, and presents a number of conflicting facts and figures about the stated levels of generosity in the country. The review shows that giving habits in South Africa are evolving along non-racial lines and that South Africans have great potential to become a valuable source of funding for INGOs that are implementing humanitarian assistance programmes abroad. Finally, the review covers emerging trends in humanitarian aid, which include a) reductions in DAC government aid budgets, b) increased support from emerging economy governments, and c) the growing importance of private funding for INGO humanitarian assistance interventions.

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology and discusses how the data was collected for the report. An explanation is given on the mixed methodology used and how the data was gathered for analysis from three separate sources, namely a) a literature review; b) one-on-one interviews with donors; and c) an on-site poll. As the one-on-one interviews were central to the research, this section details how the interviewees were selected, and presents a demographic profile of the cohort. It also looks at the manner in which the interviews were conducted, and identifies issues that were encountered during the process as well as several limitations to the research. Finally, it provides an overview of how the on-site poll was conducted.

Chapter 4 is the presentation of the raw data from the qualitative and quantitative components of the research. **Chapter 5** includes an analysis of the one-on-one interviews as well as the reinforcing on-site poll. It presents the key thematic findings of the research, with a focus on establishing any commonalities in the respondent's motivations for giving to international causes.

The final section, **Chapter 6**, provides conclusions and implications based on the research findings.

Chapter 2: The Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Philanthropic Studies in South Africa

The body of research into philanthropy and individual donor motivations has been growing at a rapid pace over the past decade in both the United States and in Western Europe. Such studies draw most frequently on the disciplines of marketing, economics psychology, sociology and anthropology (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007). This rapid growth has led to some commentators maintaining that 'philanthropic studies' has become a distinct mutli-disciplinary field within the social sciences (Katz, 1999). However, this is perhaps premature as it remains a field not widely accepted in academic life.

This growing interest in philanthropic studies and the psychology of giving has developed in tandem with the increasing volume of private voluntary contributions available for development and humanitarian work. Such private donations have become an important source of funding for international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) over the past decade, and this has sparked general academic interest in the phenomenon. Private donations now account for an estimated 40% of the global humanitarian relief response by INGOs, and this proportion is expected to continue to grow in the medium-term (Stoianova, 2012).

Understandably there is now great interest from within the relief and development community as well as in academia for more rigorous research into the motivations and behaviour of individual donors. This has resulted in the recent availability of a more substantive and objective research base for studying issues around fundraising and philanthropy.

In South Africa, the study of indigenous philanthropy is less well developed than it is in Western Europe and the United States. This is despite the increased attention that has been given to the subjects of development and poverty alleviation by the South African academic community over the past

decade. In particular there is a dearth of academic research into the motivations of South African citizens who donate to INGOs delivering humanitarian services abroad.

In reference to the limited academic research into philanthropy in South Africa, Habib, Maharaj & Nyar (2008) acknowledge the difficulty of developing theoretical levels for research into individual giving in the country. Nevertheless, there is sufficient anecdotal and academic evidence available to conclude that a substantial volume of financial resources is being transferred from South African citizens to the social sector within the country. South Africa also has a lengthy recorded history of philanthropy, and today private philanthropy is an increasingly significant contributor to non-profit activities. This type of giving has become more organized and strategic, and more international in its scope (Dulaney and Winder, 2001).

2.2 Motivation and Giving Behaviour

2.2.1 The Influence of Altruism on Giving Behaviour

Within this relatively new field of philanthropic studies, donor motivation is one of the most debated areas (Abreu, 2010). Self-reported motivations for giving vary widely depending on regional, demographic and personal factors. As a result, the complex task of categorising responses and accounting for variations is far from complete. There is currently no agreed upon framework on which to base an academic discussion about donor motivations.

A somewhat dated review of the existing literature by Hibbert & Horne in the mid-1990s revealed just two broad schools of thought on the subject of what motivates donors to give. The first of these centred on altruism and the second on socialization (Hibbert & Horne, 1996). However a more recent review by Bekkers & Wiepking (2007) identified eight key mechanisms that determine an individual's choice to donate. These were a) awareness of need; b) solicitation; c) costs and benefits; d) altruism; e) reputation; f) psychological benefits; g) values; and h) efficacy.

Other commentators have added to these varied determinants. The pure joy of giving and a whole range of other psychological benefits have been identified as motivations for individuals to give (Batson & Shaw, 1991). Academic research has further explored the role of superstition, gratitude, obligation, political beliefs, egoism, pride, membership of an organization, identity and individual values in affecting the personal decision to make a charitable gift of money (Bekkers & Weipking, 2007).

Radley & Kennedy (1995) argue that individual motivations to donate can usually be conceived of as being altruistic rather than egoistic. Altruism is defined by Abreu (2010) as a motivational state with the goal of improving another person or group's welfare. However altruism is also understood as an ethical doctrine that places a moral obligation upon individuals to help one another in times of need (Du Toit, 2009). Radley & Kennedy's study found that the act of giving among respondents generally involved providing voluntary assistance with no implied reciprocity. The respondents to their survey questionnaire also demonstrated that regional, demographic and personal factors have an influence on donor motivations and giving behaviour.

The theory that giving is inherently altruistic has been supported in other academic research. A study by Jones (1989) asserted that giving behaviour was primarily guided by a moral imperative to assist those in need, despite the existence of a number of secondary, more self-satisfying donor motivations.

In the South African context, subscribers to the philosophy of 'Ubuntu' acknowledge the importance of altruism. Ubuntu is a world view in which an individual's humanity is expressed through their relationships with others (Roux & Coetzee, 1994). The western notion of altruism is echoed in the key humanistic attributes of 'Ubuntu', namely being humble, caring, considerate, generous and virtuous.

As a stated reason for giving, some form of altruism features prominently in most studies into donor motivations. This is partly because research respondents are less inclined to cite determinants such as selfishness or

reputation, or indeed social pressure, as their prime reasons for giving. However, Radley & Kennedy (1995) argue that empathy is not necessarily present in all cases, and that giving can occur for other instrumental reasons.

Commentators who argue against the influence of altruism emphasize the strength of social values and norms, as well as the non-spontaneous nature of most individual giving. They argue that individuals often require incentives to donate, such as tax benefits, and that their motivations for giving could include among other things, selfishness, guilt, superstition and feelings of greatness. (Callero, Howard & Piliavin, 1987; Batson, 1990).

Furthermore, research has shown clear patterns of giving amongst donors who share similar demographic profiles, values and beliefs. Such studies conclude that altruism is not always central to a prospective donor's decision-making, and that the donor's demographic and cultural profile can provide insights into their motivations for giving (Smith, 2006; Frederick, 2009).

2.2.2 Income as a Motivational Determinant

The literature reveals that motivations for giving are complex, and that they can be best understood by studying particular groups of prospective donors. Research by Frederick (2009) found that the most significant predictors of the probability of selecting a particular motivation are income and education. His study revealed that respondents across the United States of America who had similar income levels and educational backgrounds tended to cite the same motivations for giving, regardless of the region they originated from.

Frederick's study found that individual giving among lower income and less educated groups in the United States was motivated principally by a desire to provide for the "basic needs" of the poor. This contrasted with the motivations cited by higher income and better educated groups, which were significantly more varied. These upper income level donors showed a pronounced interest in "making the community better", "equity" and "making the world a better place to live" (Frederick, 2009). This study highlighted the importance of income as a determinant of why people donate.

Several other empirical studies have revealed that a person's income level determines how much money they will donate too (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Houston, 2006; Rooney et al, 2001). Simply put, the prevailing research shows that higher income individuals tend to donate in larger amounts to charity than respondents with a low economic status (Banks & Tanner, 1999). Due to this fact, prospective donors' income levels are already widely used by INGOs to inform their individual fundraising strategies.

However, wealthier individuals are not necessarily more generous than other donors. Some research has found that no such positive correlation exists between income on the one hand, and generosity on the other (Frank & Shultz, 2000). This challenges the notion that having more money automatically increases a person's propensity to donate in large amounts. Furthermore, there are few studies that rate the generosity of specific demographic groups based on the percentage of their household income donated to INGOs. Such research might challenge the perception that higher income individuals are more generous than lower income individuals. In South Africa, a study by Everatt & Solanki found very little difference across demographic categories in terms of the percentage of people donating to a cause.

2.2.3 The Importance of Fundraising Solicitations

A literature review by Bekkers & Wiepking's (2007) found that there is substantial evidence in support of the argument that the majority of all donation acts occur in response to a solicitation. Furthermore, a journal article by Radley & Kennedy (1995) described how most of their interviewees found it necessary to justify their reasons for not giving to a cause when asked to do so. This was corroborated by a study of giving amongst ethnic minorities in the United States, which showed that regardless of their economic position individuals tend to acquiesce when asked to give (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1995).

Studies by Hibbert & Horne (1996), Bekkers & Wiepking (2007), Radley & Kennedy (1995) and Hodgkinson & Wetzman (1995) have demonstrated that people need to be made aware of a specific need before they can realise their motivations for providing financial support. This suggests that in the majority of cases it is an effective solicitation that prompts a donor to act, and that other stated motivations are secondary. Solicitation makes prospective donors aware of the needs and it therefore improves the likelihood that an actual donation will take place.

However, research by Leslie & Ramey found that there is a significant decrease in the marginal utility of the number of persons solicited. Donor fatigue in the face of constant appeals may therefore lead to lower average contributions and a lower return on investment for fundraisers (Leslie & Ramey, 2008). In other words, fundraising solicitations are vital, but they must be implemented strategically.

The notion that one needs to ask before one receives might seem to be common sense. Yet it was not taken into consideration in a seminal study on the state of social giving in South Africa, which concluded that South Africans were not comfortable giving to international causes (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). The fact that most respondents to this study were more motivated to support local causes was most likely because they had never before been asked to give to an international cause. They were not necessarily uncomfortable giving to international causes, they had just not yet been made aware of specific humanitarian needs in other countries. Indeed, the Giving Report (2010) revealed that high net worth South African donors cited an approach by beneficiary organizations as the most common way of identifying whom to support.

2.3 The Social Giving Behaviour of South Africans

2.3.1 The Extent of Giving in South Africa

South Africa is often purported to be ‘a nation of givers’ (Finlayson, 2010). This statement is supported by the findings of three wide-ranging reports into the matter, which are a) The Barclays Report on Philanthropy (2010); b) The State of Social Giving Report (2005); and c) The Giving Report (2010).

The Barclays Report on Philanthropy (2010) claimed that South Africa was second only to the United States in terms of individuals donating both time and money. The State of Social Giving Report (2005) revealed that 54% of respondents donated money regularly to charity, 31% gave free goods and 17% volunteered their time. These findings were further supported by research conducted into the giving habits of high net-worth individuals for the 2010 *Giving Report*. This study found that 93.5% of individuals worth over R5 million were regularly involved in some form of giving.

In addition, a study by the Centre for Civil Society found that South African respondents:

- Were more comfortable giving to formal institutions than directly to the poor
- Cited ‘religious duty’ as their main motivation for giving, and religious bodies as the largest recipients of funds
- Recognized their privileged position in relation to the poor, and acknowledged their obligation to give back
- Demonstrated a pro-poor understanding of societal priorities

Furthermore, this study estimated that the non-profit sector in South Africa received approximately 25% of its funds from private donors in 2004, which included donations from the private sector, foundations, and individuals (Kuljian, 2005).

However, the empirical evidence for the generosity of South Africans discussed above was not corroborated by the World Giving Index (2011). This is an annual report on global individual giving trends produced by the Charities Aid Foundation. The World Giving Index is a comparative report of international philanthropic behaviour which scores countries based on three

individual giving behaviours. These are the extent and regularity with which the populations of these countries a) donate money; b) volunteer time; and c) help a stranger. Table 1 below depicts South Africa's international rankings on this index as well as the percentages of respondents involved in each form of giving:

Table 1: South Africa's Rankings on the World Giving Index (2011)
Source: Charities Aid Foundation, 2012

Behaviour	SA World Ranking	% Pop. Involved
Donating money	138	10%
Volunteering Time	101	14%
Helping a Stranger	43	53%

South Africa's overall ranking in the World Giving Index (2011) was 108th. This compares unfavourably to the country's rating of 76th in 2010. The figures in Table 1 above show that 'helping a stranger' was the most common giving behaviour stated by South Africa respondents. The percentage of positive responses for this category also remained consistent across gender and age brackets. However, the report showed that only 10% of South African respondents reported donating any money to charity in the month prior to the survey. This is a significant deviation from the figures claimed by of the State of Social Giving Report (2005), the Giving Report (2010) and the Barclays Report on Philanthropy (2010).

There are several possible reasons for this deviation. Firstly, there is a wide variety of research methodologies employed in the aforementioned studies. Everatt & Solanki (2005) acknowledged that their research methodology may have led to over-claim by respondents. Secondly, giving behaviours are notoriously complex social phenomena. Du Toit (2009) maintains that they defy accurate quantification. Thirdly, there is no dedicated mechanism to track giving in South Africa. Morgan (2007) notes that South Africa has seen a surge in corporate giving over the past decade, but that individual giving has not yet reached its potential.

Finally, South Africa is still a recipient of funds for development and humanitarian assistance from abroad. Ewing (2010) notes that a significant proportion of resources available to non-governmental organizations for poverty reduction and development programmes in South Africa originate from international private donors. All of the abovementioned factors have resulted in widely divergent claims about the generosity and social conscience of South Africans.

2.3.2 *The Difference Between Philanthropy and Charity in South Africa*

As discussed in the previous section, the extent of social giving in South Africa is much contested. However, there is general consensus that disregarding the volume of charitable giving, philanthropy is prevalent in equal measure throughout South African society. Research by Christa Kulijan (2005), for example, shows that income level is not a determinant of a South African individual's propensity to donate their time and money (Kulijan, 2005).

Habib, Maharaj & Nyar (2008) argue that philanthropy has a unique meaning in the South African context, where it is not conflated with charity. In Europe and the United States, the term philanthropy is often used interchangeably with charity. Here both imply wealthy benefactors disbursing disposable income for poverty alleviation in a voluntary transfer of funds from the rich to the poor. However, in South Africa the meanings of the words philanthropy and charity have been extensively debated (Du Toit, 2009).

South Africans are more interested in giving to causes that seek longer-term sustainable solutions (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). The term charity is often associated with short-term, ad hoc and unsustainable contributions for poverty alleviation. Charity therefore contains negative connotations for many South Africans. For Du Toit (2009) philanthropy is a broader term, encompassing humanitarianism and the manner in which people organize their society.

In the book Giving in Solidarity (Habib, A. & Maharaj, B. Eds., 2008), academics address several western assumptions about individual philanthropy. Two of these assumptions are that a) giving is an act undertaken by the wealthy; and b) giving is an altruistic, voluntary act. The contributing authors then compared these assumptions to the practice of philanthropy in South Africa. David Everatt and Geetesh Solanki found that in South Africa, giving occurs among both the rich and the poor of all races.

Giving is not just the preserve of the wealthy in South Africa. This conclusion is reinforced by the aforementioned findings of Christa Kulijan. Furthermore, the authors found that South African giving was often driven by obligations to the donor's extended family and social network, rather than by pure altruism (Everatt & Solanki, 2005).

2.3.3 Race, Class and Giving in South Africa


In the context of a country obsessed with racial identity, studies into South African philanthropy tend to disaggregate and present data by race. The legacy of apartheid is a country where inequalities persist along racial lines. For example, research by Statistics South Africa into the relative earnings of South Africans by population group found that the median monthly salaries of whites (R9, 500) and Indians (R6, 000) were significantly higher than those of the coloured (R2, 652) and black African (R2, 167) populations (Statistics South Africa; Statistical Release P0211.2; 2010).

Similarly, unemployment rates for the economically active population were substantially lower for whites (6%) and Indians (12%) than they are for coloureds (25%) and black Africans (29%) (Quarterly Labour Force Survey, 3rd Quarter, 2012). South Africa also has a relatively high dependency ratio with every working South African supporting three other people who are not employed (Isa, Business Day, 2013).

However, South Africans of all races appear to be equally generous in terms of giving their money, goods and time, regardless of extreme material inequalities. A study by Everatt & Solanki (2005) scrupulously selected

research respondents to include representatives from all of the major racial groups. Then, in this unshakable South African tradition, the authors presented their data across the colour scale. Figure 1 below shows the responses they received to the question "Do you give money, goods or time?" The bars in the graph represent different racial groups. Each bar indicates the total 'yes' answers in the shaded lower end, and the 'no' answers in the area above.

Figure 1: Proportion of South Africans who give money, goods or time
Source: Social Giving Among South Africans; Everatt & Solanki; 2005



Encouragingly Everatt & Solanki's study also found that since South Africa's transition to democracy in 1994, giving has evolved in a non-racial direction and it is no longer confined to the donor's own community. This means that when making their decision to donate, some South Africans are beginning to consider humanitarian needs beyond their own race and communities.

2.3.4 South Africans Giving to International Causes

Everatt & Solanki's (2005) study indicated a very low level of motivation among South Africans for donating to international causes, with only 8% of

respondents giving money directly to help people in need abroad. This exact figure of 8% was corroborated in the 2010 Giving Report, a study into the philanthropic practices of high net worth individuals in South Africa.

The respondents for this latter survey all had a total net worth of over R5 million and were predominantly white (77%) and male (60%). Although this cohort is well travelled and relatively well educated about international humanitarian issues, the majority of their giving (83%) was focussed on their own province of residence (The Giving Report, 2010). These two studies suggest that South Africans are mainly concerned with local rather than international causes.

However, very few South Africans have been exposed to fundraising appeals for international assistance. Research shows that once people are made aware of a need through an effective solicitation, then there is a substantially higher likelihood that they will respond positively (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007; Hibbert & Horne, 1996; Radely & Kennedy, 1995; Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1995).

Furthermore, Everatt & Solanki's own research indicates at least two reasons why there is significant potential for South Africans to support international humanitarian causes through INGOs. Firstly, respondents in the State of Social Giving Report stated that their main motivation for giving was 'a feeling of human solidarity'. This motivation is at the root of the humanitarianism that drives international relief operations. Secondly, most respondents preferred to donate to formal structures, like INGOs, rather than giving directly to the targeted beneficiaries of their donation (Everatt & Solanki, 2005).

Giving trends since the transition to democracy indicate that South Africans can and would donate to international causes when given the opportunity to do so. Commentators such as Du Toit (2012) recognize the gaps in knowledge of South African giving patterns and motivations, and underline the imperative of conducting new studies into this subject.

2.4 Individual Giving at the International Level


2.4.1 The Impact of the Global Financial Crisis on Official Humanitarian Aid

Funding for INGO humanitarian assistance interventions comes from either government or private contributions. Government funding represents the majority of humanitarian aid channelled through INGOs, and this funding also flows bi-laterally between governments or through multi-lateral agencies such as the United Nations. In 2012 the extent of the impact of the global financial crisis of 2007 / 2008 became apparent, as official relief expenditure by DAC members declined as a percentage of gross domestic profit for the first time in 15 years (Stirk, 2012).

Yet during the period 2008 to 2011 there was much disagreement over the extent to which the global financial crisis had affected official aid budgets. Stoianova (2012) used data from the World Bank and the United Nations Financial Tracking Service to indicate that there had been a general upward trajectory in humanitarian financing from 2007 to 2011, despite the financial crisis.

This trend is illustrated in Figure 2 below which depicts official humanitarian assistance contributions over a five year period from both government and private sources. Each bar on the graph represents the total humanitarian aid for the year that is indicated on the left vertical axis. The shaded area on the left of each bar represents government aid, and the remainder represents private contributions.

Figure 2: Official humanitarian assistance: government and private contributions
Source: Development Initiatives Report, 2012



From this graph it is evident that private contributions had been growing at a slightly quicker pace than government aid. There was a surge in both private (increased by 70%) and government (increased by 28%) contributions in 2010 after an earthquake off the coast of Haiti led to the largest humanitarian response in history. As a result, there was debate amongst commentators as to the impact of the global financial crisis on humanitarian financing.

However, it is now understood that there may have been a time-lag for the reduction of government aid budgets following the global financial crisis. Statistics from the Organization for Cooperation and Development (OECD) show that 16 of the 23 countries in the Development Action Committee reduced their aid budgets in 2011 (OECD, 2011). The upward trend identified by Stoianova (2012) was being sustained by private contributions and the growing involvement of emerging economy government donors.

2.4.2 The Growing Importance of Private Contributions and Aid from Emerging Economies

Smith (2011) argues that emerging economy governments (including China, India and Brazil, among others) have contributed a steadily growing portion of humanitarian financing over the past 5 years. These donors are often referred to as ‘non-Western’ or ‘non-OECD’, yet they contain a very diverse group of countries. Their aid is most often directed to development and relief programmes in their own regions, involving a ‘south – south’ transfer to funds.

Yet despite the perceived growth of funding from emerging economies, the volume of donations from ‘non-Western’ donor countries is difficult to determine given the absence of consistent reporting (Global Humanitarian Assistance Report, 2012). There is no single repository for collecting information on humanitarian financing, and national initiatives tend to have varied tracking methodologies. This makes humanitarian aid trends difficult to corroborate.

As argued in the introduction (section 1), the absence of a dedicated tracking mechanism also makes it difficult to quantify the extent of private philanthropy. Apart from a few isolated cases, such as in the United States, this is a problem encountered by researchers of philanthropy in most countries. Globally there is a lack of consistent reporting on private aid funding and it remains unclear just how significant this aid channel has become.

However, it is generally agreed that since the global financial crisis of 2007/2008 private funding (which covers contributions from foundations, corporations and individuals) has become a lifeline for INGOs responding to humanitarian challenges. This has resulted in a growing body of research into private funding as an emerging trend in humanitarian donorship.

However the dependence of INGOs on this type of funding varies greatly. For example, Norwegian People's Aid receives just 1% of its funding from private individuals, whereas it accounts for 86% of Medecins Sans Frontieres funding (Development Initiatives, 2010).

Despite the myriad difficulties in quantifying aid flows, it is estimated that in 2011 overall private contributions represented 37% of the total humanitarian response. For INGOs this funding stream has remained consistent despite the global financial crisis which negatively affected the aid budgets of many institutional donors (Stoianova, 2012). This has generated great interest within the INGO community for developing individual giving programs in emerging economies such as South Africa.

2.5 Conclusion to the literature review

The literature review revealed a high likelihood that South Africans would donate to INGOs for humanitarian work conducted abroad. Seminal studies into social giving in South Africa cited "basic needs" and "human solidarity" as the most common motivations cited by respondents (The Giving Report, 2010; The State of Social Giving Report, 2005). Furthermore, Everatt & Solanki demonstrated that giving behaviour in South Africa was developing

along non-racial lines, and that people were showing an interest in donating to causes outside of their own communities. The most exhaustive studies into the giving habits of South Africans also revealed a generous nation with a well-developed notion of human solidarity.

In summary, the literature shows that in general South Africans are a) concerned with human solidarity; b) showing an increased interest in humanitarian issues; and c) are very involved in social giving. These three elements indicate a society with great potential for supporting international humanitarian interventions by INGOs.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Data Collection

3.1 Reasons for Applying A Mixed Methodology

This research was a preliminary investigation into the stated donor motivations of South African citizens who financially support the work of international humanitarian organizations. The purpose of the study was to better understand the giving behaviour and motivations of current South African donors, so as to inform further research into the potential for South Africa to become a major source of private funding for global humanitarian assistance. Ideally, the findings from this initial small-scale research project would be used to generate a hypothesis that could be tested by other qualitative and quantitative methods at a later point.

A Mixed Methodology was applied for this study. According to the Journal of Mixed Methods Research (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner, 2007), mixed methods has come to be considered as one of the three major research paradigms, alongside qualitative and quantitative research. This approach to research involves the use of multiple investigative channels to improve the validity of results. It combines the in-depth scrutiny of qualitative research with the statistical techniques of quantitative research.

Both qualitative and quantitative data were required for this research project, which is why a mixed methodology was adopted. Firstly, it was necessary to use a qualitative method to gain insights into individual motivations for supporting international causes. This allowed for an approach to the collection of data that allowed for adaptation, as well as for the necessary rapport to be built with the respondents to the semi-structured interviews.

These semi-structured, one-on-one interviews were used to extract a large volume of data from ten respondents. A topic guide was used for these interviews in order to allow for a free flowing discussion between the researcher and the interviewees. This resulted in a range of insights that would have been missed had only a quantitative method been applied. However, a limitation was that the interview sample size was too small to extrapolate the findings to all South Africans. It would not have been possible

to make firm conclusions about South African giving habits based on interviews with only ten respondents. Therefore it was necessary to compare the results of the qualitative research with another set of results from a quantitative study.

For this reason an on-site poll was conducted of fifty donors to international causes. A questionnaire was designed for the poll that allowed for the easy quantification of results. This questionnaire was based upon the results gleaned from the qualitative interviews. For each question in the poll the respondents were asked to select a statement that applied most to them. These statements had been the most common responses received during the interviews.

This quantitative component of the research provided a relatively simple way to gather a large volume of data. It was then possible to compare this data with the results of the qualitative component. This helped to increase the validity of the results and also allowed for firmer conclusions about the giving habits of donors who support international causes.

In addition to this, the data from the qualitative interviews and the quantitative on-site poll were triangulated with information from the literature review. This process of triangulation allowed for an analysis of the central and sub-research questions from three separate, reinforcing perspectives. In all, the sources of data for the research analysis included:

- A review of relevant literature on philanthropy
- Semi-structured interviews with existing South African donors to Médecins Sans Frontières / Doctors Without Borders (MSF)
- An on-site poll of new MSF donors

The following section examines each of the methodologies used in the research. It begins with a brief description of the literature review (section 3.2), including the issues addressed in the review and the sources used. This is followed a discussion on the qualitative research component (section 3.3), including a description of the sampling approach, the study sets and the interview process. Finally, there is an account of the quantitative component

(section 3.4). The varied limitations of these methods are addressed throughout.

3.2 Data from the Literature Review

The literature review explored academic research and other commentary on philanthropy from a range of sources. This included journal articles, online text collections, academic abstracts, INGO reports and books on economics, marketing and philanthropy. The review addressed key published findings in three interconnected areas, namely a) theories of motivation and donor behaviour; b) social giving behaviour in South Africa; and c) individual giving trends at the international level.

The purpose of the literature review was to gain a perspective of the current state of knowledge of social giving, as well as to provide background detail for addressing the central- and sub- research questions. It presented an argument that showed the need for this research into the study topic.

3.3 The Qualitative Component

3.3.1 Sampling and Selection

The primary source of information for the research analysis was the semi-structured one-on-one interviews with current MSF donors. These interviews were conducted over a two month period with 10 respondents using a topic guide with open-ended questions. These ten interviewees were selected using non-probability sampling. This sampling method was convenient because the findings from this particular research were not intended to be extrapolated to the South African population as a whole. Instead, this was a preliminary study into the motivations of South Africans who give to international causes. The selection of respondents was therefore based upon their likelihood of generating useful data for the research.

Furthermore, a particular focus of the research was on whether income was a determinant of donor motivations. Therefore the study set needed to be purposively selected in order to test the impact of income on motivations for giving to international causes. As such the sampling was approached with a plan in mind to target a specific set of respondents. All the interview respondents had to be people who were regular donors to Médecins Sans Frontières / Doctors Without Borders (MSF) and who were either residents of the Johannesburg suburban areas of Alexandra or Bryanston.

The respondents for the interviews were identified and selected using the MSF donor database. This database is an electronic collection of the personal and donation details of over 15, 000 individual South African donors. It is a record of every person that has donated money to MSF in South Africa since 2008, and it contains a wealth of information on their donation frequency, demographics, interests and giving behaviour. The database is a 'living record' of all MSF's South African donors and it is regularly updated as and when additional information is garnered on specific individuals. For this reason the individual donor records used in the research varied in their level of detail, depending on the length of a particular donor's involvement with MSF and how forthcoming they had been with their personal information.

Regarding income status, it has already been discussed extensively in the Literature Review that income is considered to be one of the most important predictors of the probability of a donor selecting a particular motivation (see section 2.3.2). Research conducted in Europe and the United States has shown that people with similar income levels tend to have similar motivations for giving (Frederick, 2009; Brown & Ferris, 2007; Houston, 2006; Rooney et al, 2001; Banks & Tanner, 1999). Therefore one of the goals of the research paper was to explore whether this observation was valid in the South African context.

However, acquiring individual respondent's income data was problematic. The MSF donor database from which the respondents were selected did not contain any information on the income levels of individual donors. This is

because MSF considers such information as too fluid and personal to obtain. Therefore, for the purposes of this research the criteria used to determine the economic status of respondents were a) the occupation of the respondent, and b) their place of residence. Information on both of these factors was present in the MSF database, and they were used as a proxy for the respondents' income levels.

In addition, an attempt was made to minimize sample bias by ensuring, as far as possible, that the respondents selected from the two study areas reflected a range of demographic variables. Of the 30 MSF donors contacted, 10 agreed to participate in the study. Section 3.3.3 contains a detailed profile of these individual donors who selected to participate in the study.

3.3.2 The Study Area

The City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality was chosen as the general study area for the research. Two distinct Johannesburg suburban areas roughly 20km apart were then identified from which to select the respondents. These were the high income suburb of Bryanston and the low income township of Alexandra. These two study areas were selected because they represented stark contrasts in living standards.

The two study areas had significantly different profiles in terms of average income, quality of life, property prices, education levels and health indicators. On the one hand, Alexandra is an impoverished settlement with widespread unemployment and an average annual income of R32, 000 (Affordable Land and Housing Data Centre, 2012). The ward falls below the official poverty deprivation threshold and is characterised by low levels of education (Johannesburg Poverty and Livelihoods Study, 2008). Alexandra is also a high-density area with poor service delivery and a proliferation of informal dwellings.

On the other hand, Bryanston is an upmarket residential suburb where residents have an average annual income of R266, 821 (Johannesburg Archive, 2011). The average price of a freehold property in Bryanston is R2.6

million, which makes it one of the highest priced suburbs in the whole of South Africa (Property 24, 2004). These statistics showed that the average income of Bryanston residents was higher than those of Alexandra by a factor of eight.

As such, during the selection of respondents it could be assumed that residents of Bryanston would most likely have substantially higher incomes than residents of Alexandra. The respondents' places of residence were viewed as a strong enough indicator of an individual donor's financial wealth for the purposes of the research.

However, as the study progressed it became evident that this was a flawed assumption due to the inevitable presence of exceptions in both residential areas. An analysis of the one-on-one interviews revealed a far smaller distinction between the income levels and quality of life of the respondents from the two study areas than had previously been assumed. This issue will be discussed further in section 4: Research Analysis and Presentation.

3.3.3 The Interview Process and Questions

Following the identification of the prospective interviewees, each prospect was contacted telephonically to inform them of the study purpose and to gauge their willingness to participate. Approximately one third of the prospects contacted agreed to be interviewed at their homes or in mutually convenient locations. The interview format was designed to allow for free descriptions from respondents that could be analysed at a later stage.

For this reason a topic guide was used, which allowed for flexibility depending on the responses received. Three main themes related to the research questions were covered in the topic guide:

a. Expressed motivations for supporting international humanitarian causes

b. Preferences for supporting international or national causes

c. Perspectives on international and national non-governmental organizations

In addition to exploring the respondent's motivations for giving and attitudes to international humanitarianism, the interviews aimed to solicit and confirm personal information including the occupation and educational attainment of the respondents. The topic guide contained six main questions:

1. *Have you donated money, time or goods to any other charities in the past year – if so, to which ones, and why?*

   This question was used to establish the past giving behaviour of interviewees, including the charities that they had already supported and their motivations for doing so. It was the starting point for a broader discussion on their charitable history and beliefs.

2. *What do you know about MSF?*

   This question was used to probe the respondents' understanding of international humanitarianism, as well as the length of their interest in MSF.

3. *What made you decide to donate to MSF?*

   This question related directly to the central research question, and was aimed at establishing the interviewee's stated reasons for supporting an international humanitarian cause. Several follow-up questions were used to further probe their initial statements on the matter.

4. *How do you feel about giving to international causes in comparison to local causes?*

   This question was posed to establish the level of comfort that the respondents had in giving to either international or local causes. It was to lead to a broader discussion on the aid needs of South Africa as compared to those in other parts of the world.

5. *Do you think that International NGOs are more effective than local NGOs?*

This question was used to establish the level of trust in the manner in which funds were used, and activities implemented by either international or local NGOs

6. *Do you believe that South Africa is worse off today than it was 10 years ago?*
   This question was used to probe the respondents' view of their country and of their own futures, and to test the assumption (made by Havens et al, 2007) that people are more likely to donate if they perceive their own future financial situation in a positive light.

The interviews were conducted in a rigorous manner to ensure reliability and validity. Hand-written notes were taken and then transcribed immediately into a Word document for ease of analysis. Follow up calls were made to interviewees to gain further clarity if necessary. A significant limitation was the time allotted for the one-on-one interviews. The difficulty lay in scheduling an appropriate time to meet with each of the respondents. As a result, four of the ten interviews had to be conducted telephonically. Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes.

3.4 The Quantitative Component

3.4.1 Sampling and Selection

Following an analysis of these one-on-one interviews in December 2012, a new questionnaire for a different cohort of donors was designed to improve the validity of the interview findings. This questionnaire was based on the responses received during the one-on-one interviews. It was used in January 2013 for an on-site poll of 50 new MSF donors.

A non-probability approach was also taken for this component. In this instance convenience sampling was used to select a specific group of respondents, namely new donors to MSF. The selection of these new donors

took place during an MSF fundraising campaign at the Westgate Shopping Centre in Johannesburg over the course of a single week in January 2013.

The selection process began with MSF fundraisers approaching members of the general public to solicit a donation for the organization. Once a particular person had signed up as a donor, they were requested on the spot to respond to a short poll on their motivations for giving. This resulted in a demographically diverse group of respondents. However, this also reflected the diversity of the MSF donor base as a whole, and so the sample was deemed sufficient for the purposes of this research. Approximately 90% of those requested to participate took part in the poll.

The limitations to this approach were that these new donors had not yet had an opportunity to fully consider their motivations for supporting international causes. This affected the quality of the data obtained, and will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

3.4.2 The On-Site Poll Questions

The on-site poll consisted of just two questions, which were used to make comparisons with the results from the one-on-one interviews. Respondents were asked to select a reply to each question from a choice of seven possible answers. The first question was *"What made you decide to donate to an international cause?"* The answer choices for this first question included the most commonly cited motivations by the one-on-one interview respondents. These included a) I care about the cause; b) It's important to provide for the basic needs of the poor; c) I want to help the poor to help themselves; d) It feels good to help people; e) I donate for religious reasons; or f) Other. The respondents were asked to select the statement that most applied to them.

The second question asked *"Why did you decide to donate to MSF in particular?"* Again the answer choices included the most common responses from the one-on-one interview. The respondents were asked to select the statement that had the most resonance for them (even if they agreed with

more than one of the statements). The choices were a) MSF is aligned with my interests; b) MSF is an accountable organization; c) I respect the work that MSF does; d) MSF has demonstrated good governance; e) MSF has sound fiscal management; or f) MSF spends an appropriate amount on administration.


Chapter 4: Presentation of the Research Data

4.1 The Qualitative Component (1): Profile of the Interview Respondents

Five of the interview respondents were selected from a cohort of MSF donors residing in Alexandra, and the other five respondents were selected from MSF donors residing in Bryanston. All ten of the respondents were regular donors to MSF who donated between R50 to R200 every month for a period of longer than six months. This was a purposeful choice of regular donors over one-off donors and it was done to ensure that all respondents had previously demonstrated a commitment to the social mission of MSF through repeated donations to the organization.

Figure 3 below shows the interviewees' financial donation profiles. On the left vertical axis is a set of monthly donation amounts. These amounts relate to the bars on the graph. On the right vertical axis is the number of months that each interviewee had been donating, and these numbers relate to the graph line. Respondents 1 – 5 in the graph are residents of Alexandra, and respondents 6 – 10 are residents of Bryanston.

Figure 3: Donation profiles of the respondents




The graph above shows that residents of Bryanston (Resp. 6 – 10) had a much higher average monthly donation to MSF than residents of Alexandra (Resp. 1 – 5). The respondents from Bryanston had also on average been donors for a longer period of time than those from Alexandra (although the longest period of donation, 18 months, was by an Alexandra resident).

Regarding the respondents' racial profiles, this research paper was not specifically concerned with the influencing factor of race. Instead, income was the determining factor under examination. An effort was however made to select respondents from a diversity of racial backgrounds. This was because most studies into philanthropy in South Africa tend to disaggregate and present data by race (as discussed in section 2.4.2 of the Literature Review). Although wholly imperfect, this factor is often assumed to be a significant predictor of a person's motivations for donating.

Figure 4 below shows the racial make-up of the respondents. The bar on the left of the graph represents the total cohort of respondents. The bar in the middle is the Bryanston group, and that on the right is the Alexandra group.

Figure 4: Racial profiles of the respondents



As can be seen in the graph above, all of the respondents in the Alexandra cohort were black African. This is because all the residents of Alexandra who

currently donate to MSF (35 in total) were black African, and so there was no possibility of selecting a racially diverse study group. However, the respondents from Bryanston were more racially diverse, although the significant majority of this cohort was white. In total, the respondents to the interview were 60% black African, 30% white and 10% Indian / Asian.

These proportions adequately reflected the racial make-up of MSF South Africa's complete donor base of approximately 20, 000 individuals. This meant that the findings could be extrapolated to the donor base as a whole. Nevertheless, as mentioned, it was not the intention of this research to test for differences in donor behaviour based on race.

In terms of education, all of the respondents had a minimum of a high school diploma. However, there was a discrepancy in the levels of tertiary education achieved by the interviewees from the different study areas. Each of the respondents from Bryanston had a university degree, albeit in a diverse range of subjects. However none of the respondents from Alexandra had completed a university degree. Instead most had obtained a diploma or certificate from an accredited institution.

Figure 5 below illustrates the level of tertiary education obtained by respondents in each of the two study areas. The bar on the left of the graph represents the total cohort, in the middle is the Bryanston group, and on the right of the graph is the Alexandra group.

Figure 5: Educational achievement of the respondents




Figure 5 above shows that by South African standards the respondents to this study were a relatively well educated group. Half of them had received a university education, and the remainder had pursued some level of tertiary education upon completion of their high school education.

In terms of origin, as far as possible the respondents were purposively selected from donors who were born and bred in Johannesburg. The vast majority (80%) of the respondents were of Johannesburg origin, but 30% of these had lived outside of the city at some point in their lives. The remaining 20% of respondents had been born and raised elsewhere but had lived in Johannesburg for a significant portion of their adult lives.

There was a diversity of age groups represented in each of the two study areas. The average age of respondents was 35 years old, although the outliers were the youngest at 21 years and the oldest at 55 years old. In terms of gender, 60% of the respondents were female and the remaining 40% male. This breakdown reflected the overall gender diversity of MSF donors in South Africa, and was therefore considered suitable for the purposes of the research.

Figure 6 on the left below shows the respondents' places of origin. Figure 7 on the right depicts the percentage of respondents in each of the assigned age groups (20s, 30s, 40s or 50s).

Figure 6: Origin of the respondents





Figure 7: Age of the respondents



4.2 The Qualitative Component (2): Key Findings of the Interviews

The key findings from the research are grouped here according to theme. The first section below (4.2.1) addresses the giving behaviour of the respondents. Here findings are presented on giving habits in terms of donations of money, goods and time. The second section (4.2.2) covers the stated motivations of donors for supporting international causes. The third and final section (4.2.3) presents findings of the respondents' views on international and local NGOs and the work they are involved in.

4.2.1 The giving behaviour of the respondents

Question one of the topic guide was specifically designed to illicit information about the current giving behaviour of the respondents. The question posed was *"Have you donated money, time or goods to any other charities in the past year?"* This was then followed up by a series of related questions, the form of which depended upon the initial answer provided by the interviewees. The intention of these questions was to discover whether respondents had an interest in any other local or international charities. Furthermore it was to gauge their levels of involvement in the varied forms of social giving, and to probe any ideological standpoints on giving.

The respondents were asked to comment on only the gifts that they might have made to NGOs/INGOs or directly to the poor. They were not to include details of any gifts that were made to their friends or to members of their extended family over the past year (i.e. gifts that might be considered obligatory).

70% of the respondents claimed to have given money to a charity other than MSF during the 12 month period from December 2011 to November 2012. Of these, 30% gave regularly to another charity (i.e. on more than three separate occasions in the year). This regular giving was done either by monthly direct debit or by other less formal means (i.e. bank transfers or gifts of cash).

However, the majority of those who donated money did so only on an ad hoc basis. This involved giving either in response to a particular seasonal appeal from an NGO/INGO, or giving directly to those in need, such as to people begging on the street. In other words their giving was not structured, nor necessarily ideologically driven. Instead it was done in response to varied appeals, from either a formal agency, from personal connections or directly from the poor.

The interview group from Bryanston were significantly more likely to have donated (80% gave money during the past year) than the group from Alexandra (only 40% gave money). However, the percentage of household income donated by both the Bryanston and Alexandra cohorts could not be established. This was because the interviewees were not asked to provide the amounts of money that they had donated, nor were their income levels made available for the purposes of the research.

70% of respondents also claimed to have donated material goods over the past year. These included gifts of blankets, food and blood. In exactly half of these cases the donation of goods to those in need was facilitated by a friend or family member. These respondents mentioned being made aware of the particular need due to discussions with friends or family members who were directly involved in the provision of in-kind donations. None of the respondents were actively involved in seeking out charities in order to donate goods.

Respondents from both study areas gave material goods in almost equal measure. 40% of the total had given blood over the past year, which is a significant proportion of the study cohort. As with the giving of money, donations of such goods appeared to be driven by specific appeals either from agencies (such as through blood drives) or from friends or family members. Only three of the respondents stated that they had not given any goods to an NGO/INGO or directly to the poor.

Despite the relatively high incidence of donations of money and goods (both at 70%), only 40% of respondents stated that they had volunteered their time for a good cause during the past year. Interestingly, all of those who donated

their time were female. Not one of the male respondents claimed to have volunteered any of their time. The incidence of volunteering also increased with age, education and place of residence. The majority of respondents involved in this activity hailed from Bryanston.

Table 2 below contains the responses of each of the interviewees to question one. The 'X' indicates an activity that was performed by a particular respondent during the past year (December 2011 to November 2012). The final row of the table shows the total percentage of the respondents who claimed to have given in each of these three particular manners.

Table 3: The incidence of respondents giving money, time and goods

Resp.	Study Site	Money	Time	Goods
1	Alex	X	-	X
2	Alex	-	-	-
3	Alex	-	-	X
4	Alex	-	-	X
5	Alex	X	X	X
6	Bryn	X	X	-
7	Bryn	X	-	X
8	Bryn	X	-	-
9	Bryn	X	X	X
10	Bryn	X	X	X
% of total respondents		70%	40%	70%

As explained previously, at issue for this research were the frequency and the reasons behind the respondent's involvement in charitable giving. This was done to compare and contrast donor motivations for giving, unclouded by the relative size of the respondents' donations. Therefore the absolute volumes of money, time and goods donated were not an issue addressed by this research.

4.2.2 Stated Motivations

Questions two and three of the interview were used to guide the discussion on donor motivations. The first of these asked *"How did you hear about MSF?"* and the second *"What made you decide to donate to MSF?"* The former question was designed to gauge the respondents' depth of knowledge about MSF, and by implication their understanding of international humanitarianism. It was also to test whether they had become donors and adherents to international causes after being solicited by MSF fundraising personnel, or whether their interest in international emergency relief had a longer history.


The second question built on this line of inquiry and was pointedly designed to determine exactly why the respondents had become donors. Both questions were aimed at uncovering the respondents' interests in international humanitarianism, and their reasons for deciding to support MSF and its work abroad despite the myriad social issues plaguing South Africa.

A belief in the 'humanitarian cause' was the most frequently reported motivation for giving. Humanitarianism involves providing assistance to the world's most vulnerable populations, regardless of their origin. Major emergencies such as conflict and natural disasters serve to heighten people's vulnerabilities. During such times the humanitarian imperative is to provide assistance as and where necessary. A belief in this humanitarian cause was cited by 40% of the respondents as their primary reason for supporting MSF.

On further investigation it was established that these respondents considered it an obligation to help people in need. They respected MSF and felt comfortable donating money to the organization to implement relief programmes abroad as the organization saw fit. This position was reinforced by an overwhelming belief among these respondents that South Africa was a relatively more stable and well-off country than others in Africa. Therefore their donations might be better spent elsewhere.

The interviews revealed that each respondent had a range of motivations for supporting MSF. However, most respondents had a primary motivation that they presented as the main driving force of their support for international causes. Figure 8 below depicts these primary stated motivations for donating money to MSF. They fall into five categories, which are displayed on the left vertical axis of the graph. The bars on the graph represent the percentage of respondents who claimed each of these motivations as their primary cause for donating.

Figure 8: The Primary Stated Motivations for Donating to MSF




There were only minor differences in the primary stated motivations of respondents from Bryanston and those from Alexandra. As indicated in section 3, these two study areas had been used as a proxy for the respondents' income. This was done in order to determine whether income had an influence on a South African individual's reasons for donating.

One difference between the two study areas was that 80% of respondents from Alexandra discussed the issue of money when asked to give their motivations for donating. They mentioned that their support for MSF was contingent upon their being able to continue to afford the monthly donations. The issue of affordability was paramount, and frequently referred to. This may have also been true of the Bryanston respondents, but during the

interview this group focussed on their expressed motivations for giving rather than on their financial situations.

A further difference was that fundraising solicitations played a much larger role in prompting the initial donation from the Alexandra respondents than it did from the Bryanston respondents. As figure 9 below shows, 80% of the total respondents stated that their initial donation to MSF was prompted by a face-to-face solicitation by an MSF fundraiser. This includes 100% of the Alexandra group and 60% of the Bryanston group.

Figure 9: Percentage of respondents who became donors following a solicitation



Significantly, the interviews revealed that 80% of the respondents would most likely not have given to MSF had there not been a fundraising solicitation. This was despite their stated motivations for supporting international causes.

4.2.3 International versus Local NGOs

The final questions of the interview were designed to encourage a conversation on the respondents' understandings of international humanitarianism, as well as on their preferences for international or local (i.e. South African) relief agencies and causes. Questions 4 and 5 of the topic guide were linked, with the former asking *"How do you feel about giving to*


international causes in comparison to local causes?" and the latter *"Do you think that international NGOs are more effective than local NGOs?"*

These two questions were followed by a discussion on whether the respondents felt that South Africa was worse off today than it was ten years ago. This question was used to gauge how people felt about their own futures in the country, as research has shown that people are more likely to donate when they feel secure about their future.

80% of the respondents, split evenly between the two study areas, indicated that they preferred donating money to INGOS rather than to local NGOs. These respondents tended to hold negative views of local NGOs, which were characterised as being corrupt and mismanaged. INGOs on the other hand were seen as more transparent and accountable to their donors.

INGOs were further favoured by the respondents due to their perceived heightened effectiveness in delivering humanitarian aid, as well as their frequent communications with donors. Figure 10 below illustrates the respondents' preferences for giving to international NGOs or local South African NGOs. The titles on the left vertical axis include a) a preference for INGOs; b) a preference for local NGOs; or c) no preference. The percentage of respondents who indicated either of these options is represented in the adjoining graph bars.

Figure 10: Preferences for International or Local Non-governmental Organizations



Several of the respondents (40% each in the Alexandra and Bryanston groups) felt proud that they were able to help people in need across the continent. However, the stated preference for giving to INGOs did not necessarily translate into a preference for international causes over local causes. 40% of the respondents stated that they would prefer for their donation to be spent where the needs are greatest, including in South Africa.

4.3 The Quantitative Component: Key Findings of the On-Site Poll

The on-site poll was conducted in January 2013. The questions used in the poll were formulated based on the stated motivations and preferences of the respondents from Alexandra and Bryanston. Individuals who had recently become donors to MSF were asked to answer two short questions, the first being: *"What made you decide to donate to an international cause?"* and the second: *"Why did you decide to donate to MSF in particular?"* The purpose of these questions was to establish whether the responses from the one-on-one interviews were common to other supporters of international causes.

There were severe limitations to this quantitative method. The primary issue was that the on-site poll respondents had only recently heard of the work of MSF and had not yet had time to articulate their motivations for making their donation. This was not true of the qualitative interview respondents. As mentioned previously, the vast majority of these interview respondents (80%) indicated that they had first heard of MSF through a fundraising solicitation. They stated that they would not have donated had this solicitation not occurred. Following further engagement with MSF however, most of these respondents subsequently articulated their motivations for donating to international causes. This is evidenced in the interview respondents' heightened comprehension of international humanitarianism as propounded by MSF in its' donor communications.

Similarly, the majority of respondents to the on-site poll had also heard about MSF first through a fundraising solicitation. However, this solicitation had occurred just minutes before the poll was conducted. As a result these

respondents were not given sufficient time to articulate their own motivations for making the donation to MSF. They had also not yet demonstrated the loyalty that the respondents to the interview had done by donating on a regular basis for over six months. This affected the quality of the data retrieved through the on-site poll.

On the left of Table 3 below are the choices that were offered for the first question of the poll. On the right of the table are the percentages of new donors who selected each particular motivation. The fifty poll respondents were asked to select only the one statement that most applied to them.

Table 3: "What made you decide to donate to an international cause?"

Motivations	**% of donors**
I Care about the humanitarian cause	32%
It's important to provide for basic needs of the poor	24%
I want to help the poor to help themselves	10%
It feels good to help people	6%
I donate for religious reasons	26%
Other	2%

Table 4 below presents the responses to question two of the poll. The left column of the table contains a series of statements on why a person might donate to MSF. The right column contains the percentage of respondents who selected one of the particular reasons. As in the first question of the poll, respondents were asked to select only the one statement that resonated most with them, even if they agreed with more than one of the statements.

Table 4: "Why did you decide to support MSF in particular?"

Reason	**% of donors**
MSF is aligned with my interests	14%
MSF is an accountable organization	38%
I respect the work that MSF does	26%
MSF has demonstrated good governance	4%
MSF has sound fiscal management	10%
MSF spends an appropriate amount on administration	8%

Chapter 5: Analysis of the Research

5.1 Introduction

Once the data had been collected, a thematic analysis was conducted to identify common responses to the qualitative and quantitative components of the research. This included an inductive analysis of the verbal data collected during the interviews, and a deductive analysis of the quantitative data from the on-site poll. The inductive approach for the qualitative component was a straight forward way to condense the varied responses into a summary format with legible patterns. It helped to tease out the dominant themes related to the research objectives.

The general purpose of the research had been to explore South African motivations for supporting international humanitarian interventions by non-governmental organizations. The focus in particular was on establishing any commonalities in the respondent's motivations for giving to international causes. This was considered to be the main theme of the research analysis. A second important theme for the analysis was the respondents' preferences for supporting INGOs and international causes over local NGOs and causes.

In the instance of the first theme, comparisons were made between the interview respondents' stated motivations for supporting international causes based on income, age and education levels. The findings from this analysis were then contrasted with the responses to the on-site poll. The same process took place for the analysis of the second theme. Here too the data collected during the interviews was categorized, and then patterns were identified. The findings were then compared to the responses to the poll.

A basic coding system was applied to reveal patterns in the data. Once the pertinent information had been coded it was gathered together for a comparative analysis. Special attention was paid to deviant cases to account for why they differed from other responses.

The data from the qualitative and quantitative components of the research were further compared to the key findings of the literature review as outlined in chapter 2. The review had concluded that there was a high likelihood that

South Africans would support international causes once they were given the opportunity to do so. This conclusion had been reached because the literature review had shown that in general South Africans were a) concerned with human solidarity; b) had an increasing interest in humanitarian issues; and c) were very involved in social giving. Furthermore, some of the most exhaustive studies into social giving in South Africa had revealed that giving was developing along non-racial lines and that there would be a growing number of INGOs fundraising in the country in the very near future.

Chapter 4 of this research paper presented the raw data from the on one-on-one interviews and the on-site poll. These interviews were conducted with ten respondents over a period of two months. The on-site poll consisted of responses from fifty new MSF donors over a one week period. There were strong patterns in the data in terms of commonalities between the responses of all these participants.

This chapter (5) is an analysis of the findings from the data presentation section. This analysis in turn leads to the conclusions and implications in chapter 6. The analysis, conclusions and implications are limited in their scope due to the relatively small size of the research participant groups. The findings can therefore not be extrapolated to the South African population as a whole. It was intended for this initial mixed method research project to help to inform further research into the potential for individuals in South Africa to become a major source of funding for global humanitarian assistance through INGOs. The findings from this research serve as an indicator of how South Africans might respond when requested to financially support international humanitarian interventions.

5.2 The Analysis

The analysis suggests that both rich and poor South Africans would be willing to structure their giving behaviour and to donate regularly to international causes. There is a high likelihood of this happening because the interview and on-site poll respondents a) cited humanitarian interests as their main

motivation for donating; b) responded positively to INGO fundraising solicitations and c) showed a higher level of trust in and a preference for INGOs over local (i.e. South African) NGOs.

The research respondents' motivations for giving were more altruistic than egoistic. This was in line with research by Radley and Kennedy (1995) and Jones (1989), which found that most giving involved providing voluntary assistance with no implied reciprocity. The altruistic motivations of the research respondents furthermore demonstrated the spirit of Ubuntu, the South African world view characterised by consideration for others, generosity and virtuousness (Du Toit, 2009). The main stated motivational factor for giving was a concern for humanity. This was verified by the findings of the State of Social Giving Report which highlighted the importance that South Africans ascribed to helping one's fellow man (Everatt & Solanki, 2005).

The findings from this research paper therefore confirmed two established academic notions about the giving behaviour of South Africans. These were that in general South Africans a) have altruistic motivations for giving; and b) have a great concern for their fellow man. However, in addition to this, the research paper showed that this concern for one's fellow man can extend beyond the borders of South Africa to vulnerable populations living abroad.

South Africans are altruistic and have a concern for humanity. This was confirmed by both the literature review and the research in question. Yet most South Africans have not been adequately informed about international humanitarian crises nor given the opportunity to financially support the work of INGOs in this area. This demonstrates the importance of fundraising solicitations in getting South Africans to support international causes. Research by Hibbert & Horne (1996), Bekkers & Wiepking (2007), Radley & Kennedy (1995) and Hodgkinson & Wetzman (1995) confirmed that even if individuals have an inclination to support a certain cause, they needed to be made aware of the specific need before they would donate.

This is evidenced by the fact that each of the interview respondents had been relatively easily convinced to structure their giving behaviour and to donate

regularly to international causes. The data from the qualitative component showed that the majority of these respondents had not previously had any structure to their giving. Those who had been engaged in any other charitable activities preferred to give of their money or material goods, rather than of their time. For the most part this giving was done in an ad hoc fashion, without ideological direction and only in response to specific appeals from friends or family.

The analysis confirmed the importance of the fundraising appeal in convincing prospective donors to alter this type of unstructured approach to charitable giving. 80% of the qualitative component respondents indicated that their decision to support an international cause was based primarily on the fact that they were asked to do so. None of these respondents had prior knowledge of the humanitarian work of MSF. None of them had previously supported a formal non-profit organization with regular monthly donations. However, once they had been informed of the urgent humanitarian needs in other parts of the world, these South Africans became reliable, regular donors to MSF.

The analysis further uncovered that income was not a determining factor in donor motivations or the frequency of giving. The respondents' level of income did not have an impact on the regularity of their donations. The five respondents from Alexandra and the five from Bryanston had all been dedicated donors to MSF for over six months prior to the research being conducted.

Finally, the interview respondents showed that they were significantly more comfortable giving to international NGOs instead of local (i.e. South African) NGOs. This finding was in line with research by Kuljian (2005) into the giving habits of South Africans which showed that South Africans were most comfortable giving to formal institutions that they could trust. INGOs such as MSF, with greater resources and operational experience than most local South African NGOs, were able to project a higher level of accountability and transparency to the research respondents. Therefore the respondents showed a clear preference for INGOs during the interviews.

However, 40% of the respondents stated that they would prefer for their donation to be spent where the needs are greatest, including in South Africa. This suggests that respondents are more willing to support the work of INGOs than local NGOs, even if this work takes place in South Africa itself.

In summary, the analysis of the research data and the literature review found that there was a very high likelihood that most South Africans would be willing to support international humanitarian work by INGOs. The stated motivations of the research respondents confirmed the high incidence of altruism cited in other studies into social giving behaviour in South Africa. Furthermore, the research respondents displayed an interest in and an understanding of humanitarianism, such as had been attributed to South Africans in wide-ranging reports such as The Social Giving Report (2005) and the Giving Report (2010). This research paper therefore highlighted the importance of INGO fundraising solicitations in convincing an altruistic and increasingly internationalised South African society to support international causes.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Implications

This research paper established that most current donors to MSF in the Alexandra and Bryanston areas did not have a history of structured charitable giving prior to their initial transfer of funds to the organization. Instead these donors had previously given to charity only on an ad hoc basis, usually in response to an appeal from a local agency, friend or family member. Their giving was neither structured nor ideologically driven. Furthermore the research found that they preferred to give money and goods to charity, rather than to volunteer their time.

However, the respondents' giving behaviour changed significantly after they had been exposed to an MSF fundraising solicitation. Just being made aware of the needs of vulnerable populations abroad was in itself sufficient to prompt these South African donors to support MSF's international humanitarian activities. They became regular monthly donors to the organization, giving unrestricted funds to be used in MSF projects both locally and abroad. In this manner they demonstrated an understanding of the humanitarian imperative to provide assistance as and when it is needed.

This engagement with MSF has not just irrevocably altered the respondents' giving behaviour; it has also altered their perceptions of INGOs and the activities that they perform. The respondents now hold a greater trust in international NGOs than they do in local South African NGOs. They have also developed an appreciation for the effectiveness of large and experienced INGOs such as MSF in delivering humanitarian assistance during emergencies.

Almost all academic research into the subject of donor motivations in South African is focussed on current patterns in domestic giving. This exclusive focus has prevented the development of a comprehensive picture of the variables that impact on the flow of resources from South African citizens to international causes. There is an absolute dearth of information on the motivations for South Africans donating to international causes, and on the potential for this phenomenon to increase substantially in the near future.

The literature review found that most researchers refuted the notion that South Africans could become comfortable in giving to international causes. Furthermore, the State of Social Giving Report found that what internationalism has not permeated equally in South African society (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). These widely accepted conclusions are contested by the findings of this research paper.

These research findings have two important implications. Firstly, fundraising appeals that make prospective donors aware of humanitarian needs abroad have the potential to be very effective in soliciting support from South Africans. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority of the respondents tended to give money or goods in response to specific appeals, either from agencies, the poor or from friends and family members.

Secondly, there is a significant possibility that the previously ad hoc giving behaviour of most South Africans could be structured with the introduction of monthly direct debit donations. As addressed above, only 30% of the research respondents were in the habit of giving regularly to an NGO/INGO prior to being approached by MSF for a monthly donation. However, since being made aware of specific international causes, and of the importance of regular support from individuals, each of the respondents has become a long-term regular donor to MSF. This is despite relatively erratic giving behaviour in the recent past.

What is needed now is a national survey that measures behavioural trends in charitable giving to international causes. This would help to support the argument that there is great potential for South Africa to become a major source of funding for global humanitarian assistance.

References

Affordable Land and Housing Data Centre (2012). *Suburb Profiles: Diepsloot*. Retrieved on 8 August 2012 from: http://www.alhdc.org.za/static_content/?p=1227

Badenhorst, C. (2012). *Research Writing: Breaking the Barriers*. 3rd Impression. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers

Banks, J. & Tanner, A.(1999). *Patterns in Household Giving: Evidence from UK Data*. International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations. Vol. 10, pp. 167 - 178

Batson, C. & Shaw, L. (1991). *Evidence for Altruism: Toward a Pluralism of Prosocial Motives*. Psychological Inquiry. Vol. 2; pp. 107 – 122.

Barron, C. (2013). *Championing the Nonprofit Sector*. Retrieved from the Business Times 27 Jan 2013 from: http://www.bdlive.co.za/business/2013/01/27/championing-the-nonprofit-sector

Bekkers, R. And Wiepking, P. (2007). *Generosity and Philanthropy: a Literature Review*. Presented at the 35th Annual Conference for the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action, November 16 – 18 , 2007, Chicago. Retrieved on 11 December 2012 from: http://www.fss.uu.nl/soc/homes/bekkers/generosity.pdf

Barclays Wealth (2010). *Global Giving: the Culture of Philanthropy: a White Paper in Co-operation with Ledburg Research*. Retrieved on 8 August 2012 from: http://www.barclayswealth.com/Images/BarclaysWealth_GlobalGiving__US.pdf

Batson, C. (1990). *How Social and Animal? The Human Capacity for Caring*. American Psychologist, Vol. 5, pp. 336 – 346

Bell, J. (2007). *Doing Your Research Project; 4th edition*. Open University Press: Berkshire, England

Brown, E. & Ferris, J. (2007). *Social Capital and Philanthropy: And Analysis of the Impact of Social Capital on Individual Giving and Volunteering*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. Vol. 6; pp. 85 – 99.

Callero, P.; Howard, J. & Piliavin, J. (1987). *Helping Behaviour as Role Behaviour: Disclosing Social Structure and History in the Analysis of Prosocial Action*. Social Psychology Quarterly, Vol. 5, pp. 247 – 256

Dulany, P and Winder, D. (2001). *The Status of and Trends in Private Philanthropy in the Southern Hemisphere*. The Synergos Institute, New York. Retrieved on 23 November 2012 from: http://www.synergos.org/knowledge/01/philanthropyinsouthernhemisphere.htm

Everatt, D and Solanki, G. (2005). *A Nation of Givers: Social Giving Among South Africans*. From The State of Social Giving in South Africa Report Series. Retrieved 19 October 2012 from: http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/SOG_report.pdf

Ewing, D. (2010). *Understanding Private Foreign Giving in South Africa*. Retrieved on 8 August 2012 from http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/socialgiving5-6.pdf

Jones, C. (1989). *The Charitable Imperative*. Londen: Routledge,

Johannesburg Poverty and Livelihoods Study (2009). Retrieved on 4 August 2012 from: http://www.ncr.org.za/pdfs/Research_Reports/Livelihoods%20study.pdf

Johnson, R.; Onwuegbuzie, A., and Turner, L. (2007). *Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research*. The Journal of Mixed Methods Research, Vol. 1. Retrieved on 5 December 2012 from http://drupal.coe.unt.edu/sites/default/files/24/59/Johnson,%20Burke%20Mixed%20Methods%20Research.pdf

Havens et al (2007). *Charitable Giving: How Much, by Whom, to What, and How?* In The Nonprofit Sector: a Research Handbook, Eds. W. Powell & R. Steinberg. Pp 542 – 567. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Habib, A and Maharaj, B (Eds.). (2007). *Giving and Solidarity: Resource Flows for Poverty Alleviation and Development in South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council Press

Hibbert, S. & Suzanne, H. (1996). *Giving to Charity: Questioning the Donor Decesion Process*. Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol. 13(2), 4 – 15

Houston, D. (2006). *Walking the Walk of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood and Money*. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. Vol. 16; pp. 67 – 86.

Katz, S. (1999). *Where Did the Serious Study of Philanthropy Come From, Anyway?* Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. Vol. 8; pp. 74 - 82

Kulijan, L. (2005). *Philanthropy and Equity: The Case of South Africa*. Paper Commissioned for the Harvard Global Equity Initiative. Retrieved on 24 October 2012 from www.fas.harvard.edu/acgei/philanthropyPDFs

Mabovula, N. (2011). *The Erosion of African Communal Values: a Reappraisal of the African Ubuntu Philosophy*. Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 3, No 1, pp 38 – 47

Mahony, H. (2012). *Europe Entering Age of Aid Austerity*. Retrieved on 16 January 2013 from www.eurobserver.com/foreign/115801

Neuman, L. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (7th edition).* Boston: Pearson Press

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2012). *Net Official Development Assistance from DAC and other OECD members in 2011*. Retrieved on 9 August 2012 from http://www.oecd.org/dac/aidstatistics/50060310.pdf

Radley, A. & Kennedy, M. (1995). *Charitable Giving by Individuals: a Study of Attitudes and Practice.* Human Relations, Vol. 48(6), 683 - 709

Rapley, T. (2009). *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis*. The Sage Qualitative Research Kit. Sage Publications: London

Rooney et al (2001). *A Methodological Comparison of Giving Surveys*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. Vol. 30, pp 551 – 568.

Statistics South Africa 1 (2010). *Statistical Release P0211.2: Monthly Earnings of South Africans*. Retrieved on 4 January 2013 from www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P02112/P021122010.pdf

Statistics South Africa 2 (2012). *Quarterly Labour Force Survey: Quarter 3*, 2012. Retrieved on 4 January 2013 from www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0211/P02113rdQuarter2012

Stirk, C. (2012). *Announced Cuts to Aid Budgets Amongst World's Top 20 Donors.* Retrieved on 14 January 2013 from www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/announced-cuts-to-aid-budgets-amongst-worlds-top-20-donors-3656.html

Tapula, T., de Kock, P. And Sturman, K. (2012). *South Africa's Development Partnership Agency: a Burden or a Blessing?* South African Institute of International Affairs. Retrieved on 8 December 2012 from www.saiia.org.za/diplomatic-pouch/south-africa-s-development-partnership-agency-a-burden-or-blessing.html