the purposes for which they were given is crucial, as is informing donors about how these commitments have been kept. Stewardship applies to donors at all levels and not just major donors.

Waters calls for more research in this area. The current study should be

expanded to encompass a broader range of organizations. The model also needs to be tested in international contexts.

Hon, L.C. and Grunig, J.E. (1999) *Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations*. Gainesville, FL: The Institution for Public Relations.

International Journal of Educational Advancement (2009) 8, 228–236.
doi:10.1057/ijea.2009.14

**SUSAN D. SAMPSON
AND LYNDIA L. MOORE
(2008), 'IS THERE A GLASS
CEILING FOR WOMEN
IN DEVELOPMENT?'
NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT
AND LEADERSHIP, 18(3),
PP. 321–339**

Equal opportunity and comparable compensation for women and minorities has not become a reality despite legislation that was enacted more than 40 years ago. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 stipulates that within an organization, the compensation for similar work should be the same without regard to gender.

Denial of access to the highest paying positions to women, minorities and the disabled is known as the 'glass ceiling.' Although glass ceilings are created by discrimination and bias, pay disparities between men and women are often attributed to women leaving the workforce for periods of time to take care of family obligations. Time out of the workforce translates to significantly lower lifetime earnings. However, there is no research that supports the notion that women are leaving the workforce in large numbers for substantial periods of family leave.

Statistical comparisons of women in the workforce, educational attainment, senior managerial positions held and wages over a 10-year period document the existence of a glass ceiling for women in the corporate world.

This presence has not been as persuasively documented in the nonprofit arena but comparisons can be made. Women managers in the nonprofit sector are both underrepresented and undercompensated. In both the profit and nonprofit sectors, the compensation gap is highest in middle age and older individuals. Nonprofit wages tend to be lower than government or profit companies. In addition, women in the nonprofit sector are paid less than their male counterparts. A disproportionate number of women in the nonprofit sector work for small and midsize organizations. Where women have managed to advance in the larger organizations, male executives earned 27 per cent more than women in comparable positions. One favorable change has been in foundation board composition, where the percentage of women participants grew from 23 to 34 per cent between 1982 and 2000.

Within the field of fund raising, prior research indicates that women comprise the majority of members of professional organizations. There are more women than men entering the profession. Salaries for women are two-thirds those of men in comparable positions.

Based on evidence provided by other researchers, Sampson and Moore pose four research questions:

- Is there a wage disparity between women and men in the development field? If wage disparity does exist, in which types and sizes of organization does it occur?
- Is there a glass ceiling? Are women taking time out of the workforce in great numbers, thereby limiting their future careers?
- If there is a wage disparity between women and men in the development field, is it becoming greater or lesser over time?
- Given the state of the development field today, what can individuals and organizations do to remedy the wage and advancement gaps for women? (p. 325)

Methodology

An online questionnaire was sent to 4393 men and women who are members of fund-raising professional organizations in the northeastern United States. The 50-question instrument included questions on demographics, salaries, bonuses, pensions, benefits and leadership. A total of 970 surveys (22 per cent) were completed. Gender representation was 800 women and 170 men. Chi square analysis was used to determine relationships between variables and gender. The variables included

organization type, organization size, institutional budget, area of responsibility, job title, advancement expectations, salary, satisfaction with salary, pension, time off, reason for time off, marital status, age, children at home, highest academic degree, related course work and racial or ethnic identity. A longitudinal perspective was obtained by comparing the results with data collected in 1988 and 1998 by Women in Development of Greater Boston (WID).

Results

The data confirmed that men earn more than women – on average 28 per cent more. Salaries are aligned until the director level, beyond which most women fail to advance. The senior-level positions occupied primarily by men create a large proportion of the wage disparity. Women work in smaller and mid-sized organizations that pay lower salaries. The organizations offering the highest salaries tended to hire men. Men consistently make more money through the course of their career even though there is no difference in educational attainment for men and women in the field. Fewer women had a pension plan.

The disparity in lifetime earnings was not explained by time off from work. Women take time off from the workforce twice as often as men but more than 50 per cent of the women surveyed had never taken time off for any reason. These data dispel the notion that large numbers of women drop out of the workforce for long periods of time.

The longitudinal study demonstrated a persistent wage gap. Based on the

WID data, salary growth over the 18-year period from 1988 to 2005 was 18 per cent. Although the change between men and women was level during this time, the view is altered by examining job titles. The change in salaries at the senior level – positions primarily held by men – was 42 per cent. The growth in positions typically held by women was 10 per cent. Real salary growth was in positions not generally held by women.

The survey disclosed women's feelings about their potential to advance in the field. Surprisingly, 65 per cent were optimistic about the future. Those who were not cited the need for leadership development, workplace recognition of preferences for different leadership and work styles, and 'family-friendly policies and culture' (p. 333). Women believe they will get ahead 'by (1) using power and leadership effectively, (2) performing above and beyond job expectations, and (3) taking on high-visibility assignments' (p. 333).

Conclusions

It is apparent that a glass ceiling does exist for women in the field of fund raising. Gender wage disparity exists and little progress has been made in closing the gap. Although women tend to work in smaller organizations that pay less overall, women are paid less even within these organizations. Work experience is comparable across the board and cannot be used as an explanation for the difference. The data point to job title as a point of departure. Few women move beyond the director level into senior positions. The notion that women opt out of the workforce for substantial periods of time was not supported and cannot

be used to explain wage disparities. Although there has been salary growth in the field, it has occurred primarily at the highest levels where there are few women.

Implications and future research

Women in nonprofit organizations identify at least some of the same barriers to advancement as women in the corporate world:

- senior management failure to take responsibility for women's advancement;
- persistent stereotypes about appropriate roles for women and their ability to perform;
- female assumption of responsibility for family and personal needs;
- inability to gain access to formal networks.

Although corporations have put programs (such as child care services, leadership development and networking opportunities) in place to help women in these areas, there is no research that shows whether or not these same initiatives would have a positive impact in the nonprofit sector.

The authors recommend that organizations promote leadership training for women. In addition, senior managers need to be responsible for women's advancement – making certain that compensation and promotion are equitable. They also recommend implementation of work/family policies and supports that are vital for the advancement of women in the field.

Additional research is needed in a number of areas. Future studies need to include comparable

populations outside the New England area. These would help to determine if organizational size and geographic locale contribute to the glass ceiling effect. We also need to know if women in areas of the nonprofit world other than fund raising are moving beyond the director level. A more extensive examination of women leaving and returning to the workforce is warranted. As the number of women of color in this sample was too small to draw any inferences, it implies that recruitment of women of color is also a major issue.

**GREG PIPER AND SYLKE V. SCHNEPF (2008),
'GENDER DIFFERENCES
IN CHARITABLE GIVING
IN GREAT BRITAIN,'
VOLUNTAS, 19, PP. 103–124**

Prior research indicates that women are more likely to make charitable donations than are men but the relative amounts are not agreed upon by researchers. The aim of this study was to look at differences in gender giving patterns. Analyses were conducted to see the effect of marital status and background factors such as age and education on giving behavior. Regression models were used to see if gender differences persist when background characteristics are controlled for.

The current study confirms that in Britain, women are more likely to give independent of marital status and other background characteristics. It also confirms prior research that among single donors, women tend to give more than men. The study also examines gender preferences for causes supported through donations.

The CAF/NCVO Individual Giving Survey provided data for the research. The survey is run three times per year as part of the Omnibus Survey of the Office for National Statistics. It is a face-to-face instrument utilizing Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing. Participants were asked about their personal giving during the previous 4-week period as well as a series of demographic questions. The survey has some inherent potential limitations including

- seasonality (may not reflect or may overemphasize seasonal differences in donations);
- household giving (participants take personal credit for giving by a household);
- definitions of 'charity' may not be universally interpreted in the same way;
- participants must assign gifts to a specific cause although more than one may apply;
- gifts that were stripped from the sample because they appeared to be related to fundraising events.

At the broadest level of analysis, a significantly larger number of donors were women. Among average donors, women gave more than men. Above the 75th percentile, men are the larger donors.

The analysis of giving to specific causes indicated that in almost all areas, the number of women donors is higher. The areas of largest gaps are animal welfare, education, the aged, medicine and child welfare. There were small differences in number of donors to environmental causes, religion and mental health. Variations in amount given were most significant for religion, where men gave considerably

more. Overall, women gave more but spread it over a broader range of causes.

Marital status had some effect on giving patterns. The data showed insignificant differences in either frequency or amount of giving by women, regardless of marital status. The greatest variances were between single men and women, which can be attributed to factors such as age, education, income and accumulated wealth. The quintile analysis of amounts showed that married people generally give in higher amounts than singles. However, up to the 90th percentile, women gave more than men. This shift occurred at the 75th percentile for married individuals. Overall, single women gave more often and in higher amounts than men.

Variations in giving by age and educational attainment are presented in a series of graphs. Age and gender are plotted against giving to a composite of causes and then individually for the areas of child welfare, religion, animal welfare, international aid and medical research. Graphs showing gender versus age giving by marital status are also presented. Finally, giving by women is plotted against educational attainment.

The final section of data analysis examines the extent to which gender differences in giving can be attributed to background elements such as age and income. The authors used regression analysis to determine both the frequency and amount of gifts in relation to a range of background characteristics. The results corroborated earlier evidence that proportionally more women make donations. The amount given was analyzed using a quintile regression

model with separate calculations for married and single individuals. Only in the highest quintiles did men exhibit higher amounts of giving.

Piper and Schnepf suggest areas of research that need to be addressed. Their results assumed that individuals had not claimed household gifts as individual gifts. They recommend additional research to confirm their findings. The current study also does not satisfy questions regarding gender, giving and how responsive donors are to tax incentives that modify the price of giving.

**ASTER MEKONNEN AND
FIONA HARRIS (2008),
'LINKING PRODUCTS TO
A CAUSE OR AFFINITY
GROUP: DOES THIS
REALLY MAKE THEM
MORE ATTRACTIVE TO
CONSUMERS?' *EUROPEAN
JOURNAL OF MARKETING*,
42(1/2), PP. 135–153**

Cause-related affinity marketing links commercial marketing and nonprofit revenues. The purchase of a good or service triggers the donation of a sum to a designated cause or nonprofit organization. Cause-related marketing is differentiated by its short-term status, while affinity marketing implies a longer-term relationship. Affinity marketing draws on the identity that individuals have with groups that endorse the use of the affinity card or product. Little research has been done on consumer attitudes toward these arrangements because access to the names of individuals who participate has not been available. This study, which did have access to individual cardholders, begins to bridge this gap.

Mekonnen and Harris examined the premise that the connection with the nonprofit or cause is compelling enough to motivate consumers to choose a product over rival products available in the market. They found that the validity of this premise depends on the particular cause or affinity group. The value placed on the benefits varied by type of affinity group.

Both group and individual benefits are associated with affinity credit cards. One is the payment of sums to a designated nonprofit organization – usually an initial donation plus a percentage based on card purchases. The cards may also serve to promote the group and the self-image of the cardholder. Additional individual benefits may include a low interest rate. A four-part typology pairing individual versus group benefits and functional versus image benefits was developed to assess whether consumers are really attracted by the link between the affinity card and the cause or organization.

Methodology and findings

The consumer credit card market has been a major venue for affinity marketing. A connection is forged between the consumer and a product or cause that is exemplified by the credit card. Presumably, the affinity card creates and nurtures an ongoing relationship between the consumer and the associated group and the transaction between the consumer and the affinity group has ongoing value to the consumer. These assumptions were tested both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Individual interviews and focus groups were used to develop an

understanding of how consumers perceive their use of affinity cards and the relationships they may or may not represent. A total of 10 individual interviews and seven focus groups (total of 26 participants) were conducted in London. Five categories of affinity cards were represented – professional organization, work-related membership, lifestyle, charity and university. Topics covered in the focus groups were perceptions of affinity, relationship with the affinity and financial services organization offering the card, the decision to open an affinity account, attitudes about using the affinity card, and about credit card use in general. The data were analyzed using QSR N6 qualitative analysis software to discover themes and areas of disagreement.

Although affinity cards are marketed around the notion that consumers value the opportunity to make donations through using the card, participants indicated that this was an important factor in deciding to get the card but it was not the only attraction. Over the long term, the financial benefits became more important. Benefits such as interest rate, interest-free period and online account management were a deciding factor in opening the card. As long as it did not have a negative financial impact, consumers would adopt the card. A recurring theme was that cardholders wanted to know how much money was being raised through card usage and how it was being used. There was no sense that a long-term relationship was being developed and sustained. Participants also questioned the value of the affinity card for the beneficiary organizations.

Although there was evidence that some individuals did associate adopting a card with a personal identity, it was often tempered by a sense that in some situations, using the card was inappropriate or primarily a substitute membership card for a selected group. Promotion of the affinity group was also acknowledged by users but its importance was tempered by functional benefits.

The quantitative phase tested the prevalence of attitudes found during the interviews and focus groups. These six areas were:

Functional benefits:

- (1) Interest rate and
- (2) Interest-free period
- (3) Online account management
- (4) Individual image (status)
- (5) Group functional (donation to the affinity group)
- (6) Group image (promotion of affinity group)

The instrument also collected information on affinity card use, including whether or not information about the use of donations would affect use of the card and if the affinity card was the consumer's primary credit card. After pilot testing, the survey was sent to 5000 individuals. Four hundred and eight usable responses (8.02 per cent) were received. The largest number of respondents held university affinity credit cards. Groups other than membership organizations were equally represented; membership cards represented the lowest response group.

With the exception of charity cards, the individual functional benefits ranked first in importance to cardholders. Status conveyed by the

card was consistently ranked last. Group benefits (donation to and promotion of the affinity group) varied in importance. Priorities by affinity category were:

- membership organizations – individual functional benefits most important, other categories not important;
- professional organizations – individual functional benefits most important, other categories not important;
- universities – individual functional benefits most important, group functional benefits and image slightly important;
- charity – group benefits more important than individual;
- lifestyle organizations – individual and group benefits equally important.

Information on donations was most important to charity cardholders but, overall, donation information availability had no impact on choosing to use the affinity card over another card.

Conclusions

This study concludes that the assumptions that underpin the affinity credit card market are too simplistic. Financial benefits attached to the cards are much more important to holders than has been assumed. Since there are variations in consumer attitudes based on affinity organization type, marketing should be tailored to appeal to those differences. Affinity marketers also need to work to develop long-term commitments to card usage and to continually remind consumers that these cards serve a larger purpose while still being competitive with other credit cards.

**RICHARD MARTIN AND
JOHN RANDAL (2008),
'HOW IS DONATION
BEHAVIOR AFFECTED
BY THE DONATIONS OF
OTHERS?' *JOURNAL OF
ECONOMIC BEHAVIOR &
ORGANIZATION*, 67,
PP. 228–238**

Research to date has put forward a variety of theories to explain why people make charitable contributions. Much of this inquiry has been done in laboratory settings. Martin and Randal's research takes the issue into the natural setting – an art gallery that offers free admission but provides the opportunity to contribute through a prominently placed donation box. The researchers manipulated the contents but not the dollar value of the donation box in four ways – an empty box, a large collection of coins (50-cent box), a large number of small bills (\$5 box) or a few large bills (\$50 box) – anticipating that the contents would influence people's beliefs about the amount and frequency of donations that had gone into the box. They also questioned if the contents of the box might serve as a 'cognitive anchor' (p. 229) that would impact giving behavior.

Three theories that have been used to explain giving behavior are impure altruism – motivations other than pure unselfishness – conditional cooperation, where a personal will give if others are making a donation, and conformity to social norms, where a person will give an amount that reflects what he or she feels must be contributed to maintain self-esteem. In prior studies, information about the donations of others was provided to participants directly. In this case the information

about giving was indirect. Participants had to infer frequency and amount of gifts by observing the donation box. In particular, there was the element of how accurately people assessed the actual amount of money in the donation box.

The hypothesis that the contents of the donation box do not influence giving behavior was tested at City Gallery in Wellington, New Zealand in early 2005. The researchers imposed appropriate environmental controls to prevent bias in the data and measured the daily number of donations, total collars collected on any given day and number of visitors to the gallery. The resulting data disproved the hypothesis, showing that the contents of the box definitely affected subsequent donations. Busyness of the gallery also had an effect on donations. As the number of visitors increased, the number of donations went down.

Martin and Randal conclude that neither impure altruism nor conditional cooperation completely explain the results. The non-empty boxes generated higher average donations, which is inconsistent with the theory of impure altruism. The presence of a large number of small donations increased the frequency of donations but not necessarily the amount. This is consistent with the theory of conditional cooperation. Compared to the empty box, bills, either large or small, increased the average donation but the differences between small versus large bills in the box were insignificant. Frequency of donations was highest in the box with coins and lowest when empty. Average donation size was highest with bills and lowest with coins. The form of

donations tended to mimic the box contents that the donor was presented with.

The model of social norms appears to be a better theoretical explanation for the results. The empty box gave the signal to free ride, whereas the box full of coins sent the message that a small contribution was the norm. Not only was donation size consistent but composition of the money donated (coins versus bills) followed suit.

The research makes three contributions to the literature.

The evidence shows that people give in kind to conform to a perceived standard rather than as a reciprocating behavior. When information given to prospective donors is manipulated, there may be negative effects. In this case, the scenarios that produced more gifts resulted in smaller size gifts. Finally, information that is passed indirectly does influence what donors do but the current research does not show if the perceptions gained from indirect means are more influential than those directly received.