NOT JUST ABOUT THE MONEY

An exploration of barriers in giving to arts and culture

Student name Robin Ekkart

Student number 429114

Supervisor Prof. dr. A. Klamer

Second reader Prof. I. Mazza

MA Cultural Economics and Entrepreneurship

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master Thesis

June 11th, 2019

NOT JUST ABOUT THE MONEY

An exploration of barriers in giving to arts and culture

Abstract

Governmental budget cuts are often perceived to be diminishing the financial sustainability of the field of arts and culture. The lack of funding which is created by such budget cuts could be solved by stimulating an increase of private funding for arts and culture.

However, to stimulate such an increase, we need to know what hinders people to donate. Therefore, the aim of this research is to explore which barriers arise in giving monetary donations to arts and culture. What should be stressed, is that I do not aim to make implications for solving these barriers, as the scope of my research is not sufficient to do so.

I will explore barriers for giving to arts and culture through employing a qualitative research strategy, in which I will partake in exploratory and reflexive research. By doing so, I set out to interact with experts-in-practice in order to get in touch with the field and reflect on it, instead of keeping an academical distance and observing what seems to be going on. Furthermore, the reflexivity of my research enables me, personally, to pursue academic research in which I can be myself.

My research results in the insight that givers experience both practical and conceptual barriers in giving to arts and culture. Practical barriers often result in a question to give which is asked in an inelegant way, which discourages (further) giving. The conceptual barriers are structured in dichotomies which touch upon matters that are as big as the cultural field itself and which give way to multiple avenues for further research, such as rationality versus emotionality.

In sum, this thesis has a dual quest: to explore barriers for giving to arts and culture as well as bridging the gap between myself as a student and as a researcher.

Key words: arts philanthropy, motivations for giving, monetary donations, exploratory research, reflection through practice

Table of contents

1 Introduction

According to *Geven in Nederland* (Bekkers, Schuyt & Gouwenberg, 2017), giving – in abstract terms – is a private initiative for public benefit (Bekkers et al., 2017, p. 3). Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) provide a more concrete definition. From their perspective, which only incorporates the donation of money, giving is "the donation of money to an organization that benefits others beyond one's own family" (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011, p. 925). Klamer (2017) specifies that giving is a contribution to a practice in which givers can valorise their values. In my research, I will follow the definition which Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) propose as it suits both the perspective and focus of my research; it is a broad definition yet it is specified on monetary donations. Therefore, it fits my exploratory research by leaving room for my own results.

When looking at the academic knowledge available on philanthropy, it is noticeable that the literature and knowledge on giving is copious. We know how much people donate and how they do so (Bekkers et al., 2017) as well as why people partake in giving (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). What is missing in this abundance of literature, is detailed knowledge on why people do not donate money to arts and culture as this could give way to a solution for financing culture. Thus: what are the barriers for giving, what limits people to donate money to arts and culture?

1.1 Origins

At the start of my thesis process, this research was supposed to address why endowed foundations give financial resources to arts and culture. I was bound to research why wealthy individuals allocate their money towards the arts. Why do they do it? What motivates these endowed funds to donate to the arts? Why do they not put their money towards the building of a new hospital, for instance? Do they do so because of a genuine interest in the arts or because donating might bring them financial benefits through tax reimbursements?

I assumed that social and market logics (Klamer, 2017) are entangled when it comes to giving financial resources to arts and culture. And even more, I wanted to be the one to disentangle this issue, as well as I wanted to give a better insight in arts philanthropy.

Yet, something about this topic felt off. Not only was it too broad, after writing a personal reflection upon why I wanted to address this topic, it became clear that it was not urgent enough for me as a person. In this reflection, I wrote the following:

> "Arts and culture have always been important to me. From an early age on, they have enabled me to get in touch with my emotions and made it easier for me to process whatever happened in my often-troublesome childhood and family situation. Growing up in a single-parent-household, money often was scarce. Therefore, by the time I finished elementary school, I was well aware of the fact that my theatre course was too expensive for us and that arts and culture in general cost a lot of money. When starting high school, the Flemish budget cuts (Vanderbeeken, 2014) hit the cultural sector hard. Attending a leftist and rather artsy school, by graduating, I was certain about at least one thing: there is no money in culture and this is a bad thing.
>
> However, in the second year of my bachelor in Algemene Cultuurwetenschappen (Arts and Culture Studies), I had the opportunity to run an internship at a cultural fundraising agency. Alas, there is money for culture! Maybe not in Belgium, but I was now located in the Dutch cultural sector and there it was: private money for culture. Big lumps of it, just be to be thrown at you when you asked for it. Or so it seemed, for one glorious moment of stupidity (…).
>
> (…) I assume that it boils down to this: if I had money to spare, I would put it towards culture with the intention to keep arts and culture possible. Especially in a climate that is suffocating what I love so much.

What this personal reflection questions, is why not all affluent people give to culture – as I would do when I had the money. I wonder what holds them back.

However, all the above is based on personal feelings and experiences. Therefore, before drafting up a research question, I started to read up on monetary donations to arts and culture. As I already mentioned, while engaging in these first steps of research, something struck me: through academic knowledge, we already know a lot about this topic. However, we never address why people could feel limited in donating monetary resources to arts and culture, although this might be largely beneficial in the contemporary field of arts and culture. Again, what holds them back? To find more knowledge on the specific topic of barriers in giving to arts and culture, I turned to non-academic literature, to articles and opinionated pieces on giving, written in educated magazines and eligible newspapers such as *NRC* and *de Volkskrant*.

The academic literature on giving can be perceived as rather dull and generic: he gives that, she gives in this way and we assume they both do it out of, say, altruism. Hence, the liveliness of the debate in non-academic literature surprised me. Experts were quoted saying the *mecenaat is geen pinautomaat* (Steenbergen, 2017), meaning that you cannot just ask for the money, take it and leave. People with own funds wrote opinion pieces on how they want to operate in the open to fight cultural degradation caused by budget cuts (Westerlaken, 2013), opinion writers declaring a new set of governmental rules to be a charitable pillory (NRC, 2019) … In this non-academic literature, multiple problems are introduced when it comes to giving monetary donations to arts and culture which can be seen as barriers to giving. This intrigued me.

The academic knowledge on what limits affluent people to give to arts and culture is thus lacking in this extent. Therefore, I decided to denominate my thesis as an exploratory research in which I investigate which barriers for giving monetary donations to arts and culture affluent people experience.

1.2 Urgency

Ever since I started working with this topic, the urgency to find an answer grew bigger. Barriers for giving to arts and culture quickly became a topic of which I believe that it can make or break the cultural field. However, trying to write this feeling down made me doubt it. I turned to my friends, family and colleagues. I even had quick conversations about it with uninformed people. While talking about it, I regained my confidence: this topic is urgent, and it is so in multiple ways.

1.2.1 Topic

Societal urgency

The topical urgency of my research lies within the social sphere: due the budget cuts the Dutch government has issued a few years ago (Van Lent & Kammer, 2014), the cultural field is shifting towards a situation in which the government withdraws itself and civil society needs to come to action. Thus, the private giver needs to step up and put his money into action.

However, if the giver feels limited in his giving by whatever reason possible, this will cause deficits in the cultural budget. Thus, to create a healthy and sustainable field of arts and culture, it is needed to explore and, in further research, define the problem of barriers in giving. In this way, external funding can be optimised and we can work better and quicker towards a financially stable and sustainable field.

Academic urgency

The lack of academic knowledge on barriers for giving to arts and culture could be perceived as the scientific urgency of this thesis. However, precisely the fact that this topic is not adequately addressed yet, makes for a scientific urgency which is yet to be determined. One of the outcomes of my thesis therefore will be an answer to the question whether this topic should be further researched academically. It is urgent in a societal way, but is this also an academical matter?

1.2.2 Personal

It might already be clear that the main urgency behind this thesis lies within me. Let me give you a better insight in why I am writing this thesis the way I do. Put bluntly, I do not like the superficiality of academia.

Throughout my academic career, I always took standing on the shoulders of giants serious. I tried to be critical and to engage with the literature through writing lengthy yes-but-no-pieces in which I polarized multiple scholars and their thoughts. Depending on my grades, I did a fine job. Though, it felt as if my own thoughts and reflections were missing. I have always wanted to go more in-depth than possible at any given moment. I want to feel things, to experience things. Keeping academic distance often makes me nervous, and even sad, because I do not believe that I can thoroughly research something if I have not experienced it. Fortunately, academia is a broad field and different scholars have described my feelings quite accurately, for example in an article about how passion is perceived to be controversial in academics (Polanyi, 1956).

I recognize myself in these writings, as what always kept me going is my fascination for what I perceive to be lying behind an academic education and career. I admire the curiosity, the unbridled passion for a specific topic and the feeling that you sometimes can escape in theoretic knowledge. Yet, when the time came around to write this thesis, something in me snapped. This led to a crisis in which I mailed my supervisor exactly this: "I do not feel it. I do not want to do this anymore." Much to my surprise, for what felt like the first time in my academic career, he then said to me: "Well, then do it another way. Maybe you should write in dialogue, as Plato does." Standing on the shoulders of giants, right?

We engaged in a conversation about how science as it is done nowadays is only a small part of what can be. We discussed hermeneutics and the passion of science (Polanyi, 1956) and talked about problematizing the field of science and working as a reflexive practitioner (Schön, 1984). This gave me new perspectives and room to breathe again. We agreed that I should find my own way of doing this and that the most obvious way to do so was by engaging with the field. And that is exactly what I did. I did not turn all of my readings into a literature review and I did not make an interview guide for my empirical research, although I do engage in academic research.

Because of this need for agency, to valorise my own wants and needs within academia, I will partake in exploratory and reflexive research, which I will explain later on. What is most important for now is that I will incorporate a personal reflection (or anecdote, as I already did above) in each chapter. In these brief reflections, I will give a you a peek inside my head in an informal manner. I will share my doubts, my agony and my passion for the topic. By doing so, my research should not only investigate my formal research question, but should also explore my role as a researcher. Nonetheless, let me first provide you with some administrative information.

1.3 Administration

1.3.1 Summary of research methods

I will explore barriers for giving to arts and culture by employing a qualitative research strategy, in which I will partake in exploratory and reflexive research. The research design I opt for is cross-sectional, in which I work with in-depth, unstructured interviews to obtain conversations with the participants of my research in which they can share their perspective with me. The participants are gathered through both purposive and snowball sampling. The conversations are coded in both an open and thematic manner to add structure to the amount of data gathered.

1.3.2 Structure of thesis

Following upon this introduction, I will address the academical context in which my research is embedded for a first time. Because of the lack thereof and as my research strategy is exploratory, I will not indulge in covering a large amount of literature. On the contrary, I will briefly address an overview-article on motivations for philanthropy. Later on, I will resort back to this knowledge.

In the third chapter, I will provide an overview of how I went about doing research and why I did so. Alongside the more regular choices I made in my methodology, I will also address and advocate for my choice for exploratory and reflexive research.

Fourth, I will present the results of my conversations with experts in practice. Here, I will both look at individual results as well as the thematic dichotomies that arise from these. The former leaves me with somewhat concrete barriers for giving, yet, the latter results in a more interesting view on conceptual barriers which can be related to the field of arts and culture as a whole.

Following upon the presentation of my results, I will relate them to the academical context I mention above. Here, an exciting focus is placed on the value-based approach.

Lastly, I will conclude my research by giving a short recap of my results and highlight the most interesting ones to answer my research question. More importantly however, I will also specify the multiple avenues for further research that arise in my thesis through conceptual barriers for giving.

2 Academical context (I)

To research the limitations in giving to arts and culture, I will first briefly explore how giving takes place in general, through an academic perspective. Two questions will be answered in short: who gives and what do they give to? A third and more intriguing question, especially in context of my thesis, will be addressed more thoroughly: why do we give?

2.1 Who gives?

According to Schuyt, Bekkers and Smit (2010), philanthropic actors in the Netherlands contain almost everyone: individuals, foundations, philanthropic organizations, corporate businesses and lotteries. They all give, and according to *Geven in Nederland* (Bekkers et al., 2017), together they donate 0,85% of the Dutch GDP. Considering that the average percentage of donations in the USA between 1965 and 2015 is 2%, with a lower tax rate and therefore a climate that is more stimulating towards donations, the Netherlands can be considered to be a generous country when it comes to donating in general.

2.2 What do we give to?

A rather logical step then is to determine to what we give. According to *Geven in Nederland* (Bekkers et al., 2017), we donate to multiple causes: religion-related causes (20%), health-related causes (14%), international aid (15%), environmental- and animal rescue-related causes (9%), education and research (4%), arts and culture (9%), sports and recreation (10%) as well as societal causes (10%). Miscellaneous causes receive 10% of all donations.

As already mentioned, in my research I will focus only on donations towards arts and culture.

2.3 Why do we give?

A more intriguing question than who gives or to what people give, is why do people give? What drives them to donate money?

When academics address this question, it often seems to happen in a more general way. A prime article on this topic (based on its amount of citations via Google Scholar, that is) is written by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011). This article actively looks at the motivations of individuals and households to donate money to charitable organisations. As donations in terms of volunteering and material gifts are not measured for, the overview Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) give is in line with my own research. This makes it a significant source to work with.

In the article, Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) create an overview of more than 500 articles on motivations for charitable giving from all kinds of academic disciplines. By doing so, they explore the mechanism that drive all charitable giving. I will briefly address all eight mechanisms here, as I believe that the barriers of giving cannot be explored without knowing the drivers. At the end of the day, whatever drives you, can also hold you back, can it not?

The first mechanism for charitable giving is the *awareness of need*, meaning nothing more than that people need to become aware of the need of support. Thus, the cause needs to be urgent and the giver needs to be made aware of this. The stress of this mechanism lies with the askers, as they need to be able and willing to express the urgency of their cause.

The second mechanism for charitable giving is *solicitation*, which means that the askers actively have to ask people to donate. Thus, again, the weight of this mechanism lies with the organization that asks for a donation, as this question needs to be properly prepared and placed.

A third mechanism is what Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) call *costs and benefits*, meaning that if the cost of giving declines, giving in itself will increase. Contrary to the two first mechanism, the focus of this mechanism is on the government and its tax laws, as well as on the asking organization. If it is fiscally beneficiary to donate, then this will stimulate giving and vice versa. On top of this, if the asking organization makes sure the giver retrieves (exclusive) benefits in return for its gift, this could sustain the gift for a longer period of time.

The fourth mechanism that Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) describe is *altruism*. This mechanism, which they (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011) even call 'obvious' (p. 936), entails that the giver cares about the cause he or she is donating to. However, the research cleverly addresses the crowding-out effect (Abrams & Schitz, 1978; Frey & Jegen, 2001) as a reason to look further than just altruism, as crowding out shows that not only the cause of the donation is important.

The fifth mechanism is *reputation*, pointing at the effect that giving might have on someone's social life or how he or she is perceived by others.

An adjacent, and sixth, mechanism are the *psychological benefits* which giving might stimulate. Next to the outward-orientated social benefits, giving also causes internal benefits, such as a positive self-image or the 'joy of giving', which can also be recognized as the warm glow (Scharf, 2014).

The seventh and eight mechanism that Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) describe are also internally-orientated: *values* and *efficacy*. When considering values, donating becomes a way to valorise the values you want to stand for through supporting an organization that actively gives forth such values. Efficacy can be seen as the realization of the values the donor supports, the concrete notion whether a donation makes a difference.

In an essay that is yet to be published at the time of my writing, Klamer (2019) adopts a different approach. Here, he questions our way of problematizing giving. Why do we always want to know why people give? According to Klamer (2019), giving is a natural thing to do. We have been giving since for ever and will probably always do so. The real question here is why people are more reluctant to giving when it comes to a deteriorating field of arts and culture.

To answer this question, Klamer (2019) proposes a change of perspective. When theorising giving within the market or governmental sphere, it is always the odd one out. Thus, it will always be questioned. Yet, it is not as odd when you consider it to be part of a third sphere labelled as the social sphere. In this sphere, people are able to strive for what they actually want: a family, solidarity, skills, … (Klamer, 2019, p. 4). In short, a proper sense of belonging, to be acquired through shared goods. The main point is that to valorise your values in the social sphere, you have to contribute. Thus, giving is evident because it enables you to share a good you value.

When adopting this perspective, which Klamer (2017) coined as the *value-based approach*, the question that remains is why people do not give to certain causes. To avoid a Bordieuan account and to specify my quest on cultural economics, the question becomes rather recognizable, indeed: what limits affluent people to give monetary donations to arts and culture? What holds them back?

Personal reflection

Ever since writing this brief academical context, I feel as if it is off. Everything that I have written is okay, but I do not like okay. I prefer excellence, rigour, fascination and strive to provide this in my thesis. I want my personal work to be spot on and if it is not, it needs to be fascinating enough to cover the fact that what I have written is not fully on topic.

However, writing this academical context seems to be the only way for me to work with the lack of academical knowledge on barriers for giving to arts and culture as it at least provides me with some literature to work with. Standing on the shoulders of giants, remember?

Another thing which bothers me, is that the knowledge on giving to arts and culture is more advanced in the UK and USA. Therefore – unfortunately, because that might have made my research easier in terms of literature – I am of the opinion that these situations cannot be compared to the European situation, as they have largely different backgrounds. Nevertheless, I felt obliged to make some comparison to the USA when it comes to how much we give to arts and culture. And it bugs me that I do, because I just argued why not to do so. Still, it feels as if it needs to be there. I do not know why, but, hey, let us call it 'okay'.

This feeling links to a general doubt I have. I wonder whether arts and culture can be seen as a cause for charity. It is an urgent matter to me. I would love to tell whoever wants to hear it that arts and culture are important and that I cannot imagine living without it. Yet, although it is meaningful, it is not a life-or-death type of charity. In line with this train of thought comes the hesitation about the urgency of my topic. It obviously is urgent to me and I am pretty damn sure that it really is urgent within the field of arts and culture and cultural economics. But things like the environment are more important, are they not?

It must be clear that I am a bit puzzled. And actually, I think that is a good thing. Let us see where it brings me.

3 Methodology

Before delving into my data and results, I will guide you through how I did my research and why I did so. First, I will introduce my research question and cast a light on my research strategy and method. Second, I will look at the practical part of my research: how have I operationalized my research question? What is my sample and how did I obtain it? Furthermore, I will explain how I analysed my data and why I did it this way. More importantly, I will address why I partake in exploratory and reflexive research. I end this chapter with a quick glance on my own expectations for my results.

However, two matters should be stressed before further delving into my methodology: first, the assumption that barriers for giving to arts and culture do arise lies at the base of my research as it is necessary to narrow down the scope of my research. Second, I choose to focus on people who have money to spare because this steers my research away from the more obvious barriers for giving to arts and culture such as not having the extra money.

3.1 Research strategy and method

This thesis is conducted by use of a qualitative research strategy. Such a strategy is favourable as its interpretivist nature enables me to engage in understanding socio-economic phenomena through the examination and interpretation with my participants (Bryman, 2012, p. 380). More specific, within this qualitative strategy, I will make use of exploratory and reflexive research methods, about I will give more information further on in this chapter.

The design of this thesis is cross-sectional, as multiple cases are examined at a single period in time (Bryman, 2012, p. 59). Within this cross-sectional design, I opt for the use of in-depth interview as this gives me the opportunity to uncover the opinion and perspective of the interviewees (Bryman, 2012, p. 470). This is an important aspect of my research, as it enables me to explore the perspectives of my conversation partners and thus get in touch with what is actually happening in the field. The interviews are designed to be conversations and therefore mostly unstructured. This is most favourable as the informality of a conversation invites both my conversation partner and me to talk about the cultural sector and its financing, without getting tangled up in questions which I prepared beforehand and which might steer us away from topics that are more urgent.

Thus, I conduct inductive research which will result in insight in barriers for monetary donations to arts and culture. Contrary to what is often aimed for in qualitative research

(Bryman, 2012), this thesis will not result in a theorisation of the gained knowledge. By engaging in this research, my aim is to explore and problematise barriers in giving monetary donations to arts and culture. My hope for this thesis is that it can serve as a point of departure for further research which aims at optimizing external funding for arts and culture as through both small, practical solutions and more conceptual matters.

3.1.1 Operationalization, sampling and data analysis

In regard to the operationalization of my research, I did not prepare an interview guide. Although I could have built such a scheme based on the article by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011), I opted not to do so. This gave me the freedom to interact befitting with each individual conversation partner and to properly engage in a conversation without making it a formal interview (Bryman, 2012). Contrary to what it can be perceived as, this non-operationalization is suitable for my exploratory research as the perspectives of my conversation partners are thus not compromised by what I had liked to address.

Concerning my sample, I had five conversations, of which two with independent (strategic) advisors in the field of arts philanthropy and patronage, two with heads of development at large cultural institutions in the Netherlands and one with an ex-business director of a large museum in the Netherlands who is now affiliated with multiple boards of cultural institutions. The interviews averaged a length between an hour and an hour and a half and were all held in Dutch.

I started my sampling process by purposive sampling. Based on the popular literature I had engaged with, I selected experts with whom I wanted to have a conversation. Thus, this is a non-probability sample in which I selected people based on their perceived knowledge of the field (Bryman, 2012, p. 714). Afterwards, my sampling method switched to snowball sampling as conversation partners led me to invite others. Again, this brought me to people of whom I already knew they were knowledgeable (Bryman, 2012, p. 716).

Doing exploratory research, I perceive this to be a suitable sample method as it enabled me to discuss a broad topic with leading experts, which enhances the validity of my research. An unforeseen advantage of using snowball sampling seemed to be that people were less reluctant to have a conversation with me as well as that I encountered people who often work under the radar and whom I would not have been able to invite for a conversation if I had only used purposive sampling.

The five conversations are transcribed and coded by hand. After transcribing, I read the transcripts and jotted down my own thoughts and links. This could be everything, from links to literature to a straight forward answer to the research question. However, more often it was thoughts on the state of the cultural field in general. In the second phase, I re-read the transcripts and started categorizing my own thoughts and links to create larger themes that could lead to answers to my research question.

Thus, in the first phase, starting from scratch, I employ a inductive and open way of coding which happens via an iterative system that builds up a body of knowledge (Boeije, 2010; Bryman, 2012). In the second phase, I employ a thematic way of coding. These ways of coding are suitable as they structure the data and therefore enable me to make sense out of the large chunk of information with which I have been provided by my conversation partners (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006).

All participants signed a form for informed consent at the time of our conversation. However, due to the nature of their functions, I offered all my conversation partners to read my draft version and asked them whether they agreed with my use of our conversation.

One of my conversation partners did not fully agree with my use of our conversation. Based on the specifications of this disagreement, I rewrote small passages of my thesis in order to match our conversation better. In doing so, I actively sought a balance between adhering more to the conversation we had and not influencing my results in favour of my conversation partner. This method of working strengthens the reflexivity of my research as it increases the co-constitution between my conversation partner and me as a researcher (Finlay, 2002).

3.1.2 Exploratory and reflexive research

An important aspect of my research is its exploratory and reflexive character. These two characteristics drive me to build a broad yet thorough research (Stebbins, 2001, p. 3), in which I portray a "conscious self-awareness" (Finlay, 2002, p. 532) through which there arises "a mutual shaping between researcher and research" (Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 33). Thus, I opt to interact instead of to observe and to have a conversation instead of having an interview.

Due to its largely inductive nature, the process of exploratory research is more focused on exploring a new topic than on finding answers. Therefore, such a research can seem lacking when evaluating its sample, validity or generalisability (Stebbins, 2001, p. 5).

Nevertheless, an exploratory approach is absolutely fitting for my research as it is beneficial for both the previously overlooked topic, as well as for my personal needs.

Looking at myself as a researcher, I want to explore barriers for giving to arts and culture in a way that aligns with personal gut feeling. Yet, I want to do so without diverting too much from what is considered to be 'good' in academia. Thus, I want to find a balance between being a rebel with a sharp, critic eye and following the rules. For me, this balance lies in reflexivity.

Looking at my research, being a reflexive researcher is beneficial as it results in two things: first, it enhances the aptness and rigour of my research as it improves the reliability of my data (Jootun, McGhee & Marland, 2009). Second, by partaking in reflexive research, I am able to have a role in the research process that is close to the participant. As I stated earlier, as a reflexive researcher, I can interact and have conversations with my participants in which we focus on their perspective and what they have to say, instead of focussing on what I think I should ask them. Thus, my research process becomes multi-layered and results both in straight-forward results that my conversation partners discussed with me, as well as more overarching results which are my interpretation of the data. By engaging in such an "explicit, self-aware meta-analysis" (Finlay, 2002, p. 531), the subjectivity of qualitative research becomes an opportunity instead of a problem (Finlay, 2002).

3.2 Expectations

As I mentioned earlier, my hope for this research is to cast a light on barriers in giving monetary donations to arts and culture. By doing so, I set out to problematize the issues at hand to stimulate further research that could lead to an optimisation of external funding for arts and culture. Encapsulated in this hope, my expectation for this research is to result in a small list of matters that could be barriers for monetary donations to arts and culture: a lack of knowledge in both content and tools, affluent people that do not have an acquired taste and thus do not see what is important for them to support, or, affluent people who are scared by the fiscal and juridical bureaucracy that seems to go hand in hand with giving. Furthermore, I expect to generate new questions and observations which initiate further research, such as the abundance in supply and the behaviour of the government.

Personal reflection

This methodology chapter is a necessary link in this thesis, especially as it gives me the opportunity to explain briefly what I intend to do by partaking in exploratory and reflexive research. Nevertheless, I do not believe that stating that I opted for a cross-sectional design, for example, is the most valuable passage in my thesis. Yet, as I already mention, I want to rebel, but within the set boundaries of a master thesis. Especially in writing this chapter, I experience difficulty by being myself and being a researcher. As a master student who has become comfortable with obeying rules, I think this chapter is necessary. However, as an aspiring empirical researcher, I aim to draw people to other chapters of my thesis, which I perceive to be more valuable.

I just want to talk to people, I want to experience the field, I want to think about things in my own way, I want to have my own opinions without trying to match them to others. They might actually be good, interesting or innovative. And if they are not, then just let me use my own brains to such an extent that I at least can try and fail. Because in my case, coming to good insights will not happen when looking at the field from an appropriate academical distance and first looking at what everybody else has to say.

4 Results and discussion

To present my findings, I will first look into the results per conversation partner. What do they think? How do they look at giving to arts and culture? What stands out? This manner of analysis is fitting as the exploratory nature of my research has supplied me with rich data that cannot immediately be described as a whole.

Second, I will highlight the more abstract and conceptual results that come forth out of the individual analyses. This discussion casts a light on giving in the cultural sector in general. Furthermore, it is useful to look into these results as they give way to avenues for further research which could benefit the field of arts and culture in general.

As a result of my informal and rather unstructured interview style, the yielded results often are derived from bigger pieces of conversation instead of straight-forward formulated by conversation partners. I will therefore not often work with quotes. However, if present, I will use direct quotes to strengthen my argumentation.

4.1 Individual results

4.1.1 Renée Steenbergen

Renée Steenbergen is an empirical academic researcher, strategic advisor and investigative journalist concerned with motivations for giving to arts and culture. Throughout her multi-faceted career, she has gathered a wide-ranging knowledge and in-depth insights in giving to arts and culture, often focussed on the giver. Therefore, in our conversation, she is able to cast a light on the perspective of the giver.

When talking to Renée about barriers in giving to arts and culture, one thing stands out: the main barriers in giving lay within portrayed behaviour. Thus, a more behavioural economics perspective is adopted as the effect that behaviour has on economic decision-making is addressed (Katona, 1953). Within this focus on behaviour, four actors in giving can be found: the one who asks for money to be donated (the asker), the one who donates the money (the giver), the government and the field of arts and culture in general.

Based on the conversation Renée and I had, a first overarching barrier for giving to arts and culture is created by the overly rational behaviour of the asker. This behaviour causes the asker to focus on reaching a monetary target, think in short terms and look at its own wants instead of the givers' need. In Renée's words: "*It is very straightforward (...), yes. And* *that is of course the frustration of givers. Then* [after donating] *the door closes again and they don't hear them for a long time, until money is needed again*". However, based on the knowledge Renée gathered in her own research (e.g. Steenbergen, 2008), most givers want a long-term relationship and do not focus on money. In more concrete terms: the giver does not feel seen by asker. Hence, the latter dissipates the opportunity to ask the giver for an additional or future donation. Thus, by acting on what appears to be most favourable on a short term instead of what might be fulfilling on a long term, the behaviour of the asker is a barrier for giving as it fends off a sustainable giving-climate.

A second overarching barrier which Renée has noticed through researching and working with givers, is the behaviour of the government. This 'barrier' is two-sided. On the one hand, the budget cuts for culture have issued a negative motivation of the government towards the field of arts and culture. By doing so, the government has abolished the urgency of the field through minor and often negative communication concerning the field of arts and culture. All too often, this lack of urgency is read by the larger public as a reason against donation. This is problematic as potential givers are amongst this larger crowd and could thus be discouraged to donate. In Renée's words: "[Civil society filling in the financial gaps the government creates] *is a very negative motivation* [for making donations]*. And what is also not a good example, is the government with those stringent budget cuts of 25 percent since 2011 over 800 million euros, so 200 million per year*".

However, once people are involved with the field and become more established donors, the behaviour of the government is not necessarily a barrier anymore. The 'usual suspect' (someone who has knowledge and passion for and about arts and culture) might be stimulated to donate by the behaviour of the government. The governmental behaviour might even be guidance in to what people donate under the motto: "*the government facilitates, patronage is there to stimulate excellence*" (Steenbergen, 2017). Thus, when – in a field that is experiencing harsh financial budget cuts – the government decides to support a cultural initiative, this initiative is seen by givers as a trustworthy cause of donation.

Based on the perspective of the giver which Renée and I discussed, a third overarching barrier in giving to arts and culture is the politicization of the field, which is linked to the overly rational behaviour of the asker. Throughout recent history, our society has grown accustomed to the welfare state (Schuyt et al., 2010). In the field of arts and culture, this means that organisations have built their finances around asking for and getting governmental subsidy and lobbying to do so. Now that the government has cut the budgets and seems to be withdrawing itself, this leads to a bigger stress on the private sphere to fund the field of arts and culture. However, the majority of the field is not specialized in working with private donors yet. This leads to a politicized landscape in which private givers are often addressed as if it where subsidy-givers: the focus lies on the money and the shortest term to get it. But this is not a fruitful way of asking for donations; as described above, it is too rational.

In an opinion piece for NRC, Renée states that *het mecenaat is geen pinautomaat* (Steenbergen, 2017). Translated literally, this means that the art patron is not an ATM-machine. The giver is thus not a rational, short-term thinking machine that coughs up a sum of money whenever you ask for it. It is a person who needs to be comforted, invited to premieres. Someone whom the asker occasionally has a chat with. Thus, this third barrier in giving to arts and culture is a mismatch between the rational – or even transactional – and politicised behaviour of the asker and the need of the giver to engage in a proper relationship.

In sum, Renée argues that "*fundraising is not the main problem, relationship management is. Everyone can raise some money if they go around, but to hold on to people and make sure you have a circle around you that you can address more often, that is important.*"

4.1.2 Hugo Bongers

During his career, Hugo Bongers – among others – was the business director of Boijmans van Beuningen and secretary for the Rotterdamse Raad voor Kunst en Cultuur. Now that he is retired, Hugo is part of multiple boards, for example the board of Nederlands Fotomuseum (Rotterdam) and WArd/waRD (Antwerpen, BE). Consequently, Hugo has a lot of general knowledge on the field of arts and culture. Moreover, he has an interesting view on arts philanthropy.

At the beginning of our conversation, Hugo did not fully understand the use of my research question because he did not see any problems. According to him, money is not an issue in the Netherlands and the reasons why not everybody donates to arts and culture is rather straight-forward: maybe the giver is not interested in the arts.

Initially, I avoided the path of 'obvious' barriers for people to give such as not having the money or having a different taste. However, in our conversation, this argument gave way to a sociological barrier to give to arts and culture which finds it way in to every one of the conversations I have had. In Hugo's exact words: "*(...) and why do people give or do not give money? Depending on taste, mood, risk, your name, your networks ... In short: the Bourdieu story.*"

Thus, Hugo sees a barrier for giving that lies directly with the giver: giving to arts and culture is based on socio-psychological factors. Do you like arts and culture? Have you grown up with it? Why do you give to Sparta (a Rotterdam-based football club) and not to Conny Janssen Danst (a Rotterdam-based dance company)? Hugo refers to the theory by Bourdieu (1986) in which he determines that whether one gives to arts and culture or not is a combination of economic, cultural and social capital.

Furthermore, as stated already by Renée, formulating a fitting question to give is often a troublesome activity for askers because they act too rational, the behaviour of the government towards arts and culture is not stimulating and the field has grown accustomed to raising 'cold money' instead of having a warm relationship. Therefore, on top of the Bourdieu-story, Hugo foresees a second barrier for giving to arts and culture: practical problems on the side of the asker. Hugo argues that a lot of cultural organisations who ask for donations in the private sphere have to deal with humdrum issues such as a lack of time, costs of personnel that they cannot handle and struggles in building an own network.

In sum, Hugo states that the taste and preferences of a giver are a first barrier to give. Though, the most likely barrier for giving lies in practical issues within the organisation. Furthermore, Hugo says: "*(...) the problem lies in the way these two have to find each other.*" Reading between the lines, this means that the main barrier for giving is creating and maintaining a sustainable relationship between the asker and the giver in which both parties are aware of the issues at hand and willing to work towards a solution.

4.1.3 Barbara de Heer

Barbara de Heer has a background in economics, marketing and charity and became head of development at Nederlands Dans Theater (NDT) in 2012, right after the budget cuts for culture were first announced. Throughout her career at NDT, she succeeded in helping the organisation grow exponentially both in revenue and in the team behind the financial strategy. By doing so, the organisation has come to be financially stable and future-proof.

Because of this embeddedness in practice, a lot of the barriers that Barbara and I discussed are of a practical nature. Lack in time, lack in personnel, little insight into information about visitors and potential givers, but also the willingness to travel (Langeveld & Van Stiphout, 2013) from, for example, Amsterdam to The Hague (where NDT is located). This focus on practical matters is in accordance with what Hugo foresees, although it also relates to the main barrier Renée pointed out: the difficulty of maintaining sustainable donation-circles. Barbara argues that although NDT is successful, the lack of resources can sometimes feel like a barrier in asking the question to give and maintaining the established relationships. This is the case because giving is always reactive, in Barbara's words: "*People almost never give without anyone asking them to do so.*"

More importantly, in accordance with Renée, Barbara points to the general behaviour of the asker as a potential barrier. To meet the wants and needs of the giver, the development-team of NDT actively works on being open and transparent, explaining the urgency of a donation, being concrete about the cause of support, … In between the lines, it thus becomes clear that they actively work on establishing a long-term relationship with givers. However, Barbara acknowledges that this is not always the case at other institutions.

Noticeable in this relationship building is that NDT behaves entrepreneurially and commercially. Barbara explains that she gathers smaller givers through commercial ways of thinking and acting, in which they practice direct marketing and give benefits to givers. When this transactional relationship is established, they start investing in a more personal relationship that could be developed into a long-lasting, sustainable one.

In sum, Barbara looks at barriers for giving to arts and culture as matters that can be solved. Problematizing them is only an initial step towards finding a solution. The concrete results of this conversation are in line with the insights that my conversations with Renée and Hugo resulted in. However, the more entrepreneurial perspective Barbara initiates seems different from the status quo as well as fruitful for NDT. Moreover, it might have potential for a large part of the cultural field.

4.1.4 Antoon Ott

Antoon Ott has a background in art history as well as law. Based on these two pillars, he initiated his own firm: Artilaw. Artilaw is an organisation that mainly advises others on the cutting edge between art and law. When asked for an example, Antoon tells me the following: "*That can be very broad, that can be copyright, that can be protection of heritage, that can be an ivory object that has to be shipped to NYC (…)*". In this function, Antoon advises affluent people on giving to arts and culture, always with a legal framework in mind. What should be stressed is that Antoon often works with donations in natura, such as the giving of sculptures or paintings, instead of monetary donations. However, we both agree that the values of these different types of donations are corresponding.

Furthermore, as an academic, Antoon has a broad overview of the field and has been active in multiple facets of it. The multisidedness of his knowledge is noticeable as our conversation is rather rich and covers multiple topics.

One of the more striking topics we discussed is what Hugo already called '*the Bourdieu-story*'. According to both Hugo and Antoon, one of the main reasons people do not give to arts and culture is because they are not into it, as a result of their accumulated social and cultural capital. In itself, this topic, which is also largely covered in socio-economic literature, is not the most striking. However, it often seems as if everyone needs to like arts and culture. Antoon and I agree that, through regulation, the government seems to enhance this perspective by focussing on education, inclusivity and visitor numbers. Antoon disagrees with this focus and argues that art does not have to be for everyone, just like football is not for everyone either. Yet, we also discuss that to stimulate an inclusive field of arts and culture (as opposed to an elitist field), arts education should be incorporated more into our general education to give people the option to start liking culture. Therefore, initiatives such as the Rijksmuseumbus (www.rijksmuseum.nl/rijksmuseumbus) should be supported. Thus, taste based on social and cultural capital can be a barrier for giving in the stage of your life that you are able to donate, but we need to make sure that we give the option to get involved with arts and culture in earlier life stages.

When considering the Rijksmuseumbus, which is an initiative from the government-supported Rijksmuseum, we are indirectly looking at government-support for arts and culture. When I ask Antoon whether he sees the withdrawing behaviour of the government as a barrier for giving, I argue that the government is not supporting the field of arts and culture to its full extent due to the issued budget cuts and the trickle-down effect thereof. Herewith, the government creates a barrier for giving as it portrays a shortage of urgency towards potential givers. Yet, Antoon disagrees with me: "*(...) I wonder (...) whether the government is withdrawing at all. Numerically, this is not correct. There has been a dip after 2008 due to the 10% budget cuts - that the whole world has had - but that has long been rectified and the government is not withdrawing in that sense.*" Thus, Antoon does not see the government as lacking nor as a barrier for giving in the way I see it. What he understands as lacking, is the perspective and behaviour of the government towards the field of arts and culture: a clear vision of what the government does or does not support and how this support is formalized. Here, we come to a point that by now might sound familiar: it is not about money and it is not about ratio.

When further discussing this topic, Antoon argues that not only the asker or the government focusses too much on the money and its value, the whole field does so. Within this train of thought, we discuss that through (previous) regulations that where meant to support artists, such as the BKR and WIK (Abbing, 1998), the field has become spoiled. As Antoon puts it: "*(...) it is not self-evident that there is a very large amount of money for* [arts and culture]". During the budget cuts, "*if you asked an artist (...): why is that necessary? (...) Why is art so important? People couldn't answer that at all. It is a difficult question, but it is your job!".* This relates to the politicization which Renée already addresses as well as the overly rational behaviour askers portray as it based too strongly on an earlier stage of our welfare state.

Antoon addresses this rationality in an anecdotal way. He argues that the asker sometimes acts downright inelegant towards the giver. To give an example: "*People (...) donate a very special work to a museum - I am not talking about a very small museum - and do not even receive a thank you note. That is not even relationship management, that is also plain decency."* The multiple anecdotes that Antoon tells indeed portray an attitude that, even if indirectly, focusses largely on the monetary transaction instead of on the relationship the asker and giver could have. This becomes a barrier for giving as such 'inelegant' behaviour impedes building up a long-term relationship between the giver and the asker. Furthermore, not only an asker who actively focusses on the money and short-term relationships can limit its own donations, but also an asker who does not reckon with standard manners.

Lastly, Antoon and I discussed practical barriers, a matter that seems to be more at stake when talking to heads of development than to advisors and academics. Here, we mainly addressed the aspect of time. Based on previous conversations, I asked whether he agreed with shortage of time (often due to a shortage of personnel) as a barrier for giving as it can limit the asker in building an emotional relationship with the giver rather than a rational or transactional relationship. Here, Antoon firmly puts: "*No, then* [the director] *goes home ten minutes late.*"

What I noticed during our conversation is that Antoon sees the field of arts and culture as a whole and thinks accordingly. Despite the fragmentation that arises in such a multidisciplinary field, the core values often stay the same. Therefore, to come up with solutions for issues such as barriers in giving, we need to look at the abstract and conceptual issues in a critical manner and design a change of perspective: from a field which is always short on money that behaves rational, to a field that acknowledges the money there is and focusses on building relationships to acquire the extra finances when needed.

4.1.5 Lobke Broos

Today, Lobke Broos is the head of development at Nederlands Fotomuseum. Before she held this function, she was the head of marketing and cultural entrepreneurship at Nederlands Fotomuseum. She initiated the branch of cultural entrepreneurship within the museum to cope with the budget cuts the government announced roughly around the same time as Lobke started at Nederlands Fotomuseum. Throughout these two functions, she has always worked with or around creating a sustainable financial landscape for the museum to depend on in its growth. To do so, she has engaged in a government-supported trajectory called *Wijzer Werven* which deepens the knowledge of experts on fundraising, specialized in relationship management through obtaining a masters' degree on the topic and was invited by the King Baudouin Foundation United States to engage in a one-week course on fundraising and relationship management, led by American experts-in-practice.

The first matter that we come across in our conversation is that I am researching barriers but Lobke does not think in barriers. The reason she firmly states that she does not, is that if she starts looking at matters as barriers, this would decrease her ability to transfer her enthusiasm to (potential) givers. After a quick detour about priorities – the Bourdieu-story –

Lobke states the following: "*I think from a very different point of view: that the moment you are connected in this way, as a Fotomuseum Ambassador or Fotomuseum Friend, you also get an incredible amount back in the sense of a story, knowledge, expertise and from this point of view, I see no barriers, in that respect, there is no obstacle to giving to culture.*".

However, I notice that Lobke addresses a lot of things that she thinks make giving difficult, such as the fact that giving needs to be clearly stimulated and that the pool of people in the Netherlands who want to support arts and culture financially is rather small. This makes me wonder whether she (and this might also count for Barbara) are taken aback by my assumption that giving to arts and culture is difficult. Thus, I rephrase my question as follows: *"You think more in solutions than in barriers, but the fact that you have to solve things does mean that not everything runs smooth yet. If I label barriers as bumps in the roads or something like that, where do these bumps manifest their selves?*".

A first bump in the road Lobke mentions is the drive of the internal organisation. All too often, contrary to in the USA, the people affiliated with development are the only ones who actively think about giving. However, it would be beneficial if everyone always has the question to give in the back of his mind. Furthermore, she points to the *geefwet*. In itself, this is an incentive to give, however, the bureaucracy that it brings with is limiting.

Yet, the main pillars of our conversation turn out to be the Americanisation of development and the fact that a relationship between the asker and the giver needs to go both ways.

Lobke often addresses the USA and has gathered a lot of her knowledge there. Yet, in other conversations, Americanisation of the Dutch field is often perceived as negative because this entails a government which withdraws more. Therefore, I thought it was striking that Lobke talks about it in such a positive way. When I address this dichotomy, we agree that on the level of the government we do not favour a more American system. We both think the government should largely support the field of arts and culture. However, Lobke argues that we can learn a lot from American fundraising in the way we keep in touch with people and how we treat them. Lobke argues that people in the Netherlands often do not know how to treat their givers, which is in accordance with what Antoon states: the Americans have more knowledge and elegance in doing so.

A surprising aspect of our conversation concerns the upkeep of the relation between asker and giver. In previous conversations, the trend is that the giver wants to be more involved and have a more emotion-based relationship, while the asker acts rationally and does not think about such things. Thus, the relationship tends to be a one-way street. However, at Nederlands Fotomuseum, this is not necessarily the case. As Lobke describes the situation, I am pleasantly surprised that both she (the asker) and the givers seem to know that the donated money is only the start of their relationship. People that are part of the Fotomuseum Ambassador or Fotomuseum Council group want to give more than money: they often help Nederlands Fotomuseum with the expertise they have on different topics such as law, (corporate) housing or marketing. Nederlands Fotomuseum recognizes the added value of their expertise.

In sum, like NDT, the case of Nederlands Fotomuseum is peculiar as things seem less problematic than academics observe. What drives this diversity in perspectives?

4.2 Discussion of main dichotomies

Now that I have highlighted the most interesting and important results on the level of individual experts-in-practice, I will address these results in a thematic manner. I will arrange a better overview of the most important notions that come forth out of the individual results. By doing so, I cast a light on issues that go beyond barriers for giving, but under which the latter falls. Indeed, there where I at a certain point thought that my research question might provide me with nothing more than a list of concrete barriers, it ended up enabling me to nuance my perspective on the cultural field as a whole.

To make these insights visible, I will look at the dichotomies that arise throughout the results. This can be perceived as static because of the inflexibility of such a structure, yet it is an appropriate manner of discussing the results as it is a way to concretize the friction which I experience in the different perspectives of my conversation partners. By doing so, it makes for a dynamic overview of the results.

4.2.1 Asker versus giver

The main dichotomy which arises when talking about barriers for giving to arts and culture is one between the asker and the giver.

When I started my research, I focussed solely on the givers: what drives them? What holds them back? How do they perceive the field? However, along the way, my perspective shifted towards the askers, as I imagined that they have a broader view on the field than the givers. In addition to this assumption, the practicalities of interviewing givers were not in my favour, as they often operate away from the limelight (Steenbergen, 2009) and my network is not established enough to approach them successfully.

In line with this early assumption (or is it because of this assumption?), I found that the weight in this dichotomy indeed is with the asker. This divide is fuelled by the philanthropic characteristic that is often referred to by my conversation partners: giving is reactive. Thus, if there is no one to ask, there is no one to give.

The aspect of this dichotomy which is most often addressed by the experts-in-practice is the precarious relationship between the asker and the giver. The majority of the experts state that this relationship is often a one-way street. The patronage is not an ATM-machine (Steenbergen, 2017), although a lot of askers do still act as if it is. The asker is accustomed to applying for subsidy and uses the same method to approach private givers.

Nevertheless, for the private giver, the donation is often only a stepping stone towards a more mature relationship with the cultural institution. Fortunately, institutions such as Nederlands Dans Theater and Nederlands Fotomuseum have come to the same conclusion and actively work on maintaining healthy, two-way relationships with their givers. Both Barbara and Lobke agree with me when I paraphrase the situations they describe as ones where the donation is an effectuation for getting involved with the cultural institution.

4.2.2 Rationality versus emotionality

A second dichotomy that arises among barriers for giving to arts and culture is one between rationality and emotion. However, before explaining this dichotomy, it is necessary to know what 'rationality' and 'emotionality' mean as throughout all conversation, my conversation partners use these terms in various manners and throughout multiple examples and I therefore also use them in a multitude of ways.

Throughout this research, rationality is often used to describe behaviour that is commercial, formal or calculative. I would like to put is as follows: it is based on calculations instead of feelings. In the decision about whom to address for donations, the askers often seem to calculate which givers might be most favourable in satisfying their financial needs without taking into account with whom an asker would like to have a relationship and because of which aligning values that is. This a cold way of reasoning (Klamer, 2017).

Therefore, the donations that come forth out of such a question can be seen as 'cold money' (Klamer, 2017).

However, givers seem to base their decision to give on what they perceive to be a fulfilling cause for donation. Here, the concept of emotionality is at play as the valorisation of the values of the givers are what determines whether a donation is made. Money that is donated based on the latter reasoning is what Klamer (2017) calls 'warm money'. Thus, when I assess emotionality, I focus on the valorisation of values which adds to the social sphere and the oikos. However, before turning to the concepts of the social sphere and oikos, let me exemplify the friction between rationality and emotionality.

I indirectly touched upon this friction already within the relationship between the asker and giver. However, it seems to be a friction that is bigger than this. A first situation in which the friction between rationality and emotion exceeds the relation between asker and giver is when we turn to formalities which are a part of giving. Almost without a doubt, it can be stated that what stands in the core of the field of arts and culture is emotionality, warm feelings and the valorisations of one's values. Unfortunately, we seem to have lost this notion when we became tangled up in the rationality of our system. For example, the way in which Lobke invites people to join a certain circle at Nederlands Fotomuseum is rather intuitive. Yet, she still needs to formalize their relationship by signing a mutual contract which Lobke sees as a barrier for giving because it complicates, if not undermines, the start of an emotional relationship. This implies that giving is a normal thing to do (Klamer, 2019), but that we have formalized it to such an extent that is holds us back.

An adjacent matter in which this friction becomes apparent is when a donation is seen as an effectuation to an emotional relationship between the giver and the (representative of) an institution. Both in the conversations I had with Barbara, Antoon and Lobke I questioned this situation: is it embedded in our society to start an emotional relationship by a monetary (and thus rational) transaction?

As I briefly discussed with Hugo, it is a well-known example of early philanthropy that Native-Americans gave each other gifts to establish respectful relationships (Mauss, 1969 in: Ruffle, 1999). However, I wonder whether we have come from this form of paying tribute and respect to a form of transactional affection. It seems as if you only gain entry to the possibility of a relationship when you pay, which does not make sense to me.

Fortunately, looking at the cases in my research, this is not the way it goes. Here, the heads of development address their givers with respect and gratitude on an emotional level. They are thankful for the donation they get, whether they are big or small. To put it with Barbara's words: "*(...) a lot of small amounts make one large amount together, so you do have a substantial influence on what we can do.*" Nevertheless, I wonder whether that is always the case. Has reciprocity become an obligation?

The topics of rationality and emotion as well as the friction between the two are near inexhaustible. It is clear that a lot of the more concrete barriers that arise in giving to arts and culture are overarched by this dichotomy. Therefore, I will specifically address these concepts in the avenues for further research I propose later on.

4.2.3 Advisor versus head of development

A third and quite interesting dichotomy arises between academical and practical perspectives, between the perspectives of the advisors with a background in academical research and the heads of development I have conversated with.

While I was conducting interviews, something struck me: Renée and Antoon tend to problematize matters and look at things in more conceptual and abstract ways, while Barbara and Lobke both actively state that they do not think in barriers or problems, but in opportunities and solutions. During the time I transcribed and coded the interviews, this dichotomy appeared even stronger. Regardless of the professional functions of my conversation partners, this resulted in most of the overarching and conceptual barriers arising in the conversations I had with Renée and Antoon and a lot of the practical ones in the conversations with Barbara and Lobke. This observation led me to think about the friction that it might cause, such as more fragmentation, although on the level of knowledge.

However, these different perspectives and bodies of knowledge also make way for possibilities. With Antoon, I discussed how fragmented the field of arts and culture is and whether that does or does not do any harm on the level of arts philanthropy. Unrelated at first sight, Barbara at a certain moment mentions a network in which practical knowledge on sponsorships, fundraising and relationship management is shared between heads of development and business directors all around the country. I wonder whether there exists a network in which both types of experts – the abstract, conceptual thinkers as well as the practical know-alls – share their knowledge. Depending on the interviews I did, I believe that this can help to develop a more nuanced framework when it comes to arts philanthropy.

Furthermore, such a framework might be beneficial for heads of development on a long-term basis. As their approaches can be conceptualized in a more academical framework, organisations who want to enhance their external funding can consult this conceptualisation, leading to private givers being addressed more appropriate in general. This might stimulate private giving altogether.

4.2.4 Government versus … everyone?

A last dichotomy I want to address is not a duality between two independent factors as such. Based on how my conversation partners look at it, it is more a me-myself-and-I-against-the-world situation concerning the behaviour of the government.

It is a well-known fact that in 2011, the government issued budget cuts for a lot of things, including the cultural sector (Van Lent & Kammer, 2014). According to Renée (as quoted before, see 4.1.1, p. 17), since 2011, the government budget for arts and culture has decreased with 25% on the level of the central government alone, thus not including its trickle-down-effect to levels of the municipality and others. This has led to an increase in the need for private money. Throughout my results, it becomes utterly apparent that philanthropy is not about ratio and money, but about emotion and a sense of belonging. What seems to lack in the governmental behaviour towards arts and culture is a sense of care, which translates in a lack of vision and direction.

Due to the budget cuts, the government has issued a negative emotion towards arts and culture that (potential) givers often follow, resulting in the question: "Why do they need more money?". This question is dubious, as the need for this private money comes forth out of the budget cuts. Apart from this dubio, what can be deducted from this question is that there is too little sense of urgency. It seems as if people often do not know what culture is good for, how it serves as glue and meaning-maker for our society.

More than issuing budget cuts, my conversation partners feel disadvantaged by the government because the budget cuts did not come with a specific message telling citizens that although they were issuing budget cuts, culture is still an urgent need in our society. To put it with Lobke's words: "*Collectively, we have to make sure that we start a campaign telling people how nice it is to give to culture and how important it is to give to culture. Because living* *together without culture is something that a person cannot even imagine. Imagine that there is no more culture.*" By 'collectively', Lobke is referring to all kind of bigger cultural institutions such as the Dutch Museums Association, the ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the municipalities. We have to unite and make sure citizens are aware of the need for culture in our society. Not only the 'usual suspects', dixit Renée, or the ones with the right 'Bourdieu-story', dixit Hugo. Everyone at least needs to know that arts and culture make a positive contribution for society and that it therefore needs monetary support on different levels.

In almost all of my conversations, we came to the point that I questioned the function of the government, and – often in between the lines – the answer was always the same: the government does have a function in arts and culture. This field is not to be left solely in the hands of individuals, let alone the market. Yet, the function of the government needs to be clarified. The field needs to know what it is in for and what kind of help it can expect. Here, it struck me that this is also a relationship between a giver and an asker. However, it is one which is similar to the reversed asker-giver relationship that was briefly mentioned in my conversation with Lobke. The asker (the field in need of support) wants a long-term relationship, wants to invest emotionally, while the giver (the government) is not willing to do so. This can be seen in the fact that the arts decree is renewed every four years, for example. Emotionally, this makes for an unstable field which causes a lot of uncertainty. Rationally, however, it seems like a good idea to evaluate every four years where all those big chunks of money go to.

Labelling this dichotomy as I do, the government versus everyone, is put too strongly. However, to create a healthy and sustainable field of arts and culture in which arts philanthropy and its barriers can be researched more profoundly, a more stable balance between ratio and emotions needs to be found. Especially when it entails the government.

Personal reflection

Now this is where it gets interesting: talking, discussing, listening to and with people who are active in the field. Finally! It took a few weeks of crisis and the idea of quitting my master all together, but I interacted with actual people in the field, the ones who know what is going on. Standing on the shoulder of giant, 2.0.

For me, the most interesting part is the discussion, where I am able to structure the individual results of my conversation partners into what works for me. I make sense of it in my own way. This is what I like to do and how I think academia should function more often: not standing on the shoulder of giants, but standing amongst the giants. This is a place which I perceive to be more fruitful because it enabled me to learn things on different levels. I experienced a learning process in how to interact with experts-in-practice, how to write about empirical research, how to structure my own thoughts without changing what my conversation partners actually said.

Every so often, I wrote things of which I doubted that they stated what I wanted to say. I commented on these in the margins of this document and came back to them later on. Thus, I also further developed a critical stance towards my own writing, as well as I practiced slowing myself down in order to disentangle my own thoughts. This is necessary, as I think fast and a lot. I discovered that a better way to shut my brains up when I am trying to fall asleep, is to let them run wild for a bit. Apparently, it works better if I just think, fantasize and worry until I fall asleep, instead of forcing myself to stop thinking.

The falling-asleep-anecdote is off topic when looking at barriers for giving to arts and culture. But for me as a person and a researcher (notice that I feel as if they have come closer together since my last personal reflection), it is on topic as it illustrates a growth I experienced throughout my research. Thus, by engaging in research that is closer to the field than usual, I feel as if becoming closer to myself in general and also feel myself becoming closer to my role as a researcher.

I love this feeling; it reminds me of how I often felt when I just started playing theatre. I found a way to do academics that makes me feel better off in general.

5 Academical context (II)

Earlier, I briefly discussed the academical context in which my research is embedded. Here, I introduced an article by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011), in which they have written an overview of motivations for giving monetary donations and empirical research thereof throughout multiple disciplines. I argued that this context is fruitful for my research on barriers for giving to arts and culture as these barriers can also be seen as demotivational factors. Furthermore, I engage in discussing a more detailed link between barriers for giving and the value-based approach which results in an important avenue for further research that I will propose in my conclusion.

5.1 Relation to eight mechanisms

The first two mechanisms that Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) introduce – *awareness of need* and *solicitation* – resonate through my results under a more practical label: if you do not ask, people do not give. Potential donors need to know that cultural institutions are in need of (extra) resources. Thus, the question to give needs to be asked in a fitting manner. Additionally, the urgency of the cause needs to be clear. Based on my conversations, the latter is a task that can be fulfilled on two levels: the cultural institution should make this urgency clear – for example through a decent question to give – but more importantly, the government should stimulate private giving by making clear that the governmental budget does not cover the financial needs entirely. Thus, it should be specified that the decrease in budget does not stem from a decrease in value.

The third mechanism – *costs and benefits* – does not draw that much attention in my research. It is discussed that people like it when a donation gives them access to (exclusive) benefits. Also, costs and reimbursements are touched upon when discussing the *geefwet.* Yet, it is not addressed in detail. An assumption of mine is that this is because the focus lies more on the emotional relationship and sense of belonging that giving stimulates in which costs and benefits do not play that big of a role.

When first considering the fourth mechanism – *altruism* – I was surprised to find that Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) call this mechanism obvious, as I assumed more calculated motivations such as image-building would play a bigger role. However, I need to agree with them. It does seem to be a rather obvious motivation or barrier when it comes to giving.

Linked to the Bourdieu-story, all conversation partners agree: if you do not feel for something, you do not donate, however big or exclusive the benefits are.

Then, arriving to the fifth mechanism – *reputation* – I find myself smiling faintly. Throughout my research, I often wondered and asked whether reputation can be a barrier for giving. However, it seems as if this mechanism is somewhat outdated. People do not give to a certain cultural institution just for their reputation anymore. If that already ever was the case. We have grown to a field in which people want to have actual relationships. Indeed, emotion over ratio.

This reminds me of a thought I have had earlier during my research: is our shifting focus towards emotion and 'real' relationships part of our *zeitgeist*? When you look at the rapid change our society has gone through since 2011 (when the article by Bekkers and Wiepking was published), it might just be that our framework now is different than it was then.

The sixth mechanism – *psychological benefits* – has not been discussed directly. Indirectly, it was referred to when discussing the concrete barrier for giving that arises when a question to give is asked too rational. However, it did not go further than that. In hind sight, this strikes me as odd because having an emotional relationship is all about psychological benefits (and costs). Yet, giving in itself could be perceived as driven by psychological benefits, which is explored through the concept of the warm glow (Scharf, 2014). Thus, also here, some kind of contrast seems to exist.

Values and *efficacy* – the seventh and eight mechanism – have been discussed, although often in a more indirect manner. However, in my conversation with Lobke, these mechanisms were addressed clearly: here, we talked about how having an asker-giver relationship (often also with corporate givers) is all about linking the vision and mission of the asker and giver to each other. Thus, an emotional and therefore sustainable relationship between an asker and a giver is only possible when values are aligned.

5.2 Relation to value-based approach

Throughout my research, the value-based approach (Klamer, 2017) did not take up that much of the limelight. Yet, it should be considered as it creates a thorough academical context for the conceptual barriers my research results in.

When considering the value-based approach, Klamer (2017) commences his theory by stating that there are two standard logics: the market, the logic of rational transactions, and the government, the logic of governance and formal laws. However, there are three other logics which might be considered to be more fitting, especially when it comes to economics of arts and culture: the social logic, the cultural logic and the logic of the oikos.

In the social logic, people share thoughts and create networks. In the cultural logic, meta-conversations enable people who are affiliated with arts and culture to valorise their field-specific needs. Lastly, the logic of the oikos is what fosters the drive to make art or to support art. An action can be entirely justifiable to yourself, but if your significant others are not on board, changes are high you will not push through.

Within this framework, the oikos is the most basal logic. If things do not work here, they will not work anywhere else either. Amidst all logics is the social logic: forming networks and sharing thoughts enables us to link different logics and valorise our needs in different spheres. These two logics need to be strong and healthy in order to keep the logics of the market and governance up and running, as the latter two are less natural for people to be affiliated with. In an abstracted way, this means that without the social or oikos logic, a market or governance logic will not yield much result within a field like arts and culture.

The last logic to be added to this framework is the cultural logic. This logic is overarching, as can be seen in *Doing the Right Thing* (Klamer, 2017, p. 163, fig. 9-3). My observation is that, thus, different links between the former four logics create different cultural logics. Here, Klamer (2017) states that "*the cultural sphere is good for intrinsic motivation*" (Klamer, 2017, p. 162). Hence, the distribution of weight between the four former logics creates a logic in which intrinsic motivations can or cannot be embedded.

When applying this theory to the results of my research, it would thus show that the oikos- and social logic stimulate, or even guide, what happens in the market- and governance logic, all of which is encapsulated within a certain cultural logic. And it does exactly that.

When looking at the conceptual barriers for giving, which I have structured in the four dichotomies to be found above, it is clear that the more rational market and governance logic create barriers in giving. What should be strived for is a sense of community amongst the givers, a sense of belonging (social logic) and the feeling of real, human, gratitude from the asker towards the giver (oikos logic). Depending on how these four logics become related to each other through behaviour, two cultures arise here: on the one hand, there is a culture which is rational, short-term orientated and focusses on the money. This culture can be seen as originated from the largely government-steered practice of applying for and getting subsidy and results in cold money. My conversations with experts result in the knowledge that this culture is not to be strived for as it does not succeed in building and maintaining sustainable relationships between askers and givers. The culture that should be strived for, on the other hand, is one where values align, both the asker and the giver benefit from relationships which can be established after making/perceiving a donation and the money is warm. In this latter culture, because of the warmth that lies within the donations, these are only a stepping stone.

The former culture I describe is based on the standard economic perspective and is driven by market and government logics, while the latter is based on the value-based approach and emerges out of the oikos and social sphere which are a facilitator for the market and governance logics. Thus, a meta-overarching barrier for giving is that both the asker and the giver all too often think and act within a standard economics framework. To create a sustainable and healthy field of private financing of arts and culture, the value-based framework should be practiced more.

5.3 The other side of the medal

In the first part of this academical context (see 'Academical context (I): 2.3, p. 7), I already assumed that every motivational mechanism Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) propose could also serve as a demotivational mechanism, or, so to speak, a barrier for giving. But is this really the case? In short: yes, it is.

Every barrier that has been discussed can be traced back to a motivational mechanism that is not properly stimulated. This means that when discussing awareness of need and solicitation, the other side of the medal becomes apparent when this does not happen and thus the motivation turns into a barrier. Considering costs and benefits, this leads to costs that are too high because, for example, the *geefwet* is repealed or the benefits for major donors are the same as for friends. Furthermore, as Antoon and Hugo point out, art can just not be your kind of cause to donate to – which relates to altruism and reputation. Or the values and efficacy of an institution are not in line with yours, thus you do not give. Sounds simple, does it not? Yet, I wonder whether it actually is that simple. Unfortunately, trying to answer this question would lead me towards philosophical or psychological questions, neither of which fit within my area of research. Nevertheless, I do think that this can be seen as an encouragement for the interdisciplinarity with which (de-)motivations for giving are researched (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). It would be valuable for the field of arts and culture if such an approach was to be developed further within academical branches focussing solely on this field. In doing so, the value-based approach might be beneficial as it creates the space to think about and work with qualitative data. Moreover, as all my conversation partners argue that a behavioural change should be made within the giving to arts and culture which almost screams for a value-based approach, it is a most suitable framework to apply to research in this field.

Personal reflection

I like this second part of the academical context because of two things: 1) I perceive the methods of this brief chapter to be academically correct; 2) it confronts me with myself.

The academical correctness lies in that it is dutiful, as I link the theory I had already introduced to my results. This gives me a feeling of power. This feeling stems from the discovery of an argument in favour of the value-based approach by Klamer (2017) in my very own results. It feels like standing amongst the giants and doing so in a rather sturdy way.

Yet, I also feel insecure. Is this standing amongst the giants? And if it is, do I really do so in a sturdy way? And if this is not the case, what does it tell about me that I think I do? I recognize this feeling as I have felt it many times before. I like feeling powerful, I like being good at things, I love being seen as smart, talented or – even better – critical. Though, it also brings about a sense of vulnerability. It feels easy sometimes to try and be a rebel, shouting that I will do it my own way because this is the way I think it should be done. Because by neglecting the bars others set, I also neglect thresholds to compare myself to, I exclude myself. And that is not what I want to achieve. I do want to be original and critical, but I do not want to be an outcast. Thus, it comes back to what I have encountered earlier in my research: I do want to rebel, but I do not want to supersede the boundaries set for this master thesis.

This feeling relates back to the personal question which lies at the origin of my research: what holds people back to give to arts and culture? Why do they not do what I would do if I had money to spare? Why are they different from me? How can I solve being different from them? This string of thought feels dramatic, almost problematic. Though, it also brings about a wildly interesting insight: I too might be thinking and acting too rational. I feel all these things and what do I do? I start looking for a solution. That is rationality at its best, is it not? By realising this, I almost become disappointed in myself and this disappointment makes me giggle as it feels oh-so ironic. I write a thesis which originates from the idea that I am different from everyone else and what does it result in? You guessed it, I might be just like everybody else: rational.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Barriers for giving to arts and culture

Throughout my research, I have questioned barriers for giving to arts and culture, what they are as well as where they come from. My research took on an exploratory nature and was mainly focussed on the expert-in-practice, such as independent advisors and heads of development. Thus, I did not gather my answers based on the giver. On the contrary, I focussed on the asker.

In hindsight, I believe focussing on the asker was a clever idea for two reasons: it gave me to opportunity to engage with the people whom I would like to work with, but more importantly, without anyone asking, no one will give. Thus, the asker is the leading actor when it comes to giving. Throughout my research, both concrete and conceptual barriers for giving emerged.

6.1.1 Concrete barriers

Concrete barriers for giving can be divided into three categories: practical limitations on the side of the asker, the behaviour of the asker towards the giver and socio-psychological factors on the side of the giver. The latter barrier is quite simple: some affluent people like arts and culture and other do not. Thus, if you want to donate money, you do so according to your own taste. The former two barriers are somewhat related to each other.

Practical limitations that are often stated are a lack of time, a lack of personnel and a lack of budget. Thus, there is not enough money to hire the amount of people needed which causes the personnel that is hired to be short on time to actively invest in relationships with the giver. Or, there is not enough money, which leads to cheaper (and often less capable) personnel to be hired. Both scenarios result in a behaviour towards the giver that does not stimulate giving: the asker is too much focussed on the money, on a short-term relationship and on his or her own needs instead of minding what the giver wants. Both situations can lead to inappropriate, or 'inelegant', dixit Antoon, questions to give.

6.1.2 Conceptual barriers

The conceptual barriers which emerged throughout my results can be seen as overarching barriers. Thus, every concrete barrier can be placed underneath one of the dichotomies in which I structure the conceptual barriers: the asker versus the giver, rationality versus emotionality, advisor versus head of development and the government versus the field.

The dichotomy of the asker and the giver overarches all barriers which relate to the frictions in the relationship between the organisation that is asking for a donation and the affluent individual that is donating money. However, there is some overlap with the dichotomy in which rationality and emotionality are opposed. When an asker acts overly rational, this has an effect on the relationship between the giver and the asker. A dichotomy which seems to be meta-overarching is government versus the field as the behaviour of the government affects both the dichotomy of asker versus giver and rationality versus emotionality. This can also be perceived as a factor which shows the strong influence government regulation has on giving.

A dichotomy that lies less within the actual barriers for giving and more within how barriers for giving can be dealt with is the one in which advisors and heads of development are opposed. What should be stressed, is that, in practice, there is no noticeable friction within this dichotomy. Yet, their perspectives can be interpreted as opposites of each other: the advisor further problematizes issues in a conceptual way, while the head of development solves issues in a practical manner.

Both for the academic knowledge on barriers for giving in arts and culture as well as within the exploratory nature of this thesis, I believe that the dichotomies are more valuable than the concrete barriers in giving. Nonetheless, in further research, the concrete barriers should be further researched in a practical manner.

6.2 Avenues for further research

When I introduced the general urgency of my thesis, I argued that the academical urgency of it had yet to be decided upon as I do not believe that a simple lack of knowledge makes a matter urgent enough to research. However, my research convinced me that this topic does have further potential on an academic level. Moreover, it does so in multiple ways.

Because of the fragmentation of the field and the broadness of my results, a lot of potential avenues for further research are scattered through my thesis. Often, these avenues are quite specific. For example: has reciprocity become an obligation? Personally, I believe that this is a vastly interesting question of which the answer will cast a much-needed light on our society. Yet, it is rather specific and not as valuable for the field of cultural economics.

However, my research also results in avenues for further research which are both valuable for cultural economics as well as in line with my aim to explore and problematize barriers for giving in order to streamline the giving of monetary donations to arts and culture.

First, I would like to propose specific researches on both rationality and emotionality in relation to giving to arts and culture. Depending on my results, this dichotomy is what causes a big part of the noticeable friction between askers and givers. Yet, the concepts are too vast to be researched together, let alone to be researched together in relation to a topic as broad as giving to arts and culture. Therefore, I believe that separate researches on the role and effects of these concepts on barriers for giving to arts and culture would benefit the field in general and deepen our knowledge of barriers for giving.

Second, the interdisciplinarity in research on giving in general is plentiful, as Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) already argue. Researches on this topic have been done in virtually every field of social science. However, it seems as if cultural economics has not been involved with the topic that much. Yet, such an academical framework would be beneficial in problematizing the issues at hand as it enables us to deal with the values at stake within giving outside of the dominant sociological framework. Furthermore, as I already addressed earlier, within cultural economics, the value-based approach could result in fascinating researches. Therefore, I propose further research in barriers for giving to arts and culture within this framework as such a perspective will deepen our knowledge of barriers for giving with a focus on the field of arts and culture, which at this point is lacking.

Third, I believe it is valuable to research whether the more entrepreneurial development strategy which Nederlands Dans Theater implements is beneficial for other cultural institutions. The urgency behind this avenue for further research is rather practical: I believe that this way of working is largely future proof. If cultural institutions adopt such a strategy, this might add to the ability of maintaining a sustainable financial field for arts and culture, even if governmental budgets (would) shrink.

Lastly, I want to propose a practical avenue for further research. I wonder whether it is possible to build a network of conceptual thinkers (such as academics) and practical thinkers (such as heads of development) in which knowledge and experiences can be shared. Such networks do exist already for both parties separately. However, I have not yet encountered a network in which the knowledge of these functions is combined. Nonetheless, looking at the insights that come forth out of my results in which these two kinds of knowledge are tapped into, I believe that this would be largely beneficial for the deepening of knowledge when it comes to the development of private funding in general.

Apart from resulting in often striking avenues for further research, my thesis also leads to questions concerning limitations of my research.

6.3 Limitations

As I mentioned earlier, pursuing exploratory research makes for research that is different from regular research. Thus, inevitably some limitations arise. However, one of the things I learned by doing this research is that I feel better when taking up the perspective of the head of development than that of the advisor and academic. I want to solve a problem when I see one, instead of pondering upon further implications. Consequently, I will point out the limitations of my research while at the same time highlighting what they have brought me.

6.3.1 Size of sample

With five conversation partners, the sample of my research can be considered small. This might lead to biased results because of a lower representability and generalisability (Bryman, 2012). In light of my research, however, it led to a research process in which I could take the time to prepare and process my conversations in detail instead of hastily researching to enlarge my sample on a quantitative level. My choice to value quality over quantity thus enhanced an in-depth research process, where a mere focus on quantity might have led to a shallower research.

6.3.2 Breadth of research

I experienced my research process to be in-depth, yet, the process did results in rather broad insights. This is probably caused by the broadness of my research. I worked following a broad research question and my unstructured manner of interviewing often lead to conversation in which everything concerning barriers for giving was addressed without a clear point to focus on.

Yet, I believe this breadth did bring my research to a higher level. If I had only focussed on concrete barriers for giving and probed my conversation partners to do the same, this thesis would have become more of a report. However, my exploratory methodology enabled me to see both the concrete and conceptual barriers for giving to arts and culture. Thus, it makes this thesis relevant for academia as well as the field of arts philanthropy in general.

6.3.3 Lack of theory

A last limitation of my research is its minimal embeddedness in academic literature. This is mainly due to the fact that barriers for giving have not been properly addressed in academia yet, but does make for a research that could be seen as unstable in the base.

Yet, because of the key overview that Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) provide, I believe that the most valuable theory concerning (de-)motivations for giving is addressed. I could have added more literature which links bits of my research to theory such as the warm glow (Scharf, 2014), Baumol's cost disease (Heilbrun, 2011) or crowding-out effects (Frey & Jegen, 2001). However, I believe that this would have fragmentized my research to an extent which could undermine the aim of my research.

Thus, this limitation finds it origin in a lack of specific academic literature on barriers for giving. Nevertheless, it gave me to freedom to go about my research as I did and I am happy to say that it feels as if by doing so, I have regained my joy in academics.

Personal reflection

Did I just write that I have regained my joy in academics? I most certainly did. Do I believe myself when I say so? I actually do. Just checking here, because only two months ago, I still screamed that I hate academics, I tried to write some kind of personal reflection and I did not get any further than wondering if I was going mad and writing down that I hate academics. In capitals, that is.

But I did not go belly up. On the contrary, I feel as if I am thriving. Finally, I managed to do research in the way I want to do it. And maybe even more important, I did so in a way of which I think it is suitable to fit within regular academics. I have tried to underpin every decision I made, especially if I perceived it to be one that can be seen as irregular in academics. By doing so, I believe that I have built a solid research, which can be beneficiary for both academia as the field of arts and culture. But most importantly, it has been beneficiary for me.

Thank you

Thank you to Renée Steenbergen, Barbara de Heer, Antoon Ott and Lobke Broos for engaging in conversations with me which gave me new and often fascinating insights.

Thank you to Hugo Bongers, both for engaging in an insightful conversation with me as well as for proofreading my entire thesis.

Thank you to Maaike Bouwen for proofreading my thesis, alongside having a more than busy schedule yourself.

Last but not least, thank you to Arjo Klamer, my supervisor. You saw earlier than I did that supporting me on an emotional and personal level was the one thing which was going to stimulate me on a more theoretical and academic level. In the same string of thought, thank you for tempting me into writing a largely self-reflective thesis. By doing so, I have gathered knowledge which is worth taking with me in the years to come.

Reference list

Abbing, H. (1998). De symbiotische verhouding tussen overheid en beeldende kunstmarkt. *Visies op beleid en markt. Overheidsbeleid en de particuliere markt voor beeldende kunst*, 25-39.

Abrams, B. A., & Schitz, M. D. (1978). The 'crowding-out'effect of governmental transfers on private charitable contributions. *Public Choice*, *33*(1), 29-39.

Attia, M., & Edge, J. (2017). Be (com) ing a reflexive researcher: a developmental approach to research methodology. *Open Review of Educational Research*, *4*(1), 33-45.

Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *40*(5), 924-973.

Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T., & Gouwenberg, B. (2017). *Geven in Nederland 2017*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers.

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In Richardson, J. (Ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241-258.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *5*(1), 80-92.

Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative health research*, *12*(4), 531-545.

Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001). Motivation crowding theory. *Journal of economic surveys*, *15*(5), 589-611.

Heilbrun, J. (2011). Baumol's cost disease. In R. Towse (Ed.), *The Handbook of Cultural Economics* (2nd ed., pp. 67–75). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jootun, D., McGhee, G., & Marland, G. R. (2009). Reflexivity: promoting rigour in qualitative research. *Nursing Standard (through 2013)*, *23*(23), 42.

Katona, G. (1953). Rational behavior and economic behavior. *Psychological review*, *60*(5), 307.

Klamer, A. (2017). *Doing the right thing: a value based economy*. London: Ubiquity Press.

Klamer, A. (2019). *A Value Based Approach to Philanthropy: how to do right by contributing.* Unpublished manuscript.

Langeveld, C. C., & Van Stiphout, M. (2013). Performing arts attendance and geographic adjacency. *International Journal of Arts Management.*

Mauss, M. (1969). *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Cohen and West.

NRC. (2019, February 3). *Nagel donateur niet aan charitatieve schandpaal*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2019/02/04/nagel-donateur-niet-aan-charitatieve-schandpaal-a3652743

Polanyi, M. (1956). Passion and controversy in science. *The Lancet*, *267*(6929), 921-925.

Ruffle, B. J. (1999). Gift giving with emotions. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, *39*(4), 399-420.

Scharf, K. (2014). Impure prosocial motivation in charity provision: Warm-glow charities and implications for public funding. *Journal of Public Economics*, *114*, 50-57.

Schön, D. A. (1984). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think In Action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schuyt, T., Bekkers, R., & Smit, J. (2010). The Philanthropy Scale: a Sociological Perspective in Measuring New Forms of Pro Social Behaviour. *Social Work & Society*, *8*(1).

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). *Exploratory research in the social sciences* (Vol. 48). London: Sage Publications.

Steenbergen, R. (2008). *De nieuwe mecenas: cultuur en de terugkeer van het particuliere geld*. Amsterdam: Business Contact.

Steenbergen, R. (2017, January 17). *Het mecenaat is geen pinautomaat [opinion]*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2017/01/17/het-mecenaat-is-geen-pinautomaat-6256037-a1541712

Van Lent, D., & Kammer, C. (2014, January 2). *Snijden in de kunst, viel het mee?*. Retrieved May 8, 2019, from https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2014/01/03/snijden-in-de-kunst-viel-het-mee-1332104-a1364426

Vanderbeeken, R. (2014, October 2). *Zeven gaten in Cultuur: een tussentijds overzicht*. Retrieved May 8, 2019, from http://www.dewereldmorgen.be/artikel/2014/10/02/zeven-gaten-in-cultuur-een-tussentijds-overzicht

Westerlaken, N. (2013, April 26). *Geef, tegen cultuurafbraak*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/geef-tegen-

cultuurafbraak~bec3f308/