SPECIAL ISSUE ARTICLE

"The sweetest songs"—Ethical framing in fundraising through the agency of service users/contributors to tell their own stories

Ian MacQuillin[1,2] | Jess Crombie[3] | Ruth Smyth[4]

[1]Rogare–The Fundraising Think Tank, London, UK

[2]Kingston University Business School, London, UK

[3]London College of Communication, London, UK

[4]BoldLight, Bedford, UK

Correspondence
Ian MacQuillin, Rogare–The Fundraising Think Tank, London, UK.
Email: ianmacquillin@rogare.net

Jess Crombie, London College of Communication, London, UK.
Email: j.crombie@lcc.arts.ac.uk

Abstract

Much of the discussion on the ethics of the framing of service users in fundraising and marketing materials focuses on the ethical dilemma of whether the means of using negative framing and negatively-framed images—which it is argued are more effective at raising money—justify that end if they cause harm by stereotyping and "othering" the people so framed, rob them of their dignity, and fail to engage people in long-term solutions. Attempts to find the right balance between these two ethical poles have proved elusive. This paper posits a new ethical solution by removing these two poles from the equation and making the ethicality of fundraising frames contingent on the voice and agency of service users/contributors to tell their own stories and contribute to their own framing: as the Niger proverb says, "a song sounds sweeter from the author's mouth."

KEYWORDS
beneficiaries, contributors, ethics, framing, fundraising, participants, service users

1 | INTRODUCTION

Live Aid—the charity concert organised by Sir Bob Geldof in 1985 to raise money for the relief of the Ethiopian Famine—was a massive success, in terms of the money it generated, reported to be in excess of £150 million.[1] However, inside charities, Live Aid caused conflict between fundraisers and service delivery staff about what NGOs' aims ought to be and how they ought to go about achieving them (van der Gaag & Nash, 1987, p.76). One of the central questions highlighted by Live Aid was how the people who use the services provided by charities ought to be "framed" in fundraising materials. For at least 35 years, this question has proved a perennial source of practical, moral and ethical conflict in the charity sector. This conflict arises from fundamentally different understandings of the role of fundraising within nonprofit organisations, which polarises attempts to solve the ethical dilemma inherent in the framing of service users/beneficiaries, often exacerbating this tension, rather than achieving consensus (CCIC, 2008).

The root of this polarisation can itself by analysed in terms of ethical frames that arise from the two roles that charities play (Sargeant, 2008, p. 531). One role is to deliver services to beneficiaries/services users. This comes with attendant duties to treat service users/beneficiaries in particular ways, such as with dignity and respect. The other role is to raise the money organisations need to provide services. Out of these practical roles arise ethical frames about what charities ought to do. It is the contention of this paper that the question of the framing of beneficiaries/service users in fundraising materials has not been resolved because ethical arguments arise from, argue in favour of, but remain within, one of these two frames.

One frame—arising from fundraising practice—argues that charities ought to use images and stories of service users that raise the

TABLE 1 Twenty-one charity surface frames described by Darnton and Kirk (2011), and how they map against the fundraising and values deep frames as described in this paper

The numbers refer to Darnton and Kirk's original numbering of these frames. Mapping these against the Fundraising and Values frames does not imply any one of these 21 frames of practice always and only falls within one of the two ethical frames, but rather that this is the most natural fit. It certainly does not imply that those surface frames that are mapped to the Values Frame have no use in fundraising.
Fundraising Frame
2. Campaign frame—Actions are constrained to the roles and relationships of a traditional campaign (contrast with 18. Social Movement frame)
4. Charity frame—The NGO is seen as the mechanism for privileged people to share their wealth with the poor
8. Giving aid frame—The primary activity for reducing poverty is a direct monetary transfer from wealthy nations to poor nations
9. Help the poor frame—A description of what NGOs do that emphasises a "hand outstretched" to help those in need
10. Human kindness frame—A belief in the basic goodness of people and a strategy for evoking compassionate response to drive action
16. Poverty frame—Defining the issue of concern as poverty, often to the exclusion of interrelated issues like trade, corruption, environment, governing philosophies, etc
Values Frame
3. Change the system frame—Effort is directed towards shifting power structures and reforming institutions in order to alleviate poverty
5. Common good frame—The underlying value that motivates people to action is a sense of caring for others, with the goal of increasing collective well-being
11. Ignorant public frame—A belief that the reason people do not do more to help is that they are uninformed, which leads to a "public education" strategy for increasing engagement
12. Individual concern frame—Emphasis on altering individual decisions through appeals to core concerns of individuals
14. Invest in entrepreneurs frame—Notion that the way to alleviate poverty is to treat the world's poor as entrepreneurs who only need to be given loans (e.g. microcredit) so they can start their own businesses
17. Social justice frame—Drawing attention to race and economic class differences, with emphasis on justice and human dignity
18. Social movement frame—Telling stories of NGO efforts in context of a movement to remove a moral failing or achieve a freedom or right for a disenfranchised community (contrast with 2 Campaign frame)
19. Social responsibility frame—Underlying value that calls upon people to recognise their role in making society better
Both Fundraising and Values Frames
7. Empathy frame—Underlying value that motivates people to care for the poor, based on feelings of commonality and compassion
• Empathy can be seen as a good thing to promote giving and understanding in both frames. Though one of the anti-Fundraising Frame arguments is that encouraging donor empathy is harmful to service users (Le, 2020)
Neither
1. Activist frame—A person engaged by the NGO is seen as one to be "activated" around a particular issue or campaign
6. Corrupt government (Africa) frame—Aid sent to Africa is like sending buckets of cash to corrupt officials, a pointless and wasteful action
13. International solidarity frame—Sentiment that rich and poor are all part of the same community; what affects some of us impacts us all
15. Market-driven fundraising frame—Treatment of NGO list members as potential customers to engage with marketing strategies
• Adapted to engaging service users in marketing, this frame would best fit with the ideas advanced in this paper
20. Transaction frame—Emphasis placed on an exchange of goods or services between individuals, commonly in the context of an economic exchange
21. Transformational experience frame—Exposure to an emotionally powerful experience that results in deep introspection and a persistent change of character

most money in order to deliver the services that will help them (which in this paper is termed the "Fundraising Frame"). The other argues that charities ought to use stories and images that are not stereotypical, do not "other"[2] service users, and do not represent them in an undignified manner, as this representation causes long-term damage both to those depicted and people like them, and that this ought to be used in place of the Fundraising Frame (which this paper terms the "Values Frame").

It should be noted that these terms—as defined and used in this paper—identify and describe two normative arguments: the first about how framing in fundraising out to be done (Values Frame); and a second contested argument about how it ought not be done (Fundraising Frame). They do not necessarily refer to how charities actually *do* frame their marketing materials.

Darnton and Kirk (2011, pp.116–117) identify 21 different possible frames for development NGOs, some of which could apply to their marketing. After Lakoff (2006) these 21 are "surface" frames (Darnton & Kirk, 2011, pp. 74–79), which describe everyday behaviours and attitudes. The Fundraising and Values Frames by contrast are "deep frames," which describe values and belief systems, and provide the foundation for the surface frames, setting them in a moral context or grounding them in a worldview (ibid). How the 21 charity surface frames map against the

Fundraising and Values deep frames is shown in Table 1. Darnton and Kirk (ibid, pp. 82–84) cite the work of Joe Brewer in identifying four deep frames for development work,[3] three of which are set out as "conflicting worldviews" (ibid, p. 82). The Fundraising versus Values Frame is thus of the same type as Brewer's (cited by Darnton and Kirk) mutually-exclusive, antagonistically-paired deep frames. Activating one side of the pair supresses the other (ibid, p. 82), which might explain the tensions between fundraisers and service delivery that emerged during Live Aid and have existed ever since. Further, the term "Fundraising Frame" does not mean or imply that all fundraising uses negative framing, nor that any that does is necessarily bad.

Through a narrative literature review, this conceptual paper presents a new normative ethical theory of—or an ethical lens through which to view—the framing of service users/beneficiaries in charity fundraising and marketing. Rather than consider the ethicality of framing according to whether it raises money (Fundraising Frame) or whether it portrays people in a respectful and dignified manner (Values Frame), the ethical lens presented here considers ethicality to be contingent on the degree of voice and agency that service users/beneficiaries have in telling their own stories and contributing to how they are framed.

While the standard nomenclature for service users is often "beneficiaries," the authors of this paper acknowledge that this term can make the recipients of services appear passive and without agency, which is one of the charges against the Fundraising Frame (Ho, 2015; Khan, 2015; Vowles, 2018). The language used is important. Therefore to avoid both unwittingly repeating this alleged wrongdoing and to avoid begging the question that it is wrong, this paper henceforth uses the term "service users/contributors."

1.1 | Methodology and structure

This is a conceptual paper that aims to identify gaps in the ethical conceptualisation of how service users/contributors are framed, and to suggest a solution to fill those gaps. As such we have chosen to approach this as a narrative literature review (Green et al., 2006). Such an approach is considered "excellent for presenting philosophical perspectives in a balanced manner" (ibid, p. 103).

The paper is structured in four discrete segments. The first three sections set the context for and build to the fourth section, which presents our new ethical theory. Relevant literature is therefore reviewed and described in each of these sections rather than in a standalone literature review—to reiterate, this is because this is a philosophical conceptual paper building to new theory.

In the first section, the literature that describes and establishes the ethical dilemma in whether to adopt the Fundraising Frame or the Values Frame is briefly reviewed, including the tensions that exist between the different departments that adopt each frame. As such the review for this section was conducted as a "commentary" that aims to "provoke scholarly dialogue" (ibid). As it is the role of fundraisers to raise money, whether negative or positive framing is more effective at raising money is a relevant consideration, so the

literature to this effect is reviewed in the second section. The ethical solution presented in this paper is contingent on the voice and agency of service users to contribute their own stories to how they are framed, and so the literature that has considered this matter is explored in the third section. Finally, the fourth section sets out a new normative ethical theory for the framing of people in charity marketing that is contingent on the degree of voice and agency that service users/contributors have in telling their own stories.

2 | THE FRAMING DILEMMA

The opposing poles of the framing dilemma are summarised in a paper published by the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (now called Cooperation Canada) in 2008 (CCIC, 2008, pp. 3–6), which sets out the pros for and the cons against the Fundraising Frame (although it does not use the term "Fundraising Frame").

The Fundraising Frame is the use of negative images (it is generally considered to be images rather than negative framing in the wider sense—see below), for example, "the use of starving babies" (Smillie, 1995, p. 136). A term commonly used to describe this frame is "poverty porn"—the term "pornographic" first having been used in connection to images in development advertising by Lissner (1981, p. 23).

The pros of the Fundraising Frame are that it calls attention to real needs, builds awareness and mobilises for action, and is effective at raising money (CCIC, 2008, pp. 3–6). It is generally acknowledged, even by its critics, that the Fundraising Frame is more effective at generating income than are more positive images (Cameron & Haanstra, 2008, p. 1479; CCIC, 2008 p. 6, p. 14; Dean & Wood, 2017, p. 6; MacKeith, 1992, p. 11; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, pp. 30, 34), and that a shift away from the Fundraising Frame could result in a fall in short-term donations (Darnton & Kirk, 2011, p. 103). Meanwhile, evidence that more positive framing raises more money is "scarce" (ibid, p. 104).

Moreover, fundraisers see it (or at least have seen it) as their "duty" (van der Gaag & Nash, 1987, p. 64) to use images that are best suited to raising the "most" money (MacKeith, 1992, p. 9). With everything they do geared towards that end, it is not fundraisers' jobs to consider the counterarguments (ibid).

The counterarguments against the Fundraising Frame (CCIC, 2008, pp. 3–6) are that it "undermines human dignity and fuels racism" (advocates of the Fundraising Frame claim that it is the situation depicted in the image rather than the image itself that is undignified [ibid, p. 3]) and perpetuates "destructive myths" about development (van der Gaag & Nash, 1987). As van der Gaag (2007, p. 185) says, the Fundraising Frame "demeans" the person in the photo, takes them out of context, and reinforces the stereotypes the NGO/charity is often trying to counter, thereby undermining or being counterproductive to the NGO's own mission (MacKeith, 1992, pp. 11–12; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 25; Smillie, 1995, p. 136; van der Gaag, 2007, p. 188).

A further criticism of the Fundraising Frame is that it "others" service users of charities by promoting a view of them as helpless and

passive, and those who help through NGOs as wise, active and helpful (Cameron & Haanstra, 2008, p. 1486; CCIC, 2008, p. 3; Forstorp, 2007; Lamers, 2005, pp. 54, 63; Nathanson, 2013, p. 107; van der Gaag, 2007, p. 190). Since, in the context of development aid, service users/contributors are most often from the Global South, while NGOs and their donors are from the Global North—Northerners are portrayed as "saviours" in development advertising (Dogra, 2007, p. 162)—this further couches this ethical dilemma in the context of decolonisation (Dogra, 2007, p. 169; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 24; Warrington & Crombie, 2017, p. 4).

While acknowledging its efficacy at raising money, critics say it nonetheless fails to stimulate interest in or engagement with development issues (Cameron & Haanstra, 2008, p. 1479), by promoting an "extremely shallow" understanding of the forces that generate the conditions that NGOs are trying to redress (ibid). Advocates of the Fundraising Frame say it is not possible to get across such a complex and nuanced narrative in the type of communications needed for successful fundraising (CCIC, 2008, p. 14), but critics respond that this initial lack of context makes it more difficult to subsequently get across complex issues (van der Gaag, 2007, p. 192).

The philosophical polarisation of the Fundraising and Values frames is reflected in interdepartmental polarisation and tension within NGOs as fundraisers adopt and advocate for the Fundraising Frame, and service delivery and other departments criticise and advocate against the Fundraising Frame and for the Values Frame. In the official report into the Live Aid fundraising operation, van der Gaag and Nash (1987), p. 76) said that the "overall impression is a mass of contradictions, arising from the different and even opposing aims of different departments, and from the competition between NGOs." MacKeith (1992), pp. 7–10) reported four sources of tension between fundraisers and other departments, one of which was the use of images of service users/contributors. The fundamental source of this tension is fundraisers' focus on money (ibid, pp. 6–7) and this tension can often escalate into "open conflict" (ibid, p. 6). Twenty-five years later, Dean and Wood (2017) described almost identical tensions between fundraisers and other departments. In fact, it's an aphorism in the fundraising profession that the rest of the organisation thinks of what they do as a "necessary evil" (e.g., Breeze, 2017, p. 187; Cooney, 2019; Institute of Fundraising, 2014, p. 25).

The tension (and sometimes open conflict) described over a 30-year time frame by van der Gaag and Nash (1987), MacKeith (1992) and Dean and Wood (2017) is fundamentally a clash of the Fundraising Frame versus the Values Frame, or that one half of the Fundraising versus Values deep frame is activated while the other is supressed. This leads to the ethical dilemma inherent in this clash of frames: is it acceptable to use images of the type that are susceptible to the criticisms made of the Fundraising Frame (as outlined above) if these images are the ones that are most effective at raising most money? In other words does the end justify the means? (Cameron & Haanstra, 2008, p. 1485; Nathanson, 2013, p. 107; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 25). Further, does this end justify these means if the means cause harm elsewhere, for example, by "othering" and stereotyping, particularly over the longer term?

(Gies, 2021, pp. 93–94; Nathanson, 2013, p. 105; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 3).

Many authors answer their own question in the negative: no, the end (raising money) does not justify the means (negative images) (e.g., Gies, 2021, p. 95; Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 36). However, the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC, 2008, p. 7) points out that the varied perspectives for and against the Fundraising Frame highlight the "complexity" of the issue and illustrate why a "single simple solution has not been found." CCIC (ibid, p. 8) further argues the need for ongoing ethical reflection to find a solution in which fundraising images can be both respectful *and* financially effective.

2.1 | Reconceptualising the framing dilemma using CCIC's three levels of ethical values

CCIC's (2008, pp. 9–13) solution is to consider the ethical values involved at three levels:

Level 1: individual needs—ensuring services users' basic human needs such as food, heath etc., are met.

Level 2: organising values—how organisations achieve their objectives at level 1 through ethical practice and patterns of cooperation. Fundraising takes place at level 2.

Level 3: care and respect for persons in the world—sits above the other two levels and relates to a higher level good that is about long-term, sustained public good. At this level, an NGO will ask questions of itself such as whether its patterns of co-operation at level 2 affect the dignity of persons at level 1, and whether short-term patterns of cooperation at level 2 affect the longer-term good of persons at level 3. How the NGO answers these questions will then be used to adapt and change their level 2 patterns of co-operation.

However, CCIC stresses (pp. 12–13) that while level 3 values provide "guidance for innovation and implementation" of processes and practices at levels 1 and 2, level 3 values "do not exist for the own sake, nor do they "trump" or override lower-level values," even though when there is a conflict of values, then level 3 values "must prevail."

Using this three-level framework, it can be seen that the Fundraising and Values Frames operate at different levels. The Fundraising Frame, with its focus ("duty"—van der Gaag & Nash, 1987, p. 64) to raise money is a level 2 pattern of cooperation. The Values Frame, from which the criticisms of the Fundraising Frame derive, is concerned with the long-term care of persons and the public good at level 3.

Criticising the Fundraising Frame, van der Gaag (2007, p. 193) says: "In an isolated context, it might be argued, why is it a problem to show a starving child if that is the situation on the ground? The problem is that an image of a starving child or baby cannot be seen in isolation."

The problem is that fundraising is isolated. Van der Gaag and Nash (1987), MacKeith (1992) and Dean and Wood (2017) have described the tensions and conflict between departments, while MacKeith (1992), Sargeant (2008, p. 531), Saxton and Guild (2010), Fiennes (2012, pp. 46–54) and MacQuillin (2018) have all described

how fundraising serves a distinct function from the rest of a nonprofit organisation—one of attracting or acquiring resources as opposed to allocating them—and that this division of function is split around a focus on donors (for fundraisers) and on service users (for the rest of the organisation) (Saxton and Guild describe the division as being either side of the "profit" margin).

The ethical debate around the framing of service users/ contributors in fundraising materials focuses on criticism of fundraisers' perceived failures to consider level 3 challenges as part of their level 2 function. For example, Nathanson (2013, p. 114) says that fundraising communications only ask for donations, but do not inform people about other ways they can make a difference, nor do they raise awareness of the causes of poverty. The reason is that this is not the role that fundraising departments have been tasked with performing. They have been tasked by organisations to raise money, and it is a common complaint of fundraisers that they are regularly given short-term targets without the necessary investment to build long-term relationships (Hillier & Cooney, 2019; Linton & Stein, 2017, pp. 32–33; MacQuillin, 2016a, pp. 17–20; Pegram, 2017).

Dogra (2007, p. 170) asks whether fundraising images should be evaluated in terms of funds raised or awareness generated. Questions such as this, and the level 3 questions raised by CCIC (2008, p. 11) described above—for example, how does fundraising affect the dignity of persons and do short-term patterns cause long-term harm?—are not questions that fundraisers can answer in isolation; they are questions for the whole organisation to answer at level 3, and then commit to as an organisation (CCIC, 2008, pp. 12–13). However, while fundraisers are given isolated, short-term targets, they are most likely to pursue a financial metric, and less likely to prioritise awareness raising targets, until this is made an equally-valued part of their role against which success is measured.

Solutions that are presented as "reframing fundraising discourse" (e.g. Nathanson, 2013, p. 114) are often in fact changing fundraising into something else: awareness raising, engagement and education—"images should serve not only to raise funds, but should also creatively link public education to fundraising" (Plewes & Stuart, 2007, p. 29). In so doing, fundraising is actually being reframed out of the equation: these are no longer "fundraising" communications, but something else that has objectives other than (just) fundraising. And since the evidence is "scarce" that more positive images will raise as much as negative images, and NGOs are fearful of this outcome (Darnton & Kirk, 2011, p. 104), then NGOs tackling these level 3 ethical challenges will need to accept that their solution may result in reduced income, at least in the short term, while they invest in finding the right fundraising formula.

The question that forms the crux of the ethical dilemma—do the ends (most money raised to help service users/contributors) justify the means (negative images/framing of service users)?—is not a dilemma that can be solved by fundraisers working in isolation at level 2. Rather it can only be addressed by the entire organisation at level 3, and then using their answers to collectively reframe their patterns of co-operation at level 2.

Finding that level 3 solution is not something that can be addressed in this paper. Instead, our aim is to contribute to the reframing of the level 2 patterns of cooperation regarding fundraising by describing a new normative ethical lens/theory of framing based in the voice and agency of service users/contributors to tell their own story. As part of that story, service users/contributors may want to include negatively-framed images and stories. In such cases, it will be important that fundraisers are certain that the evidence supports the use of such negative framing. It is therefore relevant to review the evidence around negative and positive framing, which is addressed next.

3 | POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FRAMING

As Crombie (2020, p. 18) points out, much of the literature on the ethics of framing (e.g., CCIC, 2008; Dogra, 2007; Nathanson, 2013) and of the agency of service users/contributors (e.g., Bhati & Eikenberry, 2016; Clark, 2004; Girling, 2018) focuses on service user/ contributor responses to images, rather than to fully-completed pieces of fundraising content. Also, the literature that does look at images tends to focus on images in the context of emergencies and disasters, such as famine or war, rather than ongoing issues (Dogra, 2007, p. 167). Much less of the existing research focuses on wider storytelling, the texts used to tell stories, or the wider context of positive and negative framing beyond the use of images.

Levin et al. (1998) identify three types of framing of the information that is presented to people in advertising and contexts such as health care information. The first is risky choice framing (Levin et al., 1998, pp. 152–158), developed by Tversky and Kahneman (1981), in which identical information can be either positively framed as a gain (people will be saved) or negatively framed as a loss (people will die), with experiments showing people are more likely to respond to a negatively-framed message due to loss aversion (Levin et al pp. 152–157). The second, attribute framing, describes how a particular attribute is framed. For example the same cut of beef could be negatively framed as 25 per cent fat or positively framed as 75 per cent lean (ibid, pp. 158–167). Finally, goal framing (ibid, pp. 167–178) is so named because it is about promoting an activity that is desirable, with the framing geared towards persuasion.

There is not a huge amount of research into framing in charity advertising. A recent meta-analysis of gain and loss (i.e., risky framing) research considered 27 studies, many of which focused on health messages rather than donation messages (Xu & Huang, 2021). Smyth and MacQuillin (2018) have also summarised in detail some of the studies that look specifically at framing in fundraising communications. Xu and Huang's meta-analysis shows that gain and loss appeals do not significantly differ in persuasiveness in charity advertising, whether that relates to monetary or organ donation, and so advertisers need not worry about which frame they use. In fact, there was a slight advantage towards gain-framed messages (Xu & Huang, 2021, pp. 6–7).

Studies looking specifically at fundraising messages show a complicated interplay of factors.

Das et al. (2008) could not find an impact of either loss or gain framed message on donations.

In their 2009 paper, Chang and Lee looked at the effect of message framing (gain or loss), image "valence" (presenting a "vivid"

positive or negative picture paired with a loss- or gain-framed message) and temporal framing (short or long time frame), on the likelihood of volunteering, donating or recommending others donate. The combination that led to highest advertising effectiveness was a negative photo paired with a negative (loss) message. In a second paper in 2010, Chang and Lee (2010) found that a negatively-framed message was enhanced by a negative anecdote and small numerators (e.g., one in three instead of 700 million out of every 2.1 billion). But the findings are not as simple as showing that negative framing is most effective. For example, the "congruence" of image valence and message framing is important: a positive photo with a negatively-framed (loss) message is slightly more effective than a negative photo in a positive (gain) frame. Chang and Lee (2009, p. 2927) conclude that advertising effectiveness depends on complicated inter-relationships among message framing, image valence and temporal framing.

Jeong et al. (2011) argue that the efficacy of the type of framing used in advertising depends on whether recipients have an "approach" motivation (respond to awards and incentives—gain-framed messages) or "avoidant" motivation (respond to signs of threat—loss-framed messages). Similarly, Cao (2016) explores the effect of framing on people with a "promotion" focus (respond to positive outcomes) or "prevention" focus (respond to unfavourable outcomes), finding that loss framing increased donation intention in the latter group. Choi et al. (2016) investigated whether the degree of loneliness felt by people (primed by showing them "cold" or "warm" images) impacted donation intention. Their study delivered mixed results, but suggested that negative framing might not work for people who felt lonely, particularly if the framing evokes feelings of loneliness. However, Erlandsson et al. (2018) found that people's attitudes towards an appeal are not good predictors of their donation behaviour, while even positively-framed appeals can induce negative emotions in the recipient.

Small and Verrochi's (2009) research on emotions supports the idea that negative imagery (sad faces) tends to elicit more donations when there is little other information (or limited time to process this); while Cao and Jia (2017) also provide support for the efficacy of sad images. Albouy (2017) further shows that empathy is triggered by negative emotions, which lead to increased intention to donate.

The majority of these studies focus on one aspect of the communication. Hudson et al. (2016) attempted to replicate a more realistic appeal advert, comparing a "traditional" approach (a negative image and language that frames the service user as helpless), with an "alternative" approach (a positive image and language aimed to connect the donor to the recipient). This study shows very little difference in donation levels despite differences in the emotions generated by the different versions.

The evidence is mixed regarding positive and negative framing. Notwithstanding Xu and Huang's (2021) finding that there is no significant difference between gain and loss framing in charity advertising, many individual studies in the context of fundraising lend tentative support to negative framing, particularly loss framing, though this is often in the context of sad imagery. All studies suggest that there are different factors impacting on which appeals work: the person's personality/motivation, the context in which the advert is shown, their engagement with the charity, and even their gender (Wang, 2008). It is far more complex than just "happy" or "sad" images, and the impact of images can be mitigated through other factors, such as including large amounts of textual information that increases the "cognitive load" of an appeal (Small & Verrochi, 2009). This takes the argument beyond whether negative or positive framing works best and into what is most effective for different situations and audiences—something that will need to be carefully navigated when fundraisers work with service users/contributors on co-creating fundraising communications. Smyth and MacQuillin (2018, p. 22) suggest that negative framing may work best for donor acquisition, where new donors must be "attracted" to the cause through an emotional punch; whereas positive framing may work better in donor retention, where fundraisers are trying to build lasting relationships with donors who are already engaged with their causes. Cao and Jia's (2017) findings lend some support to this, with sad faces increasing donation intention for less involved donors and happy faces working better with involved donors.

However, CCIC (2008, p. 21) specifically argues—in the context of considering level 3 ethical questions—that loss-framed messages should be avoided, since loss-framing implies service users/contributors are helpless to improve their situations and, in the context of development aid, fosters a sense of Northern superiority. CCIC (ibid) says gain-framed messages that acknowledge the service users'/contributors' capabilities ought to be employed.

Yet the use of positive imagery and positive framing is itself problematic. Positive framing can simplify the problem as much as negative framing does and may even make the problem seem easier to solve than does negative framing (Chouliaraki, 2010). Happy faces can present as much of a stereotype as sad faces (CCIC, 2008, p. 7); while Dogra (2007, p. 167) has described a "dogma of positive imagery" adopted by NGOs, arguing that positive images can be a "lazy way out" that allow NGOs to avoid confronting the "messy questions of power and ideology" (ibid, p. 168). In fact, describing images as "negative" or "positive" is an oversimplification that obscures these complex issues (ibid, p. 166), and, as CCIC (2008, p. 7) says, one can rarely categorically say that one image is good and one is bad.

The "negative vs positive" question is not the right question to ask, as whichever is chosen will not be the solution to the problem of combining level 2 and level 3 values; rather, the challenge is to find new ways to fundraise that go beyond these reductive communication practices. This starts with the voices of service users/contributors.

4 | VOICES OF SERVICE USERS/CONTRIBUTORS

According to Gies (2021, p. 88), "voice"—the "ability to participate in deliberative processes"—is a "founding principle of ethical public communication." Quoting Couldry (2010, p. 7), Gies (2021, p. 88) describes "voice as a process" as the ability of individuals to "give an account of one's life and its conditions."

TABLE 2 Studies focusing on the agency/voice of service users/contributors in telling their own stories in NGO content reviewed by Crombie (2020)

Published
1. Deconstructing "poverty porn" in Uganda (Chung, 2013).
2. Faces of the needy: The portrayal of destitute children in the fundraising campaigns NGOs in India (Bhati & Eikenberry, 2016).
3. Pictures of me: User views on their representation in homelessness fundraising appeals (Breeze & Dean, 2012).
4. Representing disability in charity promotions (Barnett & Hammons, 1999).
5. Slum discourse, media representations and maisha mtaani in Kibera, Kenya (Ekdale, 2014).
6. The people in the pictures: Vital perspectives on Save the Children's image making (Warrington & Crombie, 2017).
7. The production of a contemporary famine image: The image economy, indigenous photographers and the case of Mekanic Philipos (Clark, 2004).
8. Which image do you prefer? A study of visual communications in six African countries (Girling, 2018).
Unpublished
9. Depicting injustice: Internal report for Save the Children UK (Miskelly & Warrington, 2010).

Yet while the framing question poses two sides of a dilemma about how best to use the images and tell the stories of services users, the voice of those service users is missing, and little research has been conducted to ascertain their attitudes to how they are currently framed (Fundraising versus Values frames) or how their stories are told (Crombie, 2020; Warrington & Crombie, 2017, p. 6), a point also made by van der Gaag (2007), p. 194). Crombie (2020) reviews only nine such papers (see Table 2). Moreover, this lack of research comes as much from critics of the Fundraising Frame/advocates of the Values Frame as it does from fundraisers (ibid, p. 10). While both poles in the debate claim to be doing what is in the best interests of service users/contributors; neither is asking service users/contributors what they think is in their best interests.

Crombie (2020, p. 19) argues that the goal of eliminating the "poverty porn" of the Fundraising Frame is "based in a belief structure where the opinions of those reviewing content are prioritised above the people who tell their own stories." She adds (ibid) that the idea that removing certain types of images will "imbue dignity" on those who are depicted "assumes there is one universal way to experience dignity, and that it is possible to gift it to those who suffer."

There can be a tendency to assume that those who feature in NGO content are not also consumers of these communications (Nothias & Cheruiyot, 2019, p. 137). However, much of the research shows that service users/contributors have a sophisticated understanding of the content collection and generating process, indicating that they are regular consumers of these types of media, and demonstrate empathy and sympathy for those whose plights are depicted, responding to sad images the same way as do donors (Crombie, 2020,

pp. 20–21)—for example, children looking at an image of a sick baby (Bhati & Eikenberry, 2016, p. 36).

Service users/contributors "consistently demonstrated that they understood the fundraising model behind the telling of their story in a certain way" (Crombie, 2020, p. 20). There was an awareness/acknowledgement that raising money was a priority and that if NGOs were placed in a position of having to choose between raising money and other goals, then "maximising donations" had to take priority (Breeze & Dean, 2012, p. 135), and that "happiness doesn't move people" (Warrington & Crombie, 2017, p. 53). Service users/contributors are comfortable with images/stories that "show the problem as it exits" (Clark, 2004, p. 20; Girling, 2018, p. 16; Warrington & Crombie, 2017, p. 58). Contributors do not "like" sad images—because they empathise with the person in the image (e.g., Bhati & Eikenberry, 2016, p. 36)—but a preference for images that do not show suffering "should not be misconstrued as contributors not wanting these images to be used at all" (Crombie, 2020, p. 21).

Crucially, however, all studies listed in Table 2 agree that while contributors do not mind being shown in a position of need, they do not want that to be the only way that they are depicted (Crombie, 2020, p. 22). There is an awareness that NGO stories can be too generic and fail to contribute to an understanding of the issues that contribute to their suffering (Breeze & Dean, 2012, p. 136), as critics of the Fundraising Frame allege. In all the studies in Table 2, service users/contributors grasped the tension inherent in the need to simplify the story to appeal to donors, but their preference was to show the complexity of their own personal situation, a complexity that usually demonstrated agency on their part, alongside need.

As Crombie (2020, p. 20) says: "When those who are experiencing suffering were asked their opinions on content showing their suffering, the responses, while complex, did not tally to the widely-held assumption from those that subscribe to the Values Frame that these images were abhorrent to those who featured in them." However it is important to remember that this is not to say that they agreed with the opinions held by those who support the Fundraising Frame either. Overall service users/contributors express a desire to have their voices heard, choose what stories are told and, if possible, tell their own stories because, as the Niger proverb goes, "a song sounds sweeter from the author's mouth" (Warrington & Crombie, 2017, p. 60).

5 | FRAMING ETHICS—SERVICE USERS'/CONTRIBUTORS' VOICE AND AGENCY IN TELLING THEIR OWN STORIES

Solving the ethical framing dilemma can be done in one of two ways. The long-term solution is to do what CCIC (2008) recommends: achieve interdepartmental consensus on level 3 questions and then reform patterns of cooperation at level 2 so that fundraising is "reframed" to tackle objectives wider than income generation (and is thus provided with relevant targets beyond financial metrics and receives the support of the entire organisation in so doing).

The second is to find a new ethical approach directly at level 2. That is the option this paper presents, a solution that is developed from Rights-Balancing Fundraising Ethics (MacQuillin, 2016b; MacQuillin & Sargeant, 2019). This states (MacQuillin, 2022, p. 10):

> Fundraising is ethical when it balances the duty of fundraisers to ask for support (on behalf of their beneficiaries), with the relevant rights of donors, such that a mutually beneficial outcome is achieved and neither stakeholder is significantly harmed.

Although Rights-Balancing Fundraising Ethics is formulated on balancing duties to donors and "beneficiaries," it can be used in situations in which fundraisers have duties to any two stakeholder groups that may conflict. In the case of the framing dilemma, fundraisers have conflicted duties to the same stakeholder group—service users/contributors. From the Fundraising Frame they have the duty to raise money to provide services: Elliott and Gert (1995, pp. 33–34) say that it is fundraisers' "primary responsibility" to ensure charities have income. From the Values Frame, they have a duty to treat service users/contributors with respect, protect their dignity, not to stereotype them, and tell more nuanced stories about them. Both of these frames present their own ethical (or moral) dilemma, where an ethical/moral dilemma is the conflict of two moral options: a choice between two or more appropriate (right) responses or between two or more inappropriate (wrong) responses (McConnell, 2018; Sinnott-Armstrong, 2005). The ethical dilemmas inherent in the application of the Fundraising and Values frames are shown in Table 3.

Attempting to resolve these dilemmas through the oppositional discourse typical in the literature makes them appear intractable, and attempts to do so may reinforce and exacerbate the tensions and divisions between fundraisers and other departments. So a new approach is needed that removes these tensions and takes the opposing poles of the existing discourse out of the ethical equation. This ethical solution is based in the voice and agency of service users to contribute to their own framing and telling their own stories, and thus become contributors, the voices of whom, as has been discussed, are largely missing from both sides of the current discourse.

This normative theory/lens of ethical framing in fundraising follows the formulation laid out by MacQuillin (2022, p. 1): "Fundraising is ethical when X and unethical when NOT X—where X is a set of conditions such as "protects trust in fundraising."

In this case:

> Framing in fundraising is ethical when it provides a way for service users/contributors to use their voice and agency to contribute to their own framing and the telling of their own stories, and unethical when it does not.

"Agency" is the socially-produced and culturally-generated ability to act in specific spaces, providing a choice to act in a way that makes a pragmatic difference (Barker, 2002, pp. 236–237). And as previously stated, voice is the "ability to participate in deliberative processes" (Gies, 2021, p. 88).

This puts an ethical imperative on fundraisers to include service users/contributors in the decision-making process. If fundraisers do not include the voices and opinions of service users/contributors, then the framing is unethical. Fundraisers (and, of course, others) ought not presume to speak on behalf of or in the interests of service users/contributors without first consulting them about what they believe their own interests to be and how they want those interests communicated. This formulation of ethical framing removes nebulous terms such as "dignity" and "respect." Often in the literature, the locus of human dignity is deemed to reside in the actual image. This formulation of framing ethics moves the locus for addressing dignity beyond the image towards the recognition that a service user/contributor makes to the process as a stakeholder. This shifts the focus from an imperative to remove images of suffering, to focusing on how the service user/contributor is included in the process of telling their own story, a process that may result in the contributor telling stories of suffering (Crombie, 2020, p. 7).

As the ethics of framing is now founded on the voice and agency of service users/contributors, an ethical requirement to raise money has been taken out of the ethical equation. Yet fundraisers *do* have a duty to raise money (Koshy, 2017, 2019) and the income stream to charities needs to be protected. As previously stated, studies that have explored service users'/contributors' attitudes to framing (Table 2) have shown that they are sophisticated consumers of media and understand both the fundraising process and the necessity to fundraise. And so fundraisers need to be able to talk to contributors about the types of framing that are likely to be effective, which requires in-depth knowledge of the topic so that fundraisers can put the best case for fundraising to contributors.

By the same token, fundraisers have a duty not to "lead" service users/contributors to a particular form of storytelling just because they (fundraisers) understand this is the most effective fundraising frame. Mazzei et al. (2020, pp. 1274–1275) warn of the dangers of nonprofit professionals setting the agenda for co-production with service users/contributors, and giving them a limited say in establishing a "least bad" option. In this case, negative framing/images could be presented as the least bad option. Doing so would not enable service users/contributors to demonstrate agency and would thus be unethical.

5.1 | Co-creating fundraising frames with service users/contributors

The context for this formulation of framing ethics sits within the movement to include services users/contributors in both the governance of charities/NGOs and the co-production of services (Bovaird, 2007; Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012; Brandsen & Pestoff, 2006; Locke et al., 2003; Mazzei et al., 2020; Wellens & Jegers, 2011). Most of this literature focuses on service user/contributor engagement in co-production, co-design and co-

TABLE 3 Table showing the good and bad outcomes of the values and fundraising frames

	Good (ethical) outcome	Bad (potentially unethical) outcome
Values Frame	Correction of the stereotypical preconceptions of service users and/or framing them in a dignified manner	Potentially less money is raised to provide the services needed by service users or alleviate/address the situation in which they find themselves
Fundraising Frame	More money raised to help improve the lives of service users	Types of images required to raise the amount of money needed in the timeframe it is needed in/by may be injurious to service users' dignity and may reinforce stereotypical public perception of charity service user groups

TABLE 4 Engagement of service users in co-production of service delivery, after Mazzei et al. (2020)

	High inclusion	Low inclusion
High engagement	Scenario 1—Service users/contributors are enabled by the third sector organisation and are involved in designing and co-producing their own services	Scenario 3—Service users/contributors are represented by charities, but not directly included in the co-production process. Instead, NGOs/charities consult/engage with their service users/contributors and then design services based on that engagement
Low engagement	Scenario 2—Excessive control and tokenistic engagement emerges when services users are involved in governance (hence high inclusion), but not in co-production: the agenda for service design is often dominated by charity professionals	Scenario 4—Limited voice of service users. Engagement with service users, if it happens at all, is often little more than a box-ticking exercise

delivery of the services they will use rather than their stories as told through marketing and fundraising.

Mazzei et al. (2020, pp. 1276–1279) classify the approaches taken by third sector organisations in co-production, with users of services, based on high to low inclusion (the formal and informal processes for including services users) and high to low engagement with those process, giving four scenarios, which are depicted in Table 4.

While Scenario 1 is considered to be the "ideal" scenario, Scenario 4, with its box-ticking, limited engagement of service users is far from uncommon. It's Scenario 4 that most accurately reflects the current state of the framing debate, with both advocates and opponents of the Fundraising Frame speaking in the interests of service users/contributors, but with limited voice of those service users/contributors being heard. The formulation of framing ethics presented in this paper therefore needs to sit in scenario 3 or scenario 1. In scenario 3, service users/contributors would be fully engaged in consultative processes so that charities could represent their views in the design and framing of fundraising materials. In scenario 1, service users/contributors would be actively involved in designing fundraising materials; they would be fundraisers.

Mazzei et al. (2020, p. 1277) describe scenario 1 as the ideal for the co-production and design of services. This paper makes no recommendation as to whether scenario 1 or scenario 3 is preferable for storytelling, framing and fundraising. However, the arguments advanced in this paper require that for framing in fundraising to be ethical, it must at least fall into scenario 3, which requires a huge shift from where it currently is.

Key to applying this ethical theory/lens are the processes devised by NGOs for securing service user/contributor content. Mazzei et al. (2020) talk in passing about some of the methods used to engage service users/contributors, such as through planning days, workshops and user-led research. A full raft of techniques for co-production with service users/contributors could be through the use of public engagement techniques, such as citizen juries (Rowe & Frewer, 2005): for example, a fundraising board composed of service users/contributors, which would satisfy the requirement to place fundraising into Mazzei et al.'s (2020) scenario 3 and might even qualify it for scenario 1.

Charities could also employ the theory of organisation-public relationships (Broom et al., 2000) from academic PR theory, which sees organisations take a "co-creational perspective" with their stakeholder groups to agree on shared meanings, interpretations and goals (Botan & Taylor, 2004). The excellence theory of public relations advocates two-way "symmetrical" communications with stakeholders to resolve conflict and promote mutual understanding (Grunig, 1992, p 18; Grunig & Grunig, 1992, pp. 285–326). Photography can also be understood as a dialogic process (Fairey & Orton, 2019). A further option for engaging service users/contributors in content generation is through the MEAL model (Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, Learning) (Wakefield & Koerppen, 2017).

Save the Children in the UK has gone through such a process (Warrington & Crombie, 2017) and its recommendations for collecting service user/contributor content are summarised in Table 5.

Just as charities now have, as a matter of course, ethical gift acceptance/refusal/return policies, which aim to pre-empt any ethical

TABLE 5 Recommendations for incorporating contributors into the content-gathering process

1. Invest in creative and collaborative approaches to image-making
a. Enable contributors to become image-makers themselves
b. Invest in multiple stories over time with the same individuals
2. Uphold contributors' rights and fulfil the duty of care
3. Informed consent to be understood as a process with clear procedures in place
a. It is a two-way and multi-stage process
b. Ensure there are child-friendly versions of consent processes
4. Commit to sensitive and effective communication before, during and after image-gathering
a. Communication with contributors before the shoot is essential to support informed consent and manage expectations
b. Develop resources (and approaches) to effectively convey purpose and use to contributors
c. Invest in and insist on good translators to support good communication with contributors
d. Ensure personal consistency by making sure that contributors' contact with [the NGO] before, during and after image gathering is with the same individual
e. Invest in follow-up with contributors and the return of photographs and content.
5. Ensure that human dignity is upheld in the image-making process, not just in the image itself

Note: Summarised from *People in the Pictures* (Warrington & Crombie, 2017, pp. 67–71).

issues and provide an ethical decision-making framework for navigating any that do arise, so NGOs should also have ethical contributor policies that stipulate the processes and identify ethical dilemmas in gathering service user/contributor-generated content. A key component of such ethical policies must be the implementation of a genuine consent process rather than one that merely legally protects the organisation (Warrington & Crombie, 2017, pp. 21–40; Crombie, 2020, p. 23). Crombie (ibid) notes that all the papers she reviewed (Table 2—bar one which did not ask the question) reported serious concern among contributors about consent.

It is possible, and in some cases, likely, that charities will not, for logistical reasons, be able to engage with their service users to seek their contributions, or service users may not, in certain situations or contexts, be able to exercise agency, perhaps because it has been impaired (for example, people with severe learning difficulties, babies, people in palliative end-of-life care, non-human beneficiaries). In such cases, there might not even be a guardian or other person who can exercise agency on their behalf. It might also be the case that many service users have no wish to get involved in co-production of fundraising, leaving a cohort of contributors who regularly engage (Mazzei et al., 2020, p. 1274).

Therefore, in the absence of defined processes to secure service user/contributor content (perhaps because the charity is still developing it), when that process cannot, for logistical reasons, be implemented, and when service users/contributors are not able to, or do not wish to,

exercise agency, framing ethics requires fundraisers to use their professional knowledge and ethical literacy to frame service users/contributors in such a way that it can be reasonably expected that this is what they would have chosen had they been able to contribute their own stories.

The start of the evidence base fundraisers will need to make these decisions are the papers listed in Table 2. However, some caveats apply to using these studies. The people interviewed in them cannot speak for all people represented in charity content (Crombie, 2020, p. 18) and it is probably not possible to generalise very far from the findings of such studies (Girling, 2018, p. 6). And it must also be kept in mind that the very reason people have been surveyed is because they are at a point in their lives where they are in need, which might make them more amenable to content that shows the need they are in (Crombie, 2020, p. 20). Fundraisers will also need more than a working knowledge of fundraising ethics (MacQuillin, 2022), and the theory, evidence and practice of co-production.

Developing these processes and researching the attitudes of service users/contributors and gathering their content will be complex, time consuming and expensive and may thus represent a significant barrier for many charities (Warrington, 2020), and in the context of service design, there is often tension between budget holders and those who want to engage service users in co-production (Mazzei et al., 2020, p. 1278). However, doing the right thing does not always come cheap, and the expense of doing so should not automatically be a barrier to those NGOs that ought to be able to find the resources. Nonetheless, if some charities genuinely do not have the wherewithal to put appropriate consultation processes in place, then that could count as a mitigating factor that moves the ethics of framing, for that organisation, towards what they can reasonably expect their services users would do based on existing evidence.

6 | SUMMARY

The ethical dilemma in the framing of service users/contributors in charity fundraising materials is whether the ends (most money raised to help service users/contributors) justify the means (negative images/framing of service users/contributors), especially if these means, even if they provide short-term solutions, cause wider, long-term harm.

Previous discourse on the framing dilemma has been polarised between the Fundraising Frame and the Values Frame, contributing to, causing or exacerbating the tensions between fundraising and other departments at NGOs. But these frames address the problem at different ethical "levels" (CCIC, 2008). The Fundraising Frame operates at the level of organisational values, attempting to solve the problem of providing sufficient resources to fund services for service users/contributors, which is often framed with short-term objectives; whereas the Values Frame attempts to solve problems beyond fundraising at the level of the public good, providing long-term solutions to the causes of the situations in which service users/contributors find themselves, problems that cannot be solved by fundraising alone.

As such, these two poles are addressing different ethical dilemmas—money raised balanced against the dignity of services users/contributors—and so consensus on a solution has proved elusive for at least the last 35 years.

This paper has attempted to provide a solution at the level of organisational values by removing the poles of the Fundraising and Values Frames from the equation. Ethical framing in the context of fundraising is no longer an attempt to play off the money raised against whether services users'/contributors' dignity has been protected, but whether service users/contributors exercise voice and agency in contributing to their own framing and telling their own stories. Other things being equal, fundraising frames are ethical when contributors have choice in what stories are told, and get to tell their own stories, and unethical when they do not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

ENDNOTES

[1] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Live_Aid#Fundraising.

[2] "Othering," or "to other," means to "distinguish, label, categorise… and exclude" people who "do not fit a societal norm" (Mountz, 2009, p. 328).

[3] (1) Rational Actor versus Embodied Mind. 2) Free Market versus Shared Prosperity. 3) Elite Governance versus Participatory Democracy. 4) The Moral Order frame.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

ORCID

Ian MacQuillin https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0630-2344

REFERENCES

Albouy, J. (2017). Emotions and prosocial behaviours: A study of the effectiveness of shocking charity campaigns. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 32(2), 4–25.

Barker, C. (2002). *Making sense of cultural studies: Central problems and critical debates*. Sage.

Barnett, J., & Hammons, S. (1999). Representing disability in charity promotions. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 9(4), 309–314.

Bhati, A., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2016). Faces of the needy: The portrayal of destitute children in the fundraising campaigns of NGOs in India. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21(1), 31–42.

Botan, C. H., & Taylor, M. (2004). Public relations: State of the field. *Journal of Communication*, 54(4), 645–661.

Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community co-production of public services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860.

Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2012). From engagement to co-production: The contribution of users and communities to outcomes and public value. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(4), 1119–1138.

Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. (2006). Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services: An introduction. *Public Management Review*, 8(4), 493–501.

Breeze, B. (2017). *The new fundraisers: Who organises charitable giving in contemporary society?*. Policy Press.

Breeze, B., & Dean, J. (2012). Pictures of me: User views on their representation in homelessness fundraising appeals. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(2), 132–143.

Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (2000). Concept and theory of organization-public relationships. In J. A. Ledingham & D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 3–22). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Cameron, J., & Haanstra, A. (2008). Development made sexy: How it happened and what it means. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(8), 1475–1489.

Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC). (2008). *Focus on ethics: Advertising tensions in choosing fundraising images*. Canadian Council for International Development.

Cao, X. (2016). Framing charitable appeals: The effect of message framing and perceived susceptibility to the negative consequences of inaction on donation intention. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21(1), 3–12.

Cao, X., & Jia, L. (2017). The effects of the facial expression of beneficiaries in charity appeals and psychological involvement on donation intentions: Evidence from an online experiment. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 27(4), 457–473.

Chang, C. T., & Lee, Y. K. (2009). Framing charity advertising: Influences of message framing, image valence, and temporal framing on a charitable appeal. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(12), 2910–2935.

Chang, C. T., & Lee, Y. K. (2010). Effects of message framing, vividness congruency and statistical framing on responses to charity advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 29(2), 195–220.

Choi, J., Rangan, P., & Singh, S. N. (2016). Do cold images cause cold-heartedness? The impact of visual stimuli on the effectiveness of negative emotional charity appeals. *Journal of Advertising*, 45(4), 417–426.

Chouliaraki, L. (2010). Post-humanitarianism: Humanitarian communication beyond a politics of pity. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(2), 107–126.

Chung, L. E. (2013). *Deconstructing 'poverty porn' in Uganda*. https://leahericachung.com/deconstructing-poverty-porn

Clark, D. J. (2004). *The production of a contemporary famine image: The image economy, indigenous photographers, and the case of Mekanic Philipos*. http://www.imaging-famine.org/papers/djclarkfamine1.pdf

Cooney, R. (2019, July 3). *Don't view raising funds as a necessary evil, says shelter chief*. Third Sector. https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/dont-view-raising-funds-necessary-evil-says-shelter-chief/fundraising/article/1589793

Couldry, N. (2010). *Why voice matters: Culture and politics after neoliberalism*. Sage.

Crombie, J. (2020). *You've been reframed—Discussion paper 3. Putting the contributor Centre frame: What the people in our pictures think about the way we tell their stories*. Rogare—The Fundraising Think Tank.

Darnton, A., & Kirk, M. (2011). *Finding frames: New ways to engage the UK public in global poverty*. BOND.

Das, E., Kerhof, P., & Kuiper, J. (2008). Improving the effectiveness of fundraising messages: The impact of charity goal attainment, message framing, and evidence on persuasion. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 36(2), 161–175.

Dean, J., & Wood, R. (2017). "You can try to press different emotional buttons": The conflicts and strategies of eliciting emotions for fundraisers. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 22(4), e1603.

Dogra, N. (2007). 'Reading NGOs visually'—Implications of visual images for NGO management. *Journal of International Development: The Journal of the Development Studies Association*, 19(2), 161–171.

Ekdale, B. (2014). Slum discourse, media representations and maisha mtaani in Kibera, Kenya. *Ecquid Novi African Journalism Studies*, 35(1), 92–108.

Elliott, D., & Gert, B. (1995). The moral context of fund raising. In D. Elliott (Ed.), *The ethics of asking: Dilemmas in higher education fund raising*. John Hopkins University Press.

Erlandsson, A., Nilsson, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2018). Attitudes and donation behavior when reading positive and negative charity appeals. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 30(4), 444–474.

Fairey, T., & Orton, L. (2019). Photography as dialogue. *Photography and Culture*, 12(3), 299–305.

Fiennes, C. (2012). *It ain't what you give, it's the way that you give it*. Giving Evidence.

Forstorp, P. A. (2007). Fundraising discourse and the commodification of the other. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16(3), 286–301.

Gies, L. (2021). Charity fundraising and the ethics of voice: Cancer Survivors' perspectives on Macmillan cancer Support's "brave the shave" campaign. *Journal of Media Ethics*, 36, 1–12.

Girling, D. (2018). Which Image Do You Prefer? A Study of Visual Communication in Six African Countries. Oslo, Norway: RadiAid/SAIH–The Norwegian Students' and Academics' International Assistance Fund. https://www.framevoicereport.org/media/4513/rapportplusradiplusaidweb.pdf

Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: Secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117.

Grunig, J. E. (Ed.). (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communications management*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communications management*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hillier, H., & Cooney, R. (2019, January 21). *Future of fundraising: Is this the end of the fundraising department?* Third Sector. https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/future-fundraising-end-fundraising-department/fundraising/article/1523414

Ho, R. (2015, September 6). *Do you still use the word 'beneficiaries'*. Feedback Labs. https://feedbacklabs.org/blog/do-you-still-use-the-word-beneficiary/

Hudson, D., van Heerde-Hudson, J., Dasandi, N., & Gaines, N. S. (2016). *Emotional pathways to engagement with global poverty: An experimental analysis*. Princeton University.

Institute of Fundraising. (2014). *Proud Fundraiser Toolkit*. Institute of Fundraising. https://ciof.org.uk/IoF/media/IOF/Policy/iof-proud-to-be-a-fundraiser-toolkit.pdf?ext=.pdf

Jeong, E. S., Shi, Y., Baazova, A., Chiu, C., Nahai, A., Moons, W. G., & Taylor, S. E. (2011). The relation of approach/avoidance motivation and message framing to the effectiveness of charitable appeals. *Social Influence*, 6(1), 15–21.

Khan, R. (2015, May 13). *In international aid, people should be seen as consumers and not 'beneficiaries'*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/may/13/international-aid-consumers-beneficiaries

Koshy, K. (2017, January 30). *The fundraiser's duty to ask–A philosophical rationale*. Critical Fundraising. https://criticalfundraising.com/2017/01/30/new-ideas-the-fundraisers-duty-to-ask-a-philosophical-rationale/

Koshy, K. (2019, October 7). *The end of donor-centred fundraising and the last fundraiser*. Critical Fundraising. https://criticalfundraising.com/2019/10/07/opinion-the-end-of-donor-centred-fundraising-and-the-last-fundraiser/

Lakoff, G. (2006). *Thinking points–Communicating our American values and vision*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lamers, M. (2005). Representing poverty, impoverishing representation? A discursive analysis of a NGOs fundraising posters. *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 37–74.

Le, V (2020, July 13). *Why we need to move away from empathy in our fundraising approach*. NonprofitAF. https://nonprofitaf.com/2020/07/why-we-need-to-move-away-from-empathy-in-our-fundraising-approach/

Levin, I. P., Schneider, S. L., & Gaeth, G. J. (1998). All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 76(2), 149–188.

Linton, C., & Stein, P. (2017). *Donors for life. A Practitioner's guide to relationship fundraising*. The White Lion Press.

Lissner, J. (1981). Merchants of misery. *New Internationalist*, 100, 23–25.

Locke, M., Begum, N., & Robson, P. (2003). Service users and charity governance. In C. Cornforth (Ed.), *The governance of public and non-profit organizations: What do boards do?*. Routledge.

MacKeith, J. (1992). *Raising money or raising awareness: Issues and tensions in the relationship between fund-raisers and service providers*. Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics & Political Science.

MacQuillin, I. (2016a). *Relationship fundraising: Where do we go from here? Volume 3: Trends and challenges identified by practitioners*. Rogare–The Fundraising Think Tank.

MacQuillin, I. R. (2016b). *Rights stuff: Fundraising's ethics gap and a new theory of normative fundraising ethics*. Rogare–The Fundraising Think Tank.

MacQuillin, I.R. (2018, August 13). *How to put beneficiaries first, without throwing donors out with the bathwater*. Critical Fundraising. https://criticalfundraising.com/2018/08/13/new-ideas-how-to-put-beneficiaries-first-without-throwing-donors-out-with-the-bathwater/

MacQuillin, I. R. (2022). Normative fundraising ethics–A review of the field. *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing*, e1740.

MacQuillin, I. R., & Sargeant, A. (2019). Fundraising ethics: A rights-balancing approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(1), 239–250.

Mazzei, M., Teasdale, S., Calò, F., & Roy, M. J. (2020). Co-production and the third sector: Conceptualising different approaches to service user involvement. *Public Management Review*, 22(9), 1265–1283.

McConnell, T. (2018). Moral dilemmas. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition)*. Standford, CA: Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/moral-dilemmas/

Miskelly, C., & Warrington, S. (2010). *Depicting injustice: Final report* (Unpublished). Internal report for Save the Children UK.

Mountz, A. (2009). The other. In C. Gallaher, C. T. Dahlman, M. Gilmartin, A. Mountz, & P. Shirlow (Eds.), *Key concepts in political geography* (pp. 328–338). SAGE.

Nathanson, J. (2013). The pornography of poverty: Reframing the discourse of international aid's representations of starving children. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 38(1), 103–120.

Nothias, T., & Cheruiyot, D. (2019). A "hotbed" of digital empowerment? Media criticism in Kenya between playful engagement and co-option. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 24.

Pegram, G. (2017, April 3). *Fundraising AT people is all wrong. Here's why*. 101 Fundraising. https://101fundraising.org/2017/04/fundraising-people-wrong-heres/

Plewes, B., & Stuart, R. (2007). The pornography of poverty: A cautionary fundraising tale. In D. A. Bell & J.-M. Coicaud (Eds.), *Ethics in action: The ethical challenges of international human rights nongovernmental organizations* (pp. 23–37). Cambridge University Press.

Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 30(2), 251–290.

Sargeant, A. (2008). Marketing for nonprofit organizations. In M. J. Baker & S. Hart (Eds.), *The marketing book* (6th ed., pp. 526–550). Butterworth-Heinemann.

Saxton, J., & Guild, M. (2010). *It's competition, but not as we know it* (2nd ed.). nfpSynergy.

Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2005). *Moral dilemmas*. www.encyclopedia.com

Small, D. A., & Verrochi, N. M. (2009). The face of need: Facial emotion expression on charity advertisements. *Journal of Marketing Research, 46*(6), 777–787.

Smillie, I. (1995). Alms Bazaar. In *Altruism under fire; non-profit organizations and international development*. International Development Research Centre.

Smyth, R., & MacQuillin, I. (2018). *You've been reframed–Discussion paper 2. Positive and negative framing*. Rogare–The Fundraising Think Tank.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science, 211*, 453–458.

van der Gaag, N. (2007). Images in fundraising. In J. Mourdaunt & R. Paton (Eds.), *Thoughtful fundraising: Concepts, issues and perspectives* (pp. 184–198). Routledge.

van der Gaag, N. & Nash, C. (1987). *Images for Africa: UK Report*. http://www.imaging-famine.org/images_africa.htm

Vowles, P. (2018, March 12). *Why I hate the word 'beneficiaries.'* Bright Magazine. https://brightthemag.com/why-i-hate-the-word-beneficiaries-778f49445402

Wakefield, S., & Koerppen, D. (2017). *Applying feminist principles to program monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning*. OXFAM.

Wang, C. L. (2008). Gender differences in responding to sad emotional appeal: A moderated mediation explanation. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, 19*(1), 55–70.

Warrington, S. (2020). The people in the pictures research: Taking care with photo elicitation. In S. Dodds (Ed.), *Ethics and integrity in visual research methods*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Warrington, S., & Crombie, J. (2017). *The people in the pictures: Vital perspectives on save the Children's image making*. Save the Children. https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/12425/pdf/thepeopleinthepictures.pdf

Wellens, L., & Jegers, M. (2011). Beneficiaries' participation in nonprofit organizations: A theory-based approach. *Public Money & Management, 31*(3), 175–182.

Xu, J., & Huang, G. (2021). The relative effectiveness of gain-framed and loss-framed messages in charity advertising: Meta-analytic evidence and implications. *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing, 25*(4), e1675.