ADVANCING ARTS PHILANTHROPY PRACTICES FOR WELL-BEING

Michela Addis, Università degli Studi di Roma Tre michela.addis@uniroma3.it

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6381-6451

Andrea Rurale, Bocconi University andrea.rurale@unibocconi.it

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1107-6142

Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing

Special Issue Arts Philanthropy: When marketing helps individual and societal well-being

Project PE 00000020 CHANGES - CUP F83C22001650006, NRRP Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.3, Funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU

ADVANCING ARTS PHILANTHROPY PRACTICES FOR WELL-BEING

Abstract

Individual and collective well-being is a global priority. Arts philanthropy can play a significant role in enhancing well-being, both due to the direct impact of the arts on well-being and the contribution of philanthropy to the well-being of both donors and recipients. Despite this widely held belief, the current state of arts philanthropy highlights the need for advancements in its practices for the benefit of both givers and receivers. Through a review of previous studies, we propose a conceptual model to support the success of arts philanthropy by addressing four key elements: who, what, how, and why. Arts philanthropic practices should: (1) Identify the involved stakeholders and their interests within the context of multi-sided markets; (2) Design and execute engaging cultural experiences as part of their offerings; (3) Incorporate the four ethical principles – namely, "Do no harm," "Do as much good as possible," "Respect people's autonomy," and "Treat people with fairness" – into their decision-making processes; (4) Utilize valid and reliable measures of well-being.

Keywords: arts philanthropy; customer experience; well-being; cultural consumption

1. Introduction

Over time, well-being has garnered significant attention worldwide (Tov et al., 2022), emerging as a primary objective for numerous governments, if not all, in future social policy agendas. In the European Union, the "Beyond GDP initiative" serves as a reference point for those aiming to enhance sustainability and societal inclusiveness. The recent COVID-19 pandemic has intensified the urgency of this global priority, with 15 OECD countries reporting that more than one-quarter of their populations were at risk of experiencing depression or anxiety in 2020 (OECD, 2021).

Arts can play a pivotal role in both recovering and enhancing well-being. There exists a general and direct influence of arts on well-being: the therapeutic value of arts has been extensively researched in relation to both artistic creation and consumption (Braito et al., 2022; Smriti et al., 2022). Notably, experts in art therapy like McNiff, Malchiodi, Naumburg, Kramer, Ulman, Rubin, and many others have demonstrated that creative expression significantly contributes to the successful treatment of physical and mental disabilities in both children and adults (Vick, 2003).

In addition to this overarching general impact, there is another more specific impact related to philanthropy: Philanthropic support has a direct, positive, and enduring effect on well-being (Sabato & Bar-Ilan, 2023). This refers both to the givers and the receivers because both of them are beneficiaries of improved well-being driven by philanthropic actions. This dual relationship between art and well-being, encompassing both the direct connection and the one mediated by the source of funding, accentuates concerns regarding post-COVID data. The profound impact of the recent pandemic on the artistic sector has been palpable. During the lockdowns, the global industry incurred significant financial losses. For instance, the Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies (2021) estimates a $17.97 billion loss for American arts organizations, while Florida and Seman (2020) calculate that between April and July 2020, over 2.3 million jobs were lost in creative occupations in the USA.

The situation isn't any brighter concerning arts philanthropy. Charities Aid Foundation (2023) reports that despite an initial rise in community contributions to mitigate pandemic-induced economic

impacts, data indicate a return to previous levels in nominal terms, amounting to a significant decline when accounting for inflation's effects. Experts note a diminishing ability of philanthropy to engage and foster relationships with potential donors, attributing these signs of crisis to growing distrust and disinterest (CBS News, 2021). These patterns echo trends observed over a decade ago (Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012).

Consequently, due to this dual association, these data raise substantial concerns not only for the prospective trajectory of arts and cultural organizations but also for the overall well-being of society. In a context where recovery is neither swift nor straightforward, there has been a call for a secure resumption of activities within the cultural and creative sectors across the EU. To this end, the Commission published EU guidelines in June 2021. The support provided by policymakers, corporate entities, and individual donors to arts organizations remains a foremost priority (Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies, 2021; Rurale et al., 2020).

The heightened urgency surrounding the preservation of arts philanthropy necessitates the advancement of arts philanthropic practices. The efficacy of organizations in their fundraising endeavors constitutes a significant metric for success (Maradus & Jacobs, 2010). Presently, foundations' contributions to the arts exhibit a widespread and localized distribution, conforming to a stable power-law distribution pattern. These contributions support various art forms and exhibit a noteworthy level of donor retention (Shekhtman & Barabási, 2023).

Discovering methods to support philanthropic income, encompassing “donations and fundraising, philanthropic foundations and funds, and other business sponsorship” (Cortis, 2017, p. 807), holds substantial advantages. However, the question remains: How? Indeed, the link between prosocial behaviors and well-being is acknowledged to be intricate, with multiple variables interacting (Lyubomirsky & Layous, 2013; Sabato & Bar-Ilan, 2023). Consequently, pinpointing investment strategies and policies capable of achieving desired outcomes is neither straightforward nor obvious. Nonetheless, marketing unquestionably plays a pivotal role in advancing philanthropy to the next level (Van Steenburg et al., 2022).

Our paper delves into this very concern and seeks to elevate arts philanthropy to yield elevated levels of well-being. It focuses on the two main characters of philanthropic behaviors in arts, which are the givers and the receivers. Together they develop a relationship that activates a feedback loop that results in improved well-being for both beneficiaries. Drawing from a multidisciplinary literature review encompassing marketing, consumer behavior, arts, and psychology, we present a conceptual framework. This framework accentuates the significance of four variables that both organizations and policymakers must address in order to harness the connection between philanthropic endeavors and well-being within the arts industry.

By doing so, our research contributes to the advancement of knowledge in two distinct ways. Firstly, by illuminating the nexus between well-being and arts philanthropy, our conceptual framework incites arts organizations to refine their focus and investments in effective arts philanthropy. This response aligns with the recent call to better navigate this pivotal strategic challenge (Turrini & Voss, 2020). Secondly, our paper puts forth an investment model grounded in enabling conditions. These prerequisites are integral for the efficacy of communication strategies within the potential donors' market for players in arts and cultural enterprises. Given that these conditions necessitate specific investments, the revenue models of arts organizations could underscore their performance in this domain. It's important to note that arts organizations grapple with missions and governance that are significantly more intricate than those of conventional profit-driven entities (Burlingame, 2009).

The subsequent sections of the paper are structured as follows: We initiate with the review of existing literature encompassing the definition of the well-being concept, its interplay with arts and culture, and its association with philanthropy. Subsequently, we introduce and deliberate on our conceptual model, articulating our propositions. Moving forward, we conclude by examining the managerial implications and addressing the limitations inherent in our research.

2. Well-being, arts consumption, and philanthropy

2.1. Defining well-being

Well-being is widely recognized as a key performance indicator for economic and social progress (OECD, 2013). It encompasses the subjective assessment of one's own life and circumstances, displaying a richly comprehensive and multidimensional nature. While it is commonly encountered in everyday experiences, its precise definition is intricate (Myers & Diener, 1995; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). Many economists use terms like well-being, subjective well-being, life satisfaction, and happiness interchangeably (Graham, 2009). However, this practice can be misleading because well-being is a very complex concept incorporating cognitive and emotional evaluations, driven by objective as well as subjective factors. Happiness and well-being have long been central goals of economic and scholarly interest.

In the contemporary interpretation of well-being, it cannot be confined to the narrow borders of economics; instead, it encompasses objective and subjective considerations, as well as both enduring and momentary variables (Painter-Morland, Demuijnck, & Ornati, 2017). Well-being has been defined as the "good mental states, including all of the various evaluations, positive and negative, that people make of their lives and the affective reactions of people to their experiences" (OECD, 2013: p. 10). Thus, well-being represents a holistic construct, encompassing both an emotional and cognitive evaluation of an individual's life. Consequently, it is inherently subjective and can vary among individuals. The perception of a specific well-being level is a personal expression that arises from an individual's subjective experience of their life circumstances, giving rise to a psychological state. Given this facet, self-report measures are the most appropriate tools for assessing well-being (OECD, 2013).

The subjective nature of well-being does not imply that objective factors are irrelevant. On the contrary, well-being is influenced by a broad spectrum of both objective and subjective determinants. The characterization of these determinants has been extensively explored by economists, sociologists, and psychologists, who have examined individual quality of life, life evaluations, hedonic experiences, and personal priorities (Stiglitz, Sen, & Fitoussi, 2009). Objective factors include aspects such as high income, good health, supportive relationships, favorable marital status, social

connections, freedom, democratic conditions, absence of adversity, and more (Argyle, 1999; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Frey & Stutzer, 2002; Gerdtham & Johannesson, 2001).

Numerous psychologists have observed that objective factors account for only a small portion (around 15%) of the variance in happiness and life satisfaction. This underscores the need to explore alternative subjective factors that influence well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Argyle, 1999; Diener, 1984; Diener, Suh, Lucas & Smith, 1999; Diener & Seligman, 2004). In fact, it has been suggested that "psychological variables that help in dealing with these life events may be able to explain such a psychological phenomenon better than the objective determinants" (Mohanty, 2014: p. 82).

Among the most extensively studied objective factors is income. Over the years, several authors have engaged in a debate concerning its impact on well-being, with prominent figures like Kahneman and Deaton (2010), as well as Killingsworth (2021), contributing to this discourse. Their findings have yielded contrasting results: while Kahneman and Deaton (2010) uncovered a positive correlation between income and happiness, which peaked at approximately $60,000 to $90,000 before plateauing, Killingsworth (2021) identified a linear-log pattern wherein average happiness consistently increased with log(income). Recently, this debate was addressed and potentially resolved through an "adversarial collaboration" involving Killingsworth, Kahneman, and Mellers (2023). The three authors reanalyzed jointly the data and revealed that the flattening pattern was applicable solely to the least content 20% of the population, whereas happiness exhibited continuous growth with log(income) among more content individuals. While this reanalysis identified a positive influence of money on happiness, it also highlighted that monetary factors are not the sole contributors. Self-satisfaction is also influenced by subjective experiences (Frank, 1997, 2005; Layard, 2005). Happiness is indeed linked with positive thinking (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Folkman, 1997; McCrae, Costa, & Busch, 1986; Scheier & Carver, 1993; Seligman, 1991; Taylor & Armor, 1996), influenced by both enduring personality traits and transient determinants (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). As a result, both stable personality traits and fleeting determinants contribute to generating subjective well-being

(Stiglitz, Sen & Fitoussi, 2009).

2.2. The impact of cultural consumption on well-being

The realm of determinants influencing well-being, as examined in the literature, encompasses cultural consumption as well. Numerous studies have delved into the potential connections between cultural consumption and well-being. Indeed, the recognition of such a link has significantly shaped the conceptualization of experiential consumption (Addis, 2023; Holbrook, 2023). Currently, it is widely acknowledged that arts organizations generate four distinct forms of value that hold equal significance (Addis & Rurale, 2020): they play a substantial role in shaping the identity of both populations and territories, augment the economic value of these regions, foster innovative ideas and creative value for other industries and sectors, and contribute to the well-being of individuals and communities.

Regarding well-being, governmental policies often oscillate between perceiving support for arts and culture as nonessential (Luccasen & Thomas, 2020) and recognizing the potential for a direct and positive connection between individuals' engagement in arts and culture and their subjective well-being levels, prompting empirical analyses to substantiate this correlation (Camic, Zeilig, & Crutch, 2018). In 2011, the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services propelled a profound exploration of this theme, centering it around an integrated approach that places "the whole person" at the core, harmonizing studies and policies. The central notion explored is that participation in arts and education can enhance individual development, resulting in elevated levels of personal and collective well-being (Hanna, Patterson, Rollins, & Sherman, 2011).

Numerous studies have undertaken the exploration of the nature and potency of such connections, adopting various perspectives and methodologies. Psychologists have long unearthed that “learning art skills forces mental 'stretching' useful to other areas of learning” (Gardiner et al., 1996: p. 284). Over time, the correlation between arts education and cognitive abilities has captured the keen interest of numerous neuroscientists, consistently revealing a positive impact across multiple domains. Training programs in the arts have been found to enhance the brain's attentional neuronal networks,

leading to elevated cognitive capabilities (Gazzaniga, 2008). This phenomenon has been observed in children engaged in music, who tend to develop more advanced spatial-temporal reasoning (Rauscher et al., 1997), heightened competence in understanding abstract geometry (Spelke, 2008), a broader receptive vocabulary predicting academic success and overall intelligence (Brown, Benedett & Armistead, 2010), and increased focused attention (Neville et al., 2011).

The positive correlation between arts education and cognitive outcomes has been extensively documented not only in children but also in other segments of the population, such as young adults and the elderly (Berkowitz & Ansari, 2008; Heath & Roach, 1999; Israel & Center for Arts Education, 2009; Hetland & Winner, 2001; Verghese et al., 2003). Furthermore, as time has passed, the spectrum of outcomes explored to evaluate the benefits of arts education has expanded, revealing new effects like pro-social outcomes (Catterall, 2009), positive emotions (Brown & Sax, 2013), communal and social behaviors (Gerry, Unrau, & Trainor, 2012; Heath & Roach, 1999), personal initiative (Larson, Hansen & Moneta, 2006), subjective experiences including intrinsic motivation, focused effort, engagement, positive and negative mood states (Shernoff & Vandell, 2007), physical and mental health (Castora-Binkley et al., 2010; Cohen, 2006; Cohen et al., 2006; Fritsch et al., 2009; Verghese et al., 2003; Zeilig et al., 2015), quality of life measured through recall and problem-solving, and psychological well-being (Noice, Noice & Staines, 2004; Noice & Noice, 2009), along with functional mobility (Hackney, Kantorovich & Earhart, 2007).

Over the years, arts consumption has also captured the attention of scholars, who have sought to examine whether engaging in cultural experiences has an impact on individual well-being. Their endeavors have yielded significant success. While Catterall, Chapleau, and Iwanaga (1999) found a general correlation between arts involvement and higher academic performance, other researchers have delved into specific forms of cultural consumption. Hetland and Winner (2004), for example, identified a noteworthy relationship between listening to music and temporary enhancement in spatial-temporal reasoning. Rosenberg (2009) and Gonzales, Morrow-Howell, and Gilbert (2010) concentrated on museum visits, uncovering the positive influence of art tours on self-esteem and other

well-being measures among individuals in the early stages of dementia and their family caregivers, as well as the effects on medical students' attitudes and connection with older adults.

A pivotal study in this trajectory is Tepper et al. (2014), which, through an analysis of American data, established that engagement in various artistic practices (such as fine arts, video, music, theater, dance, crafts, gardening, artful cooking, creative writing, designing clothes, and composing music) is linked to elevated levels of well-being, gauged by an array of metrics including life satisfaction, self-image, tolerance, openness toward others, as well as materialism and anxiety about change. The relationship between artistic practice and well-being was found to strengthen with increased frequency of participation. More recently, the act of reading has also entered the scope of investigation: Addis (2020) highlighted the significant and positive impact of reading on both the emotional and cognitive dimensions of individual well-being within the Italian population.

The substantial volume of studies, characterized by diverse methodologies, metrics, and domains, collectively affirms the existence of the positive impact of art consumption on well-being. However, some consequential aspects remain to be elucidated. For instance, Kemp et al. (2018) propose a strong influence of cultural values adopted by societies, while Fujiwara, Kudrna, and Dolan (2014) bring up the issue of operationalization, shedding light on the limitations of commonly used well-being measurement methods as well as analytical approaches.

2.3. The feedback loop between philanthropy and well-being

Philanthropic activities, which encompass actions such as donating money, volunteering time, or providing resources to those in need, have a substantial and lasting impact on well-being. Among the various actions that promote well-being, prosocial behaviors stand out as particularly influential, demonstrating a positive, causal, and reciprocal relationship with well-being-related concepts such as happiness, life satisfaction, subjective well-being, positive and negative affect, and more (Batson et al., 1979; Dunn, Aknin & Norton, 2008; Rhoads et al., 2021). Empirical investigations have shown that individuals who allocate their resources to help others experience higher levels of well-being,

leading to sustained positive effects on subsequent spending behaviors (Aknin, Dunn & Norton, 2012). This consistency in the impact of prosocial behaviors on various dimensions of well-being has been confirmed by Thoits and Hewitt (2001), and Kushlev, Radosic, and Diener (2022) have further validated this effect on well-being on a global scale using data from the Gallup World Poll spanning 163 countries from 2006 to 2017.

Over time, multiple motivations have been identified as drivers for preferences towards prosocial behaviors, falling into self-regarding or other-regarding categories (Becchetti, Corrado, & Conzo, 2017):

- Self-regarding motivations: These motivations align with the conventional economic perspective, where utility is the primary determinant. Two pivotal motivations fall under this category:
    1. Intrinsic rewards, including satisfaction and well-being: According to the "glow theory," individuals engaging in prosocial actions receive benefits from others (such as apprenticeship, social networks, etc.), which elevate their well-being and internal satisfaction derived from giving (Andreoni, 1990).
    2. External rewards, such as status and social prestige: By aiding others, individuals enhance their status and earn social recognition. Donors may contribute partly to signal a status of affluence (Glazer & Konrad 1996).
- Other-regarding motivations: People undertake prosocial actions rooted in diverse motivations, values, and objectives that aren't easily captured by traditional utility-maximization frameworks. These motivations encompass higher interests and values, such as ethical considerations, the desire to foster positive relationships, generate resources to enhance others' lives, or establish themselves as competent.

Regardless of the motivation, research underscores that individuals with higher levels of well-being are more inclined to engage in prosocial behaviors. Conversely, participating in prosocial activities

contributes to an individual's well-being, demonstrating a positive feedback loop denoted as "Feel good—do good; do good—feel good" (Sabato & Bar-Ilan, 2023). This reciprocal relationship between prosocial behavior and well-being has prompted extensive investigation into its impacts on both the givers and recipients of philanthropic actions. During the recent pandemic, this link has been further accentuated. For instance, Lades, Laffan, Daly, and Delaney (2020) revealed that individuals engaging in prosocial behaviors during the pandemic reported heightened levels of daily emotional well-being. Similarly, individuals perceiving greater online social support during COVID-19 were associated with higher positive mental health levels and a propensity for prosocial behaviors (Canale et al., 2022)

The intertwining of prosocial behaviors and well-being holds significant implications for both donors and recipients, making it a crucial driver for supporting fundraising efforts in the arts industry. Given its nonprofit nature, the arts industry is particularly vulnerable: “Without fundraising, nonprofit organizations cannot achieve their mission or support their causes, leading to a precarious situation for societal well-being” (Van Steenburg et al., 2022: p. 1079). Strategies that bolster fundraising are of utmost importance for arts organizations, thereby influencing the broader societal landscape.

3. Our conceptual model

Arts organizations have a multitude of strategies at their disposal to stimulate philanthropy. Recently, Van Steenburg et al. (2022) emphasized that nonprofits operating across various industries, including the arts, should embrace future strategies capable of adapting to shifts in financial behavior among both consumers and corporations. These strategies should also be data-driven, effectively communicated to convey the value generated for donors and beneficiaries, and efficiently support brand development. Regardless of the strategy an arts organization chooses to adopt, we propose that they should initially address key questions concerning arts philanthropy. We suggest that the success of arts philanthropy in generating individual and societal well-being depends on four conditions that need to be addressed regarding key elements of arts philanthropy: who, what, how, and why. Drawing

from previous studies, our conceptual model supports arts organizations and policymakers in their efforts to raise funds from individual and corporate donors and supporters for the promotion of well-being.

Who: Arts philanthropy involves stakeholders who exchange in multi-sided markets

Arts philanthropy and other forms of giving, such as fundraising, sponsorships, volunteer-time contributions, and more, all play essential roles in sustaining the cultural industries and are expressions of generosity. While they share this fundamental aspect, philanthropic giving has traditionally been considered distinct from other forms of giving because it lacks a direct exchange expectation (Burlingame, 2001). In other forms of giving, like sponsorship, fundraising, or volunteer contributions, expected benefits are the explicit reason for these exchanges. In contrast, philanthropy is typically viewed as an act of giving with no anticipated benefit in return. This distinction also applies to arts philanthropy, where the absence of an exchange is often seen as a defining characteristic; it's viewed as a simple act of donation.

Because of this assumption, marketing has historically focused more on understanding the decision-making processes of other forms of giving rather than arts philanthropy. For example, a significant number of papers published in the Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing (formerly the International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing) from 2001 to 2022 mention "fundraising" in their abstracts, while only a smaller number mention "philanthropy.

However, the absence of an exchange as a defining feature of philanthropy, especially in the artistic and cultural industries, is debatable and somewhat artificial (Frumkin, 2006; Moir & Taffler, 2004). Several reasons support this argument:

1. Evolving Financial Context. The evolving financial landscape has introduced new challenges and complexities that highlight the interest in returns, even for philanthropic players (Van Steenburg et al., 2022).

2. Donors-Centered Approach. Since the decision-making process of donors is very complex (Daellenbach, 2012), some argue that a donors-centered approach based on philanthropy should replace the more traditional organization-centered approach based on fundraising (Radbourne & Watkins, 2015).
3. Personal Gains. Philanthropic campaigns often stimulate individuals based on personal gains (Robert, 2013).
4. Tax Incentives. Tax-deductibility acts as a motivation for philanthropic giving, and payroll giving is a successful tool based on tax incentives (Romney-Alexander, 2002).
5. Visibility and Impact. Donors are increasingly attracted to making their philanthropic actions highly visible through communication and promotion, creating a "high impact" philanthropy (McGee, 2006).
6. Multi-Sided Markets. The multi-sided markets theory, particularly relevant to arts and culture, suggests that actions in one market can impact other markets through network externalities. “The winner takes all” principle can assign an exchange value even to freely given philanthropic acts (Rochet & Tirole, 2003; 2006).

Given these factors, all the interactions and their outcomes should be thoughtfully planned to emphasize the strategic and operational synergies within the same market, considering both short-term and long-term objectives.. It becomes evident that marketing competencies and skills can be highly useful in the context of arts philanthropy. Marketing plays a pivotal role in creating a "fundraising culture" (Herrero and Kraemer, 2020), and education and training in marketing can influence individuals effectively.

In cases where these competencies are lacking, education and training can be highly effective in influencing individuals. For example, a recent study by Tu, Huang, and Sorensen (2020) discovered that a well-designed education philanthropy program has a significant positive impact on well-being by enhancing human capital accumulation for children. Furthermore, such programs demonstrate the potential to reduce intergenerational inequality.

However, it's only after identifying the specific exchanges that occur within arts philanthropy and understanding the parties involved that philanthropic actions aimed at enhancing individual well-being can be effectively planned and executed. Therefore, we present the following proposition:

> **Proposition 1:** The success of arts philanthropy hinges on the utilization of marketing strategies and competencies to create and provide value within the framework of exchanges in multi-sided markets, all while taking into account both short-term and long-term outcomes.

What: Arts philanthropy concerns engaging cultural experiences

Since arts organizations provide cultural experiences, arts philanthropy leverages them to enhance well-being for individuals and societies. Arts organizations offer and curate cultural experiences that engage their specific audiences, placing "the whole person" at the core of their business model. These audiences can vary depending on the market and its size, encompassing individuals, companies, young adults, children, and more. Engaging these audiences is a critical factor in the success of arts organizations, and customer engagement is a central measure of success in delivering any experience (Addis, 2020; Verhoef, Reinartz, & Krafft, 2010).

The significance of customer engagement becomes even more pronounced in the context of arts philanthropy, where it serves both as a precursor and an outcome. As a precursor, the success of arts philanthropy heavily relies on its relevance to the community. Community relevance is a crucial driver of the intention to contribute (Burlingame & Smith, 1999). While historically, prominent American philanthropists were entrepreneurs who amassed fortunes (Acs & Phillips, 2002), recent studies have emphasized the role of community belonging in motivating charitable giving. Research on university employees (Shaker, Kienker, & Borden, 2014) and young African American donors (Jackson, 2001) has underscored the importance of community ties in donation behavior. According to the construal-level theory (Trope & Liberman, 2010), when individuals perceive actions or topics

as psychologically close and immediate (temporally, socially, spatially, or hypothetically), their perception of the outcomes becomes more concrete, influencing their decision-making process (Appau & Awaworyi Churchill, 2019).

As an outcome, previous studies have consistently demonstrated that customer engagement is a key result of experiences (Addis, 2020). Thus, engagement serves as both a significant driver and a noteworthy outcome of arts philanthropy, strengthening the relationship with donors. Furthermore, as arts and culture operate within multi-sided markets, engagement may extend its influential effects to other domains, as engaged individuals and companies who are active donors may be inclined to share their involvement in other markets

Understanding the comprehensive relationship between arts philanthropy and engagement is particularly relevant for policymakers and organizations that rely heavily on philanthropic contributions, especially in the post-COVID era, where philanthropy remains a priority for policymakers (Madden, 2006). Cultural differences in philanthropy exist (Layton & Moreno 2014), making it imperative to explore the dynamics of engagement within specific cultural contexts. Moreover, arts organizations must pay close attention to the online realm, as social media and social networking play pivotal roles in shaping the future of arts philanthropy (Miller, 2009). Properly managing the online world can significantly increase the engagement of potential donors in cultural experiences, as demonstrated by platforms like Facebook (Lucas, 2017). Whether arts organizations are prepared to leverage the online advantage is a topic deserving of attention. Designing comprehensive yet digital-physical (phigital) cultural experiences can contribute to enhancing stakeholder engagement. Therefore, the relationship between arts philanthropy and engagement has the potential to drive both artistic excellence and commercial appeal and should be a focal point for future exploration. Consequently, we propose:

> **Proposition 2:** The success of arts philanthropy is contingent on the design and management of engaging cultural experiences.

How: Arts philanthropy benefits from the adoption of ethical decision-making processes

Arts philanthropy poses a unique challenge for arts and cultural organizations as it requires them to navigate the complexity of their mission, which involves finding a delicate balance between their arts orientation (focused on conserving and advancing cultural excellence) and market orientation (aimed at market development and entertainment) (Kolb, 2000). Unlike many other industries, this balance is particularly challenging for arts organizations, often necessitating a product-oriented approach (Carù & Cuadrado-García, 2020). Consequently, ethical considerations inevitably arise when designing customer experiences for arts organizations, raising questions about whether they should prioritize developing innovative artistic projects or investing in audience development and customer relationship management. In such scenarios, satisfying the needs of some stakeholders may come at the expense of others, even though all stakeholders are crucial for the long-term success of arts organizations. To address this challenge, an ethical approach to decision-making, one that places well-being as the ultimate goal (Diener & Seligman, 2004), can be invaluable.

The ethical approach introduces a moral dimension into the decision-making process, making it more comprehensive and capable of mitigating unintended consequences (Addis et al., 2022). This ethical approach aligns with the four ethical principles established by Beauchamp and Childress (2001) over 40 years ago in the field of biomedicine: "Do no harm," "Do as much good as possible," "Respect people's autonomy," and "Treat people with fairness." We propose that these four ethical principles can provide valuable guidance to arts organizations when navigating complex situations like the ones they face today.

This issue gains even more significance when considering that arts organizations play vital roles within complex ecosystems. The traditional view that sees arts organizations as isolated players in a specialized sector no longer holds true; they are increasingly encountering challenges from other industries. Arts philanthropy serves as a prime example, as the search for donors transcends industry boundaries. The network effects characteristic of arts philanthropy can redirect arts organizations' attention to a broader analysis of the impact of innovation processes on a wide range

of stakeholders. In situations involving a high number of stakeholders, unintended consequences may emerge. In such a context, ethical principles can serve as the guiding framework for organizational decisions. This leads us to propose:

> **Proposition 3:** Decision-making processes in arts philanthropy often involve conflicting interests among stakeholders, which can be effectively addressed by applying ethical principles.

Why: Arts philanthropy returns in terms of well-being should be assessed via valid and reliable measures

Measuring well-being is a complex task that presents theoretical and practical challenges, especially when assessing the impact of arts philanthropic actions. Defining well-being as the ultimate goal of both collective and individual strategies necessitates a clear understanding of its dimensions and the development of appropriate measurement frameworks. Several measurement models have been proposed in various fields, and three key frameworks are worth exploring further:

1. **Three-Dimensional Model:** This model decomposes well-being into three key dimensions: Satisfaction with Life, Affect (emotional well-being), and Eudaimonia (the sense of living a meaningful life) (Dolan & White, 2007; Stiglitz, Sen, & Fitoussi, 2009; OECD, 2013). Each of these dimensions can be assessed using various measures, all designed to capture specific aspects of well-being. Despite covering a wide range of characteristics related to well-being (Addis, 2020), they effectively capture and represent the specific aspects or dimensions of well-being they are meant to measure, rendering them valid and reliable indicators (Diener, 1984).
2. **European Commission Framework:** The European Commission introduced a well-being measurement module in 2013, which assesses individual well-being using 18 subjective well-being indicators. This measurement is periodically conducted across European countries to monitor well-being trends.

3. **PERMA Model:** Proposed by Seligman (2011), the PERMA model includes five dimensions of well-being: Positive emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishments (Butler & Kern, 2016). This model is gaining traction, particularly in marketing.

Identifying the most suitable framework is an initial step in using specific measures to assess the performance of arts philanthropy in terms of the generated well-being. Effective strategies and policies aimed at improving individual and collective well-being must rely on a dependable and valid set of measurements; otherwise, unintended consequences may arise. This is particularly crucial in the context of arts philanthropy due to the interconnectedness of well-being, philanthropy, and the arts. Indeed, measuring the impact of corporate philanthropy on both business and society is a fundamental component of successful corporate strategies (Liket & Maas, 2016). Corporate philanthropy involves a company's voluntary allocation of resources to contribute positively to social welfare (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988). Simultaneously, arts organizations generate a wide array of societal benefits. These beneficial effects are of paramount importance in the post-COVID era, as they often serve as a justification for encouraging support for arts and culture. Defining the measures capable of evaluating the performance of arts organizations, including their impact on well-being, remains an area in need of further research. Therefore, we propose:

> **Proposition 4:** Arts philanthropy generates various contributions to well-being that should be evaluated using appropriate measurements.

Conclusions

In conclusion, our paper explores the connections between philanthropy, the arts, and well-being, highlighting the potential of arts philanthropy to enhance individual and collective well-being. Through an extensive literature analysis, we propose four managerial implications to improve arts philanthropic practices and increase their success. These implications are as follows:

1. Identifying the stakeholders involved in philanthropic exchanges and understanding their global interests within multi-sided markets.
2. Designing and implementing engaging cultural experiences that form the core offerings of arts philanthropic actions.
3. Applying the four ethical principles in decision-making processes to resolve conflicting interests in arts philanthropic actions.
4. Implementing a valid and reliable well-being measurement system based on the most suitable framework for specific arts philanthropic actions.

By addressing these aspects, we aim to bridge the gap between the priority of enhancing individual well-being and the support for arts and culture, ultimately benefiting both. Arts organizations must adapt their approaches to arts philanthropy to successfully navigate this challenge and contribute to the well-being of society as a whole.

We hope that our proposed activities will help address a current paradox: while enhancing individual well-being is a universal priority, support for art and culture, which inherently contributes to that well-being, often falls short (Luccasen & Thomas, 2020). To effectively deal with this challenge, arts organizations must urgently reconsider their approaches to arts philanthropy. This revision may encompass changes to their offerings, processes, or business models, as suggested by Addis & Rurale (2020). It is crucial for our present and future well-being.

References

Acs, Z. J. & Phillips, R. J. (2002) Entrepreneurship and Philanthropy in American Capitalism, *Small Business Economics*, 19(3), 189-204.

Addis, M. (2020) *Engaging Brands: A Customer-centric Approach for Superior Experiences*. London: Taylor & Francis – Routledge.

Addis, M. (2023) Exploiting the Cultural Consumption Experience *International Journal of Arts Management*. In print.

Addis, M. & Rurale, A. (2020) A Call to Revise Cultural Business Management. In Addis, M. and A. Rurale (Eds.), *Managing the Cultural Business: Avoiding Mistakes, Finding Success*, London: Taylor & Francis – Routledge, 1-31

Addis, M., Batat, W., Atakan, S. S., Austin, C. G., Manika, D., Peter, P. C., & Peterson, L. (2022) Systemic Ethical Food Experience Design to Prevent Unintended Consequences. *Journal of Service Research*, *25(1),* 143-159.

Aknin, L. B., Dunn, E. W., & Norton, M. I. (2012) Happiness Runs in a Circular Motion: Evidence for a Positive Feedback Loop Between Prosocial Spending and Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *13*, 347-355.

Andreoni, J. (1990) Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving. *The Economic Journal*, *700(401),* 464-477.

Andrews, F. M. & Withey, S. B. (1976) *Social Indicators of Well-being*. New York and London: Plenum.

Appau, S. & Awaworyi Churchill, S. (2019) Charity, Volunteering Type and Subjective Wellbeing. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *30(5),* 1118-1132.

Argyle, M. (1999). Causes and Correlates of Happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.). *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation, 353–373.

Batson, C. D., Coke, J. S., Chard, F., Smith, D., & Taliaferro, A. (1979) Generality of the "Glow of Goodwill": Effects of Mood on Helping and Information Acquisition. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *42(2),* 176–179.

Beauchamp, T. L. & Childress, J. F. (2001) *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Beauchamp, T.L. & Childress, J.F. (2001) *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Becchetti, L., Corrado, L., & Conzo, P. (2017) Sociability, Altruism and Well-Being. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *41(2),* 441-486.

Berkowitz, A. L. & Ansari, D. (2008) Generation of Novel Motor Sequences: the Neural Correlates of Musical Improvisation. *Neuroimage*, *41*(2), 535-543.

Braito, I., Rudd, T., Buyuktaskin, D., Ahmed, M., Glancy, C., & Mulligan, A. (2022) Systematic Review of Effectiveness of Art Psychotherapy in Children with Mental Health Disorders. *Irish Journal of Medical Science*, *191*(3), 1369-1383.

Brown, E. D. & Sax, K. L. (2013) Arts Enrichment and Preschool Emotions for Low-Income Children at Risk. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *28*(2), 337-346.

Brown, E. D., Benedett, B. & Armistead, M. E. (2010) Arts Enrichment and School Readiness for Children at Risk. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *25*(1), 112-124.

Burlingame, D. (2001) Corporate Giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(1), 4-4.

Burlingame, D.F. (2009) Nonprofit and Philanthropic Studies Education: The Need to Emphasize Leadership and Liberal Arts, *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *15*(1), 59-67.

Burlingame, D.F. & Smith, C. (1999) The Future of Corporate Giving. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 26, 59-78.

Butler, J. & Kern, M. L. (2016) The PERMA-Profiler: A Brief Multidimensional Measure of Flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *6*(3), 1-48.

Camic, P. M., Zeilig, H. & Crutch, S. J. (2018) The Arts and Dementia: Emerging Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice. *Dementia*, *17*(6), 641-644.

Canale, N., Marino, C., Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Griffiths, M. D., Gaboardi, M., ... & Massimo, S. (2022) How Communication Technology Fosters Individual and Social Wellbeing During the COVID-

19 Pandemic: Preliminary Support for a Digital Interaction Model. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *23*(2), 727-745.

Carù, A. & Cuadrado-García, M. (2020) Understanding the Arts Customer: The Mistake of Overlooking Customer Experience. In Addis, M., & Rurale, A. (Eds.). *Managing the Cultural Business* (pp. 213-243). Taylor & Francis – Routledge. London.

Castora-Binkley, M., Noelker, L., Prohaska, T. & Satariano, W. (2010) Impact of Arts Participation on Health Outcomes for Older Adults. *Journal of Aging, Humanities, and the Arts*, *4*(4), 352-367.

Catterall, J. S. (2009) *Doing Well and Doing Good by Doing Art*. Los Angeles, CA: I-Group Books. Accessed on March 13, 2023. Retrieved from https://rhyclearinghouse.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/docs/21545-Doing_Well_and_Doing_Good.pdf

Catterall, J. S., Chapleau, R. & Iwanaga, J. (1999) Involvement in the Arts and Human Development: General Involvement and Intensive Involvement in Music and Theater Arts. *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, *1*, 1-18.

CBS News (2021) *Only Half of U.S. Households Donated to Charity, Worst Rate in Decades*. Accessed on March 7, 2023. Retrieved from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/federal-reserve-rate-hikes-acclerate-jerome-powell

Charities Aid Foundation (2023) *Corporate Giving by the FTSE 100*. https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/giving-as-a-company/corporate_giving_ftse100_2023_report.pdf

Cohen, G. (2006) Research on Creativity and Aging: The Positive Impact of the Arts on Health and Illness. *Generations*, *30*(1), 7-15.

Cohen, G. D., Perlstein, S., Chapline, J., Kelly, J., Firth, K. M. & Simmens, S. (2006) The Impact of Professionally Conducted Cultural Programs on the Physical Health, Mental Health, and Social Functioning of Older Adults. *The Gerontologist*, *46*(6), 726-734.

Cortis, N. (2017) Philanthropic and Commercial Income Among Nonprofit Community Service Organisations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 28(2),* 798-821.

Daellenbach, K. (2012) Understanding the Decision-making Processes for Arts Sponsorship. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(4), 363-374.

Deaton, A. (2008) Income, Health, and Well-being Around the World: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2), 53-72.

DeNeve, K. M. & Cooper, H. (1998) The Happy Personality: a Meta-analysis of 137 Personality Traits and Subjective Well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(2), 197.

Diener E. & Seligman, M. E. (2004) Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Well-being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5(1), 1-31.

Diener, E. (1984) Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3).

Diener, E. & Lucas R. E. (1999) 11 Personality and Subjective Well-being. *Well-being: Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*, 213.

Diener, E. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004) Beyond Money: Toward and Economy of Well-Being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *5(1),* 1–31.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E. & Smith H. L. (1999) Subjective Well-being: Three Decades of Progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276.

Dolan, P. & White, M.P. (2007) How Can Measures of Subjective Well-being be Used to Inform Public Policy? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(1), 71-85.

Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008) Spending Money on Others Promotes Happiness. *Science, 319*, 1687–1688.

Florida, R. & Seman, M. (2020) *Lost Art: Measuring COVID-19's Devastating Impact on America's Creative Economy*. Accessed on November 4, 2021. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-

content/uploads/2020/08/20200810_Brookingsmetro_Covid19-and-creative-economy_Final.pdf

Folkman, S. (1997) Positive Psychological States and Coping with Severe Stress. *Social Science & Medicine*, *45*(8), 1207-1221.

Frank, R. H. (1997) The Frame of Reference as a Public Good. *The Economic Journal*, 107(445), 1832-1847.

Frank, R. H. (2005) Positional Externalities Cause Large and Preventable Welfare Losses. *American Economic Review*, (2), 137-141.

Frey, B. S. & Stutzer, A. (2002) What Can Economists Learn from Happiness Research? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2), 402-435.

Fritsch, T., Kwak, J., Grant, S., Lang, J., Montgomery, R. R. & Basting, A. D. (2009) Impact of TimeSlips, a Creative Expression Intervention Program, on Nursing Home Residents with Dementia and Their Caregivers. *The Gerontologist*, *49*(1), 117-127.

Frumkin, P. (2006) *Strategic Giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fujiwara, D., Kudrna, L. & Dolan, P. (2014) Quantifying and Valuing the Wellbeing Impacts of Culture and Sport. *Department for Culture Media and Sport Research Paper*. Accessed on March 12, 2023. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304899/Quantifying_and_valuing_the_wellbeing_impacts_of_sport_and_culture.pdf

Gardiner, M. F., Fox, A., Knowles, F. & Jeffrey, D. (1996) Learning Improved by Arts Training. *Nature*, *381*, 284-284.

Gazzaniga, M. (2008) Arts and Cognition: Findings Hint at Relationships. In C. Asbury & B. Rich (Eds.). *Learning, Arts, and the Brain: The Dana Consortium Report on Arts and Cognition*, v-viii.

Gerdtham, U. G., Johannesson, M. (2001) The Relationship Between Happiness, Health, and Socio-Economic Factors: Results Based on Swedish Microdata. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 30(6), 553-557.

Gerry, D., Unrau, A. & Trainor, L. J. (2012) Active Music Classes in Infancy Enhance Musical, Communicative, and Social Development. *Developmental Science*, *15*(3), 398-407.

Giving USA Foundation (2022) *Giving USA Annual Report*.

Glazer, A. & Konrad, K. A. (1996) A Signaling Explanation for Charity. *The American Economic Review*, *86(4),* 1019-1028.

Gonzales, E., Morrow-Howell, N. & Gilbert, P. (2010) Changing Medical Students' Attitudes toward Older Adults. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, *31*(3), 220-234.

Graham, C. (2009) *Happiness Around the World: The Paradox of Happy Peasants and Miserable Millionaires.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hackney, M. E., Kantorovich, S., Levin, R. & Earhart, G. M. (2007) Effects of Tango on Functional Mobility in Parkinson's Disease: a Preliminary Study. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*, *31*(4), 173-179.

Hanna, G., Patterson, M., Rollins, J. & Sherman, A. (2011) The Arts and Human Development: Framing a National Research Agenda for the Arts, Lifelong Learning, and Individual Well-being. *National Endowment for the Arts, Washington DC*. Accessed on March 13, 2023. Retrieved from https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/TheArtsAndHumanDev.pdf

Heath, S. B. & Roach, A. (1999) Imaginative Actuality: Learning in the Arts during Nonschool Hours. In Fiske (Ed). *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning*, 19-34.

Herrero, M. & Kraemer, S. (2020) Fundraising as Organizational Knowing in Practice: Evidence from the Arts and Higher Education in the UK. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 25(4), e1673.

Hetland, L. & Winner, E. (2001) The Arts and Academic Achievement: What the Evidence Shows. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *102*(5), 3-6.

Hetland, L. & Winner, E. (2004) Cognitive Transfer From Arts Education to Nonarts Outcomes: Research Evidence and Policy Implications. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.) *Handbook of Research and Policy in Art Education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 35-162. Accessed on March 12, 2023. Retrieved from http://www.daneshnamehicsa.ir/userfiles/files/1/13-%20Handbook%20of%20Research%20and%20Policy%20in%20Art%20Education.pdf

Holbrook, M. B. (2023) Consumption Experiences in The Arts. *International Journal of Arts Management*. In print.

Israel, D. & Center for Arts Education (2009) *Staying in School: Arts Education and New York City High School Graduation Rates*. Center for Arts Education.

Jackson, T.D. (2001) Young African Americans: A New Generation of Giving Behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6 (3), 243-253.

Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies (2021). *COVID-19 Pandemic Impact on The Arts. Research Update: November 16, 2021.* Accessed on November 2, 2021. Retrieved from http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/NEWS-RELEASE-October-2021-Nonprofit-Jobs-Report.pdf

Kemp, E., Martic, K. & Anaza, N. A. (2018) Artistic Consumption and Well-being: A Song of Two Countries. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *23*(4), e1612.

Killingsworth, M. A. (2021) Experienced Well-being Rises with Income, Even Above $75,000 per Year. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(4), e2016976118.

Killingsworth, M. A., Kahneman, D. & Mellers, B. (2023) Income and Emotional Well-being: A Conflict Resolved. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(10), e2208661120.

Kolb, B. M. (2000) *Marketing Cultural Organizations: New Strategies for Attracting Audiences to Classical Music, Dance, Museums, Theatre and Opera*. Oak Tree Press. Dublin.

Kushlev, K., Radosic, N., & Diener, E. (2022) Subjective Well-Being and Prosociality around the Globe: Happy People Give More of Their Time and Money to Others. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *13*(4), 849-861.

Lades, L. K., Laffan, K., Daly, M., & Delaney, L. (2020) Daily Emotional Well-Being During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *25*(4), 902-911.

Larson, R. W., Hansen, D. M. & Moneta, G. (2006) Differing Profiles of Developmental Experiences Across Types of Organized Youth Activities. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*(5), 849-863.

Layard, R. (2005) Happiness is Back. *Felicidade e Políticas Públicas*, 39.

Layton, M.D. & Moreno, A. (2014) Philanthropy and Social Capital in Mexico. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(3), 209-219.

Liket, K. & Maas K. (2016) Strategic Philanthropy: Corporate Measurement of Philanthropic Impacts as a Requirement for a "Happy Marriage" of Business and Society. *Business & Society.* 55(6), 889–921.

Lucas, E. (2017) Reinventing the Rattling Tin: How UK Charities Use Facebook in Fundraising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 22(2), e1576.

Luccasen, R. & Thomas, M. (2020) Voluntary Taxation and the Arts. *Journal of Cultural Economics, 44*(4), 589-604.

Lyubomirsky, S. & Layous, K. (2013) How Do Simple Positive Activities Increase Well-Being? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(1), 57-62.

Madden, K. (2006) Growing National Philanthropy: Australia Steps Forward. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11: 155-163.

Maradus, N. P. & Jacobs, F. A. (2010) Initial Evidence on Whether Use of Professional Fundraising Services Increases Fundraising Effectiveness. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *15,* 3–12.

McCrae, R. R., Costa Jr, P. T. & Busch, C. M. (1986) Evaluating Comprehensiveness in Personality Systems: The California Q-Set and the Five-factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, *54*(2), 430-446.

McGee, S. (2006) High Impact Philanthropy. *Financial Planning*, 60-65.

Miller, B. (2009) Community Fundraising 2.0—The Future of Fundraising in a Networked Society? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 14(4), 365–370.

Mohanty, C. T. (2014) On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s. In *Between Borders*. Routledge, 145-166.

Moir, L. & Taffler, R. (2004) Does Corporate Philanthropy Exist? Business Giving to the Arts in the UK. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54(2), 149-161.

Myers, D. G. & Diener, E. (1995) Who Is Happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10-19.

Neville, H., Andersson, A., Bagdade, O., Bell, T., Currin, J., Fanning, J., ... & Yamada, Y. (2008) Effects of Music Training on Brain and Cognitive Development in Under-Privileged 3-to 5-Year-old Children: Preliminary Results. *Learning, Arts, and the Brain: The Dana Consortium Report on Arts and Cognition*, 105-106.

Noice, H. & Noice, T. (2009) An Arts Intervention for Older Adults Living in Subsidized Retirement Homes. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 16, 56−79.

Noice, H., Noice, T. & Staines, G. (2004) A Short-term Intervention to Enhance Cognitive and Affective Functioning in Older Adults. *Journal of Aging and Health*, *16*(4), 562-585.

OECD (2013) *OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-being,* OECD Publishing. Accessed on November 1, 2019. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264191655-en

OECD (2021) *COVID-19 and Well-being: Life in the Pandemic*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1e1ecb53-en.

Painter-Morland, M., Demuijnck, G., & Ornati, S. (2017) Sustainable Development and Well-Being: A Philosophical Challenge. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *146(2),* 295-311.

Radbourne, J. & Watkins, K. (2015) *Philanthropy and the Arts*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Rauscher, F., Shaw, G., Levine, L., Wright, E., Dennis, W. & Newcomb, R. (1997) Music Training Causes Long-term Enhancement of Preschool Children's Spatial-temporal Reasoning. *Neurological Research*, *19*(1), 2-8.

Rhoads, S. A., Gunter, D., Ryan, R. M., & Marsh, A. A. (2021) Global Variation in Subjective Well-Being Predicts Seven Forms of Altruism. *Psychological Science, 32(8)*, 1247–1261.

Robert, J. (2013) Individualistic Philanthropy: the Paradox of Embodied Participation for Health-Related Fund-raising Campaigns. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(4), 261-274.

Rochet, J. C. & Tirole, J. (2003) Platform Competition in Two-Sided Markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 9(4): 990-1029.

Rochet, J. C. & Tirole, J. (2006) Two-sided Markets: a Progress Report. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37(3), 645-667.

Romney-Alexander, D. (2002) Payroll Giving in the UK: Donor Incentives and Influences on Giving Behavior. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(1), 84-92.

Rosenberg, F. (2009) The MoMA Alzheimer's Project: Programming and Resources for Making Art Accessible to People with Alzheimer's Disease and Their Caregivers. *Arts & Health*, *1*(1), 93-97.

Rurale, A., Azzolini, M., Ivanova, D. & Fagundes, T. (2020) *The Impact of Covid-19 on the Performing Arts Sector*. Accessed on January 3, 2021. Retrieved from https://www.sdabocconi.it//upl/entities/attachment/REPORT.pdf

Sabato, H. & Bar-Ilan, S. (2023) Pleasure or Meaning: Subjective Well-Being Orientations and the Willingness to Help Close Versus Distant Others. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1-25.

Scheier, M. F. & Carver, C. S. (1993) On the Power of Positive Thinking: The Benefits of Being Optimistic. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *2*(1), 26-30.

Schmutte, P. S. & Ryff, C. D. (1997) Personality and Well-being: Reexamining Methods and Meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*(3), 549.

Seligman, M. E. (2011) Building Resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(4), 100-106.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). *Learned Optimism.* New York: Knopf.

Shaker, G.G., Kienker, B.L. & Borden, V. M. (2014) The Ecology of Internal Workplace Giving at Indiana University: A Case Study of Faculty and Staff Campus Campaign Communications and Fundraising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(4), 262-276.

Shekhtman, L. M. & Barabási, A. L. (2023) Philanthropy in Art: Locality, Donor Retention, and Prestige. *Scientific Report, 13,* 12157.

Shernoff, D. J. & Vandell, D. L. (2007) Engagement in After-school Program Activities: Quality of Experience from the Perspective of Participants. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *36*, 891-903.

Smriti, D., Ambulkar, S., Meng, Q., Kaimal, G., Ramotar, K., Park, S. Y., & Huh-Yoo, J. (2022) Creative Arts Therapies for the Mental Health of Emerging Adults: A Systematic Review. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, *77*, 101861.

Spelke, E. (2008) Effects of Music Instruction on Developing Cognitive Systems at the Foundations of Mathematics and Science. In C. Asbury & B. Rich (Eds.). *Learning, Arts, and the Brain: The Dana Consortium Report on Arts and Cognition*, 17-49.

Stiglitz, J., Sen, A.K. & Fitoussi, J.P. (2009) *The Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress Revisited: Reflections and Overview.* Accessed on August 23, 2017. Retrieved from https://hal-sciencespo.archives-ouvertes.fr/file/index/docid/1069384/filename/wp2009-33.pdf

Taylor, S. E. & Armor, D. A. (1996) Positive Illusions and Coping with Adversity. *Journal of Personality*, *64*(4), 873-898.

Tepper, S. J., Sisk, B., Johnson, R., Vanderwerp, L., Gale, G. & Gao, M. (2014) *Artful Living: Examining the Relationship between Artistic Practice and Subjective Wellbeing Across Three National Surveys*. Curb Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy, Vanderbilt University. Accessed on March 12, 2023. Retrieved from https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Research-Art-Works-Vanderbilt.pdf.

Thoits, P. A. & Hewitt, L. N. (2001) Volunteer Work and Well-Being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 115-131.

Tov, W., Wirtz, D., Kushlev, K., Biswas-Diener, R., & Diener, E. (2022) Well-Being Science for Teaching and the General Public. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *17*(5), 1452-1471.

Trope, Y. & Liberman, N. (2010) Construal-Level Theory of Psychological Distance. *Psychological Review*, *117(2),* 440.

Tu, B., Huang, C. C., & Sorensen, J. (2020) Effects of Education Philanthropy on Well-Being of Low-Income and Gifted Students in China. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *108*, 104659.

Turrini, A. & Voss, Z. (2020) Strategic Fundraising in the Arts: The Mistake of Selling. In Addis, M. & A. Rurale (Eds.). *Managing the Cultural Business: Avoiding Mistakes, Finding Success*, London: Taylor & Francis – Routledge, 280-310.

Van Steenburg, E., Anaza, N. A., Ashhar, A., Barrios, A., Deutsch, A. R., Gardner, M. P., ... & Taylor, K. A. (2022) The New World of Philanthropy: How Changing Financial Behavior, Public Policies, and COVID-19 Affect Nonprofit Fundraising and Marketing. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, *56*(3), 1079-1105.

Varadarajan, P. R., & Menon, A. (1988) Cause-Related Marketing: A Coalignment of Marketing Strategy. *Journal of Marketing*, *52,* 58-74.

Verghese, J., Lipton, R. B., Katz, M. J., Hall, C. B., Derby, C. A., Kuslansky, G., ... & Buschke, H. (2003) Leisure Activities and the Risk of Dementia in the Elderly. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *348*(25), 2508-2516.

Verhoef, P.C., Reinartz, W.J. & Krafft, M. (2010) Customer Engagement as a New Perspective in Customer Management. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 247-252.

Vick, R. M. (2003). A Brief History of Art Therapy. In Malchiodi C. A. (Ed.). *Handbook of Art Therapy* (pp. 5-15). The Guilford Press. New York.

Wiepking, P. & Bekkers, R. (2012) Who Gives? A Literature Review of Predictors of Charitable Giving, Part Two: Gender, Family Composition and Income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, *3(2),* 217–245.

Zeilig, H., Poland, F., Fox, C., & Killick, J. (2015) The Arts in Dementia Care Education: A Developmental Study. *Journal of Public Mental Health*, *14*(1), 18-23.