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Summary

Based on the research question “why would high-income individuals donate to human rights causes?”, a qualitative research was carried out, with an online survey and self-completed, based on a non-probabilistic sampling, which included 348 completed and validated questionnaires. The questions sought to understand the perceptions of high-income professionals regarding solidarity and citizenship practices, and with the theme “human rights”. You results indicate that there is a high propensity of this audience to practices of solidarity and donation, but still poorly structured. There is also a significant lack of knowledge, resistance, and prejudice in relation to the topic 'human rights'. Which does not mean, however, that be indifferent to the various causes that can be associated with human rights, such as: health care, education, gender and race discrimination, care for refugees; nor to the question of the defense of rights.
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Discussing the role of civil society in Brazil without discussing its financial sustainability is certainly a very limited debate in the field. In this sense, in recent years the production of data and research on the behavior of Brazilian donors has been growing (Bailey, 1999, Mendonça et al 2013; IDIS, 2015), but all of them are very focused on the persuasion and retention of small regular donors: individuals who donate R$30.00 per month on average through digital channels, telemarketing, direct mail, street fundraising, among others (Wiggers, 2016).
However, little is discussed about strategies to attract (and retain) publics with greater purchasing power (IDIS, 2015), such as mid-career professionals with high salaries, such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, advertisers, directors and senior managers, financial market agents and others. And what is your affinity (and resistance) to human rights agendas? Are there any topics that sensitize you more? It is a target audience that is little explored by organizations that raise funds in Brazil, but with great potential for donation. Added to this, in the context of Brazilian civil society, human rights organizations are increasingly challenged to diversify their sources of resources (Mendonça, Alves and Nogueira, 2013), since during the last decades their revenue has been derived from large foreign financiers, which gradually reduced investments in Brazil. For this reason, there was no concern with their organizational development, nor with rethinking the institutional model of these organizations, and expansion of the support base. However, in a political and social context as complex as the current one, in which fundamental rights are undergoing a growing process of delegitimization and discredit (Nogueira, Alves, Mendonça, 2015), the discussion becomes urgent.

In this sense, the engagement of potential high-income donors (a public that is still little mobilized in Brazil by organizations) may become a new and significant alternative for diversifying the sources of funding for human rights organizations.

This article is based on the premise that with the generation of qualified information, based on rigorous methods and techniques for producing content about this audience, it will be possible to create targeted fundraising strategies that are consistent with their profile. And then, better understand “why would high-income individuals donate to human rights causes?”.

To answer this research question, a qualitative research was developed, using both data from secondary sources to characterize the universe of high-income individuals, as well as an online and self-completed survey, based on a non-probabilistic sampling, which included 348 questionnaires. answered and validated. The questions sought to understand the perceptions of this stratum about their solidarity practices (volunteering, donation), as well as their perceptions about the theme “human rights”.

So, the article is organized as follows. We start with a literature review, to better characterize what human rights organizations are in Brazil, the challenges to their sustainability, as well as understand how to deal with potential high-income donors. Next, the research methodology and design are presented, with special attention to the size of the universe of potential high-income donors and the procedures for data collection. The third stage comprises a summary report of the survey indicating its main findings and, finally, at the conclusion, considerations for human rights organizations understand the universe of high-income donors.
LITERATURE REVISION

Human Rights Organizations in Brazil

Recently launched, IPEA's Profile of Civil Society Organizations in Brazil (2018) survey presents a group classified as "Defense of the rights of groups and minorities", composed of more than 43,000 organizations that have been appointed by practitioners in the field as representative of human rights organizations in Brazil. However, there is no closed concept about these organizations, nor their scope, but it is certain that the concept is based on the struggle for human rights and gender equality (Harris-Curtis, 2003), on the struggle for freedoms (Sen, 2000), and in the essential importance of human beings, their role and consequence in economic development and their constructive role.

The guidelines of this approach introduced the principles of human rights in the formulation of plans, programs, and projects, but also induced the participatory implementation of actions, the strengthening of accountability mechanisms, a focus on processes and results, but mainly, mobilizing local and international actors in efforts to promote the rights of the most vulnerable groups. As a result, local and international groups have articulated strategies for global advocacy campaigns. So much so that until the 1990s human rights organizations were characterized as advocacy organizations “pure”. With the emergence of the rights-based approach (Spink, 2000), a larger group of civil society organizations, with different actions and sizes, started to engage in different advocacy strategies and then articulate their actions with the defense of rights.

The IPEA classification brings together in the group for the defense of rights 339,034 Brazilian organizations active in 2016, among associations that are created to act in causes of a social nature, such as: the defense of human rights, the environment, ethnic minorities, etc., (IPEA, 2018). However, categorization still requires better specification and verification, as there is no consensus to point out the limits of the field.

Still in the effort to conceptualize human rights organizations in Brazil, practitioners in the field themselves often indicate the organizations that make up the ABONG network - Brazilian Association of NGOs - as a significant reflection of human rights organizations in the country. In turn, it corroborates by trying to link its membership profile with the “pure” organizations in the field of defense of rights and has been adopting the name 'organizations for the defense of rights and promotion of the common good' in its institutional communications. In fact, its members are organizations that are quite representative of the field in Brazil, but do not understand its totality. It is important to consider the plurality of trajectories and profiles among more traditional organizations that consider - and are
recognized - human rights organizations, for example, ABRINQ Foundation (recently associated with Save the Children), Greenpeace and SOS Mata Atlântica (the latter being the most professional in the environmental area). And others created more recently, such as Repórter Brasil - which works to combat forms of contemporary slave labor - or Conectas Human Rights, with a strong approach to the private sector and new actors of international cooperation, such as Foundations and private investment funds, for example.

Brazilian human rights organizations and sustainability

As already shown, historically in Brazil human rights organizations have focused their fundraising on large international foundations. A consequence of this was that, until recently, there was little investment in diversifying funding sources. An additional barrier is the dynamics of competition for funds between civil society organizations themselves, which generate little information sharing.

However, with the current context of threats to fundamental rights and attacks on activism, it is essential to rethink the financial sustainability model and engage more people in this cause, in favor of strengthening the entire movement.

Survey carried out in 1993 among human rights organizations linked to the ABONG network (Mendonça et al, 2009), when analyzing the profile of access to resources, it is observed that in 1993 ABONG members received about 75% of their cooperation resources International. Ten years later, at the end of 2003, this number dropped to 40%, which demonstrates that the challenges previously identified have materialized from the first years of 2000 onwards. In recent years, the global context of international cooperation for development has radically changed (Milani, 2013), aggravated by a context of crisis, of reordering programmatic and geographic priorities (unglued from Brazil), with an emphasis on efficiency, which resulted in a completely different picture from that experienced by human rights organizations for decades, resulting in significant impacts for its financing.

“High Networth Individuals”

Corroborating Armson & McKenzie (2013), “average donors” are individuals who donate to causes or nonprofit organizations more often (or in a greater amount) than the average population, but who do not attract the same attention as a large donor or philanthropist who mobilizes very large amounts. Some authors (Lloyd, 2004; Schervish, 2006; Ostrander; Ron et al, 2014; BMO Harris Private Banking et al, 2015; Pandya et al, 2016) associate the concept of “medium donor” to fundraising practices in countries with an income distribution that is more egalitarian, in which and the weight of professional training is strong
in the inculcation of values. Overall, it is economic development – not cultural or religious differences – that separates non-Western and Western countries in patterns of giving behavior (Einolf, 2017).

In the Brazilian context, with high inequality in the distribution of income among the population and less weight of professional training in the dissemination of values, the direct application of the concept of average donor is hampered. Added to this, it would be unreliable to characterize this type of donor only as “rich” (I also have no precision, according to Souza, 2018), giving rise to a series of studies with different methodologies and distinct operational definitions.

Another possibility to define this profile is based on their wealth, and not on their income, is to categorize them as “individuals with high purchasing power”. This definition is even widely accepted and very common in the international fundraising field. The World Wealth Report (2017) itself refers to such individuals as the “High Networth Individuals”, a term used to designate people whose movable assets (such as stocks and bonds) exceed a certain value. In order to adopt this type of definition – more focused on assets than on income – there is an important difficulty: the absence of public information and the inaccessibility of private information regarding people’s assets.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This article is the result of an exploratory multimethod research on the social, demographic and behavioral profile of high-income Brazilian potential donors. Its objective is to understand the motivations and interests of this population segment and answer how and why this public would donate to human rights causes. Its design of this research involved two complementary strategies: (i) sociodemographic and occupational mapping of potential high-income donors from available secondary and public data sources (ii) survey (opinion survey) from a non-probabilistic sample with potential donors of high income. A single focus group was also carried out with six representatives of this population, with the objective of better understanding the habits, practices and perceptions of donation of this public, as well as generating inputs for the elaboration of the questionnaire, which was later used in the survey.

The operational definition

In dialogue with the definitions related to income, potential high-income donors were operationally defined in this research as ‘mid-career professionals with high salaries, whose average monthly income is equal to or greater than BRL 30,000.00 (thirty thousand reais )’.
Characterization of the Universe of Potential “High Networth Individuals”

The data sources available regarding the research’s target audience, operationalized as individuals with monthly income from all sources of thirty thousand reais a month or more, as discussed in the previous section, although they are not non-existent, are few. Traditional household surveys, sample (continuous PNAD, POF) or not (Census), are not adequate bases for the investigation of this audience, because people belonging to the higher income strata tend not to participate or deny participation more intensely than the population mean; and when they participate, they tend not to respond or underestimate their income more intensely, and when they do not underestimate it, they are not always able to accurately report it (Barros, Foguel and Ulyssea, 2007 and Souza, 2016). The result is the systematic underestimation of this population stratum and its income, and therefore ineffective for what was intended with this research.

With the elimination of household and survey-type surveys, the Social Information List (Rais) of the extinct Ministry of Labor and Employment (MTE) - currently the Ministry of Economy - and the Large Numbers of Income Tax Returns of Individuals (GN-DIRPF) made available by the Internal Revenue Service. Rais is an administrative record originally made and maintained by the [current] Ministry of Economy. With annual periodicity, Rais can be considered a “Census” of the Brazilian formal labor market. All Legal Entities operating in Brazil, including those in the public sector, must, obligatorily, provide information regarding the hiring and firing of workers. In this sense, it is extremely valuable as a source of information for the higher income strata that are inserted in the formal labor market. However, it should be noted that a significant fraction of the high-income population in Brazil does not receive all or part of their earnings from formal employment relationships, thus remaining uncovered by Rais.

In summary, the analysis of data from GN-DIRPF and Rais reveals that high-income potential donor, measured from the income cut of 30 thousand reais a month, are a small group of the population. Depending on how it is measured, they constitute a group of 0.2% of the formally employed or 0.25% to 1% of the Brazilian population of working age. In the most optimistic account, we are talking about just over a million people. Although small, potential high-income donors increased quantitatively until 2015, decreasing since then. Added to this, the set of high-income potential donors, when compared to the population, is relatively more male (75% men), more mature (75% aged 40 to 64), whiter (just over 80 % declared white), more resident in the Southeast and Midwest (72% reside in these two regions) and more educated (86% have completed higher education).

Most high-income potential donors with formal occupations are employed in the private sector (42%), followed by government and professionals (31% and 25%). The main
occupations are directors and managers, in the private sector, judiciary, government and not identified among liberal professionals. From this mapping, it was possible to identify the universe of average potential donors and refine the questionnaire to apply the survey.

**THE SURVEY**

The survey is probably the most used quantitative research technique in Social Sciences. It consists of conducting a survey (opinion survey) with the entire or sample of the population of interest, in which respondents are exposed to the same stimuli, that is, a structured questionnaire, in which both questions and answers tend to be uniform and applied in a controlled environment of interaction between interviewer and informant. Earl Babbie (2003) is a wide and good reference and Márcia Lima (2016) discusses the different types of interviews in Social Sciences.

This survey was based on a digital questionnaire sent by email via the SurveyMonkey tool, self-completed (without the mediation of the interviewer) and a non-random sample, operationalized as individual monthly income from all sources and R$30,000 or more.

**Survey questionnaire**

The survey questionnaire was developed over the months of May and June 2018 and was the subject of two pre-testing rounds. The consolidated version had forty questions, of which two were open - however, depending on the flow and choices of each respondent, the number of questions reduced. The questionnaire had two large blocks, in addition to a final socioeconomic block. The first big block was about practices of solidarity and giving and explored habits, practices, and perceptions in general about giving.

The second big block was about human rights: it explored perceptions about them and advocacy organizations.

**Sampling**

The survey was based on non-random sampling, based on a record obtained from a trustworthy supplier and after research with different companies supplying the record. The registration obtained had thirty thousand names, each containing name, telephone, and email, among other information and was completed with indications of people who completed the questionnaire. We sent an invitation to participate for these thirty thousand more names to the people nominated. We emphasize that this was the best solution given the difficulties and lack of public information for our target audience. This lack of information even justifies the non-randomness of the sample. If a non-random sample prevents statistical generalization, it
can be very useful for exploring the population of interest, especially when there is little information about it or, even, its size and demographic characteristics are unknown; and for mapping the variability of this population (Becker, 2007).

It is important to say that the income cut of thirty thousand reais a month from all sources used to delimit the population of interest was obtained through the registry. Although admitting the possible existence of errors in the register and even asking the income in the socioeconomic section of the questionnaire, we prefer to prioritize extra-survey information (from the register) given the difficulties of household surveys in obtaining good results regarding income of the higher income groups (see discussion above).

The Field Effort

The survey field lasted just over a month (starting on July 2, 2018 and ending on August 13, 2018). In general terms, it consisted of sending e-mails – invitations to all the thirty thousand people listed in the register, plus invitation emails to the people indicated by those who answered the entire questionnaire. After this first email, in an average interval of one week, reminders were sent. In total, there were three reminders and already in the first reminder we started to differentiate the reminder for those who didn't even open the email or start the questionnaire from those who started the questionnaire but didn't finish.

As support, the survey had two assistants and a coordinator for reminders: they made calls to respondents, validating whether they had received the invitation to participate in the survey, and encouraging them to respond. This work was important to convey credibility about the research, and to encourage which part of the group would respond to the survey.

Results and validation criteria

In total there were 758 responses, of which 447 were complete. Of these 447, 105 were from people aged 65 or over, which we highlight since we favor people within the active population. We therefore had 342 completed questionnaires. To these 342, we added another 06, indicated by the other respondents themselves, obtaining a total of 348. These 348 people were reclassified as having completed the questionnaire because they answered at least the two large blocks, with only the block missing. socioeconomic status and the final block of observations and indications. Despite the loss of information about socioeconomic characteristics, this procedure allows us to obtain a more robust set of information about the habits, practices, and perceptions of donations of 'Average donors'.
SURVEY ANALYTICAL DESCRIPTION

Once the questionnaire application period ended, a database was generated and consolidated. In this consolidation process, in addition to a consistency test, procedures were carried out to guarantee the confidentiality of respondents, according to good research practices and academic ethics parameters, such as the standardization of answers and codification of open questions. Information relating to the email, name, address and IP of the respondent's computer has been deleted and replaced by a random number.

Sociodemographic and occupational composition of respondents

Survey respondents are mostly male (71%) and are concentrated in the most mature age groups: approximately 83% of high-income potential donors are between 40 and 64 years old. These results point to convergence between the characteristics in terms of sex and age of the survey respondents and potential high-income donors employed in the formal labor market (universe Rais). As for regionality, São Paulo (richest and most populous state in Brazil) is the state in which more than 55% of respondents live. Along with Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais, the next two states with more respondents (plus Espírito Santo), the Southeast region (richest and most populous region in Brazil) represents 77% of all people who had the questionnaire validated, repeating the trend pointed out by Rais. It is worth noting that 97% of respondents were born in Brazil.

As for education, respondents declared a high level of education: more than 95% completed at least higher education and 75% completed some post-graduation. In terms of position in the occupation, the vast majority (86.2%) declares to have some professional activity, with emphasis on salaried workers with a formal contract and employer, with the majority occupied in the private sector, followed by liberal professions and the public sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocupacional sector</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Liberal Professionals</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5,2%</td>
<td>63,8%</td>
<td>15,8%</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
<td>14,1%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self elaboration

Here, the marked difference with information from Rais stands out, most likely due to the characteristics of the informants from both bases.

In terms of religiosity, 22% of potential high-income donors say they do not have defined religion, while 74% declare to follow a defined religion, with emphasis on Catholics and
Spiritisms, and the low presence of self-declared Protestants and Evangelicals, respectively only 4% and 2.6% of the total respondents.

**Solidarity and donation practices**

The first large set of substantive questions in the questionnaire concerns the Respondent's solidarity practices, related to donations to organizations and causes. Approximately 80% of respondents said they performed solidarity practice and 77% declare having made cash donations to organizations or social entities in the last year (60.8% of respondents donated goods or services to these organizations or social entities). The most mature (83% of those over 50 years of age) and those with the highest income (85% of those who declare income among the 40% with the highest income) donated comparatively in greater intensity for organizations or social entities in the last year.

In addition to donations in cash, goods or services to organizations or social entities, many other solidarity practices were mentioned, ranging from donating hours of work and services to monetary donations to acquaintances or family members, passing through blood donation, alms, and incentivized donations or for themed backgrounds.

About organizations or social entities that were the target of donations from respondents in the last year, a plurality of organizations was mentioned (over 400). More cited was Doctors Without Borders, the object of nearly seventy mentions, followed by GRAAC, APAE, UNICEF and AACD (between ten and thirty mentions).

Among the approximately 20% of respondents who stated that they do not carry out solidarity practices or donations, the main reason mentioned (with 60% of the mentions) being the lack of trust in organizations or people who ask for help. And the three main factors mentioned that would make such people start to donate to organizations or social entities were: “know/become trusting”, “visualize work” and “alignment with personal values”.

**Donation Amount**

The annual amounts of donations made to these organizations were also asked. The table below reveals the main descriptive statistics for these responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>All organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>BRL 4,930.99</td>
<td>BRL 2,416.69</td>
<td>BRL 2,054.41</td>
<td>BRL 3,544.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>BRL 1,000.00</td>
<td>BRL 525.00</td>
<td>BRL 500.00 BRL</td>
<td>BRL 600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>BRL 17,834.18</td>
<td>BRL 9,059.38</td>
<td>BRL 4,549.38</td>
<td>BRL 13,570.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When reading the table, the considerable difference between the average and the median of the donation is highlighted, which happens due to a few high value donations (in the tens of thousands of reais), whose effect is to make the average detach from the median. Therefore, it is suggested to use the median as the value that best describes the usual behavior of respondents. Thus, we have the picture in terms of amounts donated by high-income donors as a combination of few, but very large donations (for example, donations above one hundred thousand reais to the first organization), and many, but relatively smaller donations (half of the donations to the first organization were 1,000 reais or less).

Even this multiplicity of relatively smaller amounts donated tends to be greater than the amounts donated by the population, around R$240 per year per donor (IDIS, 2015), confirming the higher income profile of the population in the current study.

Also noteworthy are some characteristics related to higher levels of donation, with the highest values tending to come from: Men; From the Southeast and the South (with highlights to Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Rio Grande do Sul); Over 50 years old; With complete higher education, and the values decrease with more years of study; Higher income (especially among the 20% who reported higher income); Liberal professionals and entrepreneurs.

Approximately 65% of respondents stated that the donated amount represents up to 1% of their income, with emphasis on the ranges from 0.1% to 0.5% and from 0.5% to 1%, with, respectively, 27% and 20% of high-income donors. Only 5% said the amounts donated represent 5% or more of their income. Assuming a threshold of 1% to 2% of income is an adequate threshold for cash donations, there is significant scope for increasing donated volumes. Once again, the challenge is to increase the amounts donated and/or diversify donations, since just over 90% of respondents said they intended to maintain or increase the amounts donated in the next year.

Planned Donations

Although 53% of respondents declare that they do not have a personal plan to organize their donations, 46% declared that they have such a plan. Men and individuals in the higher
income brackets tend to plan more, while masters and doctors and liberal professionals tend to plan less, the latter perhaps due to greater monthly variations in income. This result indicates that an important part of cash donations to organizations or social entities is sporadic and/or not planned.

**Payment methods**

To make these donations, the most used means of payment were cash (39%), transfer between accounts (34%), bank slip (33%) and credit card (28%). It is interesting to note that the means actually used were not necessarily the preferred means, with the three means indicated as being the most preferred: bank slip (53%), credit card (47%) and bank transfer (43%). Donation in cash, the main way of making the donation, is only the fifth most preferred method, with space for flexibility and diversification of payment methods here.

**Motivations to Donate and Stop Donating**

The main motivations mentioned for the donation were “trust in the organization or person”, “retribution for what they received” and “satisfaction”, all with 60% or more of mentions. The comparison between the perception of the reasons that lead a person to donate vis-à-vis that lead other people in their social or professional environment to donate suggests that high-income donors tend to see themselves as more rational and altruistic than their peers (more influenced by external factors, such as religion, and more selfish).

This finding corroborates the result of three other studies conducted in Canada and the USA recently, with more than 1,000 participants, suggesting that wealth does not inherently result in selfishness or generosity (Whillans et al, 2017). Coupe & Monteiro (2016) compared the motivations for donations among billionaires and concluded that those who conquered their wealth prefer not to leave much money for their children, while billionaires inherited their wealth feel the obligation to also distribute money to their children.

Losing confidence in the organization or person being helped is the main reason that people would stop giving their donation, cited by 90% of respondents. Other relevant factors for the interruption of the donation were decreased income, not seeing results or impacts from the donation and conflict with personal values. Considering that, for 48% of potential high-income donors, the best way to get to know an organization or social entity is by referring family, friends, or colleagues. Along with personally visiting the organization or social entity, less structured and more personal forms of knowledge are preferred by 56% of respondents. However, this preference contrasts with the ways deemed more convenient to request a donation, namely: social networks, emails, media advertisements and campaigns. Therefore,
there are challenges related to how to integrate the grant application processes with the knowledge and trust building processes between organizations and donors.

Perceptions on human rights and their organizations

The causes that most sensitize potential high-income donors are themes related to children and adolescents, health, education, hunger and poverty and the elderly. Although humanitarian aid, disasters and calamities appear with some representation and a plurality of issues commonly associated with human rights are mentioned, the term “human rights” was spontaneously mentioned by only three respondents.

The themes commonly associated with human rights that most sensitized respondents and that received the highest average scores were the homeless population, security, women, and disrespect for rights by companies. On the other hand, the themes that caused the least awareness and received the lowest average scores were affirmative actions, indigenous peoples and quilombolas (descendants and remnants of communities formed by runaway enslaved), and the LGBT+ population. The results suggest attribution of relatively less importance to actions related to the rights of minority groups.

Most respondents (56%) have never donated or do not know if they have already donated to human rights organizations. Added to this, it is suggested that the term human rights may not part of the symbolic universe of people in their daily lives, even without direct association of specific themes to the more general theme of human rights. For these people, it seems especially important to plan actions to clarify what human rights are and what organizations that work with this cause do.

Excluding those people who have never donated or who do not know if they have already donated to human rights organizations, there are two groups of similar size (just over 20% of respondents) that suggest positions diametrically opposed to donation to human rights organizations: one donates periodically or sporadically, has already donated in the past or never donated, but intends to donate; another has never donated and does not intend to donate. For the first group, loyalty actions, diversification of the donation portfolio, increase in donated amounts and first donation can be very fruitful. For the second group, resistant, it may not be suitable for actions.

Most respondents (respectively 51% and 32%) associate human rights with the so-called first- and second-generation rights, basically linked to the concept of human dignity, such as individual freedoms (first generation) and the rights to health, education, food and housing (second generation). Only a small portion of respondents (8%) disqualified the term
human rights, suggesting the existence of a difference between not donating to human rights organizations and disqualifying the topic.

The organizations identified and most cited by respondents as human rights, in order, were: Médecins Sans Frontières, Amnesty International, Humans Rights Watch, UN, UNICEF, Red Cross and Greenpeace, all with more than ten mentions.

Potential high-income donors who responded to the questionnaire recognize the importance of human rights organizations, but do not fully trust them, even knowing that they are important for the resolution of social and environmental issues. For part of this population, the origin of this incongruity may lie in the fact that these organizations do not always protect those they would like to be protected (victims of crimes). On the other hand, lack of trust can be associated with factors related to the lack of credibility of organizations or social entities, such as transparency, impact, external verification and demonstration of results and absence of corruption.

**FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Returning as the objective of this article to ‘answer how and why high-income individuals would donate to human rights causes’, a work rich in information was obtained that allows its appropriation by activists, fundraisers and organizations, enabling development and supporting your fundraising strategies. In this sense, the survey results seek to strengthen the entire ecosystem of organizations of human rights, by creating fundraising strategies that make sense for this public, which is still little explored by them in Brazil, and which can be a new alternative for diversifying their funding sources.

As for solidarity and citizenship practices, it is worth remembering that, according to the survey responses, the high-income population has many and diverse solidarity practices, combining more structured and formal modalities with less structured and informal modalities. The results converge, therefore, to signal that the argument regarding the inexistence of a culture of giving among the high-income population is fallacious. The standards and modalities of donation may not be those desired by organizations or by the fundraising segment, or such people may donate smaller amounts than organizations and fundraisers would like, but it cannot be said that solidarity and donation practices are rarefied or homogeneous in the population studied here. This perception is important for at least two reasons: first, because it helps to combat the common sense that there is no culture of giving in Brazil, at least with regard to the practices and habits of the higher-income social strata. Secondly, because, from the point of view of organizations and fundraisers, it represents a double challenge: on the one hand, convincing people who do not donate to donate, making this group of people a relatively
smaller group with the issue being, fundamentally, of structuring appropriate knowledge and trust-building processes (as will be discussed later). On the other hand, mobilize people who already donate to increase the amounts donated and/or to further diversify their practices.

In this sense, one of the most interesting results that emerged from this research is the fact that most potential high-income donors are concretely unaware of some human rights defense organization. And one of the reasons is precisely not being approached by these organizations. It is important to remember that there is widespread ignorance across Brazilian society about 'human rights', and this ignorance also affects the public of potential high-income donors, as the survey indicated.

This article sought to show that this segment of the public does not understand the complexity and fragmentation of themes that encompass human rights. There are even ideological questions about the role of human rights organizations that work especially with causes with low positive media appeal (for example, law defense and prison situation), which ends up associating and reducing human rights to the defense of people's impunity before the law.

On the other hand, most of this audience is not indifferent to the various causes that can be associated with human rights, such as health care, education, gender and race discrimination, care for refugees, not even to the question of the defense of rights. There is not necessarily a direct association between them and the more general theme of human rights. However, a concept that permeates most people and that it assumes a potential not only to unify, but above all to reduce the complexity of the discussion on human rights, which is the guarantee of the dignity of the person.

Campaigns planned and carried out by organizations in the field of human rights to "demystify" what human rights are may be desirable as strategies collective and medium and long term. The idea here is to dispute the meanings associated with the field of human rights. However, for specific organizations and with a more short- and medium-term bias, institutional campaigns that work the direct connection between human rights, the notion of dignity and the specific activities they develop may be more useful.

This can also be understood as a contribution of this article: producing and sharing knowledge about human rights as a starting point for promoting a culture of giving for human rights in Brazil. Only by getting to know their potential target audiences better will it be possible for advocacy organizations to create engaging narratives that establish a link of trust between these still unexplored audiences and the public interest entities.
It is necessary to understand their motivations in order to respond to their concerns, as this is the only way to create a culture of giving that mobilizes Brazilian society to contribute to the sustainability of those who work to promote and protect human rights.
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