

**Confidential**  
For use by member  
organizations only

# Understanding LGBT Donors:

LGBT People with High Household Wealth

Understanding LGBT Donors series: Report III of VI



The LGBT Giving Project

October 2017



## Introduction

This report is part of the *Understanding LGBT Donors* project, a series of in-depth analyses of the donation-related behaviors and opinions of several key subpopulations of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community. Directed and funded by the LGBT Giving Project, the series is intended to advance understanding of indicators and motivators for donating to LGBT organizations among these subpopulations. By focusing on specific subpopulations, the project aims to provide insight and opportunities for organizations to tailor their fundraising strategies to better reach and appeal to various groups of donors. The full series of reports is available to member organizations here: [Understanding LGBT Donors](#).

This report focuses on LGBT donors with high household wealth. Using a designated threshold in reported household wealth, respondents were split into two groups: household wealth over \$750,000 (referred to as LGBT people with high household wealth) and household wealth under \$750,000.<sup>1</sup> The analyses that inform this report focus on the respondents with high household wealth and examine their feelings and actions as donors to LGBT organizations. Included in this memo are analyses of various research questions as well as research-based recommendations for increasing donor engagement. The findings from these analyses also point to several areas for future research to understand how LGBT donors with high household wealth engage with LGBT organizations and how they see their giving overall.

The report *Understanding LGBT Donors: LGBT People with High Household Wealth* is organized into the following sections:

**Key Findings and Actionable Insights** – An overview of important results and their connections to potential fundraising strategies.

**Sample and Demographics** – A detailed description of the methods used to define the sample of LGBT people with high household wealth in this analysis, as well as selected comparisons between LGBT people with household wealth over \$750,000 and those with household wealth under \$750,000 for contextual purposes.

**Key Research Questions** – A look at the donor behaviors and attitudes of LGBT people with high household wealth, as revealed by the survey.

**Future Research Areas** – Suggestions for research to explore unanswered questions and provide deeper and broader understanding.

---

<sup>1</sup> As explained on page 2, this benchmark was set based on the net worth of highest quintile (20%) of households in the United States, as reported by the Census Bureau.

## About the LGBT Giving Project

Launched in 2011, the LGBT Giving Project is a research and testing program aimed at increasing giving by LGBT individuals to the LGBT movement for equality and to LGBT community organizations. This research has looked at who has the will and the capacity to give, what motivates them and what message frames could inspire greater giving. The project has also worked with LGBT statewide advocacy groups and community centers to test messaging and strengthen fundraising capacity.

It has received financial support from the Walter and Evelyn Haas, Jr. Fund; Anonymous; Horizons Foundation; Kevin J. Mossier Foundation; Pride Foundation; Small Change Foundation; D-5 Coalition; and Henry Van Ameringen Foundation.

The analysis that informs this report is based on data from the LGBT Donor Survey conducted online between October and December of 2013. The data is based on responses from 8,323 known donors (6,755 LGBT donors) who made a gift to one or more of 56 U.S. LGBT organizations in the six years prior. Respondents included 2,014 LGBT people with household wealth over \$750,000, representing nearly one-third (30%) of the total LGBT respondents.

Several potential limitations of the data are important to consider. First, the survey was fielded as the country's economy began its recovery from the worst recession in recent history<sup>1</sup>; the reported household wealth of respondents may differ today. Additionally, the political and cultural landscape of the LGBT movement has shifted notably since the survey was fielded, particularly under the Trump administration and after the procurement of nationwide same-sex marriage rights, meaning that responses may differ if survey data were collected today. Further, the survey was sent only to those who had already donated to LGBT organizations, and, specifically, only those who donated to the LGBT organizations participating in this research. Therefore, these findings are not entirely representative of the overall LGBT community nor all LGBT donors, though any potential differences between these groups have not been explored.

## The LGBT Giving Project Steering Committee:

Richard Burns, LGBT Giving Project  
Roger Doughty, Horizons Foundation  
Matt Foreman, Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund  
Rebecca Fox, Wellspring Advisors  
Kris Hermanns, Pride Foundation  
Ineke Mushovic, Movement Advancement Project  
Julia Ritchie, Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund  
Charlie Rounds, Kevin J. Mossier Foundation  
Addison Smith, Wellspring Advisors  
Linda Wood, Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund

## Key Findings and Actionable Insights

**FINDING:** LGBT donor respondents with high household wealth are more likely than their counterparts to give to organizations with a national focus and political goals. They are less likely to support state and local organizations and those whose main priority is service provision. However, there is still a significant proportion of LGBT people with high household wealth who are likely to donate to non-national organizations.

This suggests that organizations may increase donations from LGBT people with high household wealth by demonstrating a commitment to national issues and success in achieving legal and political objectives. For organizations that already engage in or advance broader national work, this may mean incorporating new and enhanced messaging via mission statements, clear and publicly available policy objectives, or blogs and earned media highlighting an organization's involvement in legal and political victories. These materials can then be included and referenced in donation asks.

Given wealthy donors' potential as a source of large donations, national organizations may also consider ways in which they can be a conduit for funding to other organizations. By strengthening strategic partnerships with state and local groups, particularly those that provide crucial services to LGBT people, larger organizations are uniquely positioned to support and sustain under-resourced organizations.

**FINDING:** LGBT people with high household wealth were far less likely than LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000 to support efforts by LGBT organizations to focus on issues that affect transgender people. High-wealth LGBT people are also less likely to indicate that transgender rights are an issue priority.

This finding should be considered in light of the date of the survey (i.e., before the recent surge in national attention toward broader LGBT issues). Respondents' views on these issues may have changed. The lack of support for transgender rights among respondents may also be related to age. The average age of respondents with high household wealth is older, and research shows that older adults are less likely to personally know a transgender person than younger populations.<sup>ii</sup> Furthermore, only 2% of LGBT respondents with high household wealth identified as transgender, compared to 7% of those with lower household wealth.

Given these findings, organizations working on transgender rights may want to consider pairing donation asks with educational initiatives aimed at increasing familiarity with transgender people among LGBT people with high household wealth. That said, organizations should remember always to connect the final ask to programs that the donor considers the highest priority.

**FINDING:** Among LGBT people with high household wealth, the main reason cited for decreasing or ending donations to an organization was an impression that the organization was run inefficiently or seemed ineffective. High-wealth respondents also cited receiving too many asks for donations. They were less likely than LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000 to fault organizations for a lack of commitment to vulnerable populations or to fault them for lack of diversity in staff and leadership.

LGBT people with high household wealth may have higher expectations for efficiency – perhaps because they are more frequently solicited by larger, perhaps non-LGBT organizations with dedicated major gifts departments that engage strategically with them.

Over-solicitation of this subpopulation may contribute to the impression of an organization being run inefficiently. Receiving too many asks might suggest that the organization spends too much money on fundraising and/or that its fundraising efforts are lacking in coordination and strategic planning.

However, organizations should not shy away from contacting wealthier donors; the goal should be to do so strategically. Research shows that many donors need multiple asks in order to make a donation and that more asks (to those who have not asked to receive fewer solicitations) results in more gifts.<sup>iii</sup> In order to avoid donor fatigue caused by multiple asks, it is important that communications and solicitations contain information regarding the importance of an organization's work. Additionally, first-time donors may need multiple solicitations before making another donation to the same organization.

When reaching out to LGBT people with high household wealth, organizations might consider ways to increase personalization and targeting and align frequency of contact to each individual donor's wishes. It is also advisable when reaching out to this subpopulation to demonstrate clearly how donated funds are used. Organizations also should highlight programmatic and political results in donation asks.

**FINDING:** Planned giving is a particularly auspicious opportunity for increased giving among LGBT people with high household wealth. They are far more likely than their counterparts to have a will or trust in place. They also are equally likely to make planned gifts to LGBT organizations as they are to non-LGBT organizations. In addition, LGBT people with high household wealth are more likely to indicate that they are motivated to make planned gifts because their "friends and family don't need all of it," and more likely to identify with message frames that highlight their life's commitment to their work and the organizations they give to. For more

information on message frames, see Key Research Findings on page 12.

**FINDING:** Overall, it appears that LGBT people with high household wealth respond well to most methods of solicitation (with the exception of street solicitation and phone calls). However, some methods were more successful in securing donations from this subpopulation.

The most successful method for securing donations from LGBT people with high household wealth is by mail. This was followed closely by fundraising events, personal asks and email. These methods were particularly successful in comparison to rates among LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000. Notably, social media is less successful as a method to solicit donations from high-wealth LGBT people, compared to LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000.

The success of mail over social media solicitations is likely due, in part, to the older average age of LGBT people with high household wealth. This finding is a reminder that organizations should consider maintaining contact with donors using the method or methods that have proven successful in the past. Additionally, given that younger donors (who are generally more responsive to online engagement efforts) will increase their household wealth as they age, online solicitation and engagement may prove more effective in soliciting donations from high-wealth LGBT donors over time.

The survey also suggests a substantial opportunity for increasing donations among high-wealth LGBT people through personal, one-to-one solicitation. Nine in 10 respondents (90%) indicated a willingness to donate, if contacted by someone they know. Anecdotally, personal asks tend to encourage donations of larger amounts.

**FINDING:** Although LGBT people with high household wealth gave larger total

amounts to LGBT organizations, they were slightly less likely to devote a majority of their overall charitable giving to LGBT causes.

This finding suggests there is opportunity to encourage LGBT people with high household wealth to contribute higher proportions of their charitable giving to LGBT organizations. Further research may be needed into other causes these donors are likely to support and what motivates them to give to those causes. Organizations may also want to consider more direct contact with high-wealth donors to learn about the areas they are most interested in supporting.

## Sample and Demographics

The sample of LGBT people with high household wealth includes 2,014 respondents, representing nearly one-third (30%) of the total LGBT respondents. Of LGBT people with high household wealth, 501 reported household wealth between \$750,000 and \$1 million (25%), 1,071 reported household wealth between \$1 million and \$3 million (53%), and 442 reported household wealth over \$3 million (22%).

The sample and comparison group definitions were based on the threshold of \$750,000 in household wealth, which is defined in the survey as inclusive of real estate, stocks/securities, retirement accounts, checking accounts, and saving accounts. The Census Bureau reports that the median net worth of those in the top 20% of wealthiest households nationwide is \$630,754.<sup>iv</sup> Therefore, it was determined that a threshold of \$750,000 would include the wealthiest individuals in the survey.

Overall, the sample of LGBT people with high household wealth were mostly white males, highly educated, and lived in urban or suburban areas. The vast majority of respondents in this group had master's or doctorate degrees, were over age 50, and were in a long-term partnership (married, domestic partnered, or cohabitating).

Below are key demographic points about the survey's respondents with high household wealth. Percentages refer to the proportion of the responding sample indicating their status in the specified group. Comparisons between LGBT people with high household wealth and another group ("more likely than" or "less likely than") are in reference to LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000, unless otherwise indicated. Comparison statements are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level, unless otherwise indicated (e.g. slightly less, slightly more). Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding. Similarly, aggregated percentages in the findings may not match numbers in the tables due to rounding.

### Basic information

- ❖ Men are overrepresented in the sample of LGBT people with high household wealth: nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents in this category were men.

	Male	Female	Other
<b>Over \$750K</b>	73%	27%	0%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	59%	38%	3%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **more likely** to identify as gay and **less likely** to identify as bisexual: 71% identified as gay, 22% as lesbian, and 6% as bisexual.

	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual
<b>Over \$750K</b>	71%	22%	6%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	57%	26%	17%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **less likely** to identify as transgender: 2% identified as transgender.

	Yes, transgender
Over \$750K	2%
Under \$750K	7%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **significantly older**: 4% were under age 40; 15% were between 40-50 years old; 80% were over age 50. By comparison, 45% of the rest of the population were over age 50.

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75+
Over \$750K	0%	0%	0%	1%	3%	5%	10%	17%	18%	18%	21%	6%
Under \$750K	0%	2%	8%	12%	13%	9%	12%	11%	9%	9%	12%	3%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were predominantly white: 93% of LGBT people with high household wealth identified as white/Caucasian, 2% as mixed-race, 2% as Latino, 1% as African-American, and 1% as Asian Pacific Islander.

	White/Caucasian	African-American/Black	Hispanic/Latino	API	Mixed Race
Over \$750K	93%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Under \$750K	86%	3%	3%	2%	4%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **less likely** to identify as “Very Liberal:” 48% identified as Very Liberal and 35% identified as Somewhat Liberal.

	Very Liberal	Somewhat Liberal	Moderate	Somewhat Conservative	Very Conservative
Over \$750K	48%	35%	13%	3%	1%
Under \$750K	55%	31%	10%	2%	0%

- ❖ Virtually all LGBT people with high household wealth are “out”: 95% generally considered themselves “out” as LGBT, and 65% were out at work.

	Yes, out	No, not out	I am out at work	I have come out to only a few people at work	I am not intentionally out to anyone at work
<b>Over \$750K</b>	95%	3%	65%	7%	5%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	91%	6%	62%	13%	9%

### Family and Workplace

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **far more likely** to be married or partnered and less likely to be single: 42% were married, 17% were in a civil union or domestic partnership, and 13% were single.

	Married or in a Civil Union or Domestic Partnership	In a relationship and living together	Widowed	Single
<b>Over \$750K</b>	58%	16%	3%	13%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	34%	16%	2%	29%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **more likely** to report having children: 25% reported having children.

	Has Children	No Children
<b>Over \$750K</b>	25%	75%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	21%	79%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **more likely** to live in a large city: 61% lived in a large city, 30% lived in a smaller city or suburb, and 9% lived in a small town or rural area.

	A large city	A smaller city	A suburb	A small town	A rural area
Over \$750K	61%	13%	17%	6%	3%
Under \$750K	56%	18%	15%	6%	4%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **more likely** to be highly educated: 92% had at least a college degree, and 63% had a master's degree or Ph.D.

	Some College	Graduated College	Graduate School (Master's Degree or Ph.D.)
Over \$750K	6%	29%	63%
Under \$750K	11%	36%	49%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **less likely** to be employed, part-time and full-time, and **more likely** to be retired: 69% were employed and 25% were retired.

	Employed Full-time	Employed Part-time	Retired	Unemployed and looking for a job	Student
Over \$750K	12%	57%	25%	2%	1%
Under \$750K	11%	65%	12%	4%	4%

### Financials and Donations

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth reported **significantly higher annual incomes**: 67% reported an income over \$100,000; 24% reported an income between \$50,000 and \$100,000; 8% reported an income under \$50,000.

Income	\$20,000 or less	\$20,001-\$30,000	\$30,001-\$40,000	\$40,001-\$50,000	\$50,001-\$60,000	\$60,001-\$80,000	\$80,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$200,000	\$200,001 or more
Over \$750K	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	9%	11%	35%	32%
Under \$750K	10%	8%	10%	10%	11%	16%	12%	19%	3%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **far more likely** to have a will or trust in place: 80% had a will or trust, and 19% did not have a will or trust but said that they planned to make one.

	Have will or trust	Do not have a will or trust but intend to make one	Do not intend to make a will or trust
Over \$750K	80%	19%	1%
Under \$750K	39%	52%	6%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **slightly less likely** to make planned gifts to an LGBT organization compared to those with low household wealth.

How likely are you to make a planned gift to an LGBT organization?	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not likely at all	Unsure
Over \$750K	8%	26%	25%	29%	12%
Under \$750K	10%	28%	21%	26%	15%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **more likely** to donate large amounts to LGBT organizations: 49% gave over \$1,000, and 41% gave between \$101-\$1,000. Among all survey respondents, almost all gifts of \$5,001 or more were made by high-wealth people.

How much did they give?	Over \$750K	Under \$750K
\$20 or less	1%	6%
\$21 to \$50	2%	9%
\$51 to \$100	4%	15%
\$101 to \$200	8%	17%
\$201 to \$300	8%	11%
\$301 to \$500	11%	12%
\$501 to \$1,000	14%	11%
\$1,001 to \$2,500	19%	8%
\$2,501 to \$5,000	13%	3%
\$5,001 to \$10,000	8%	1%
More than \$10,000	8%	0%
None in the last 12 months	1%	3%

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were **slightly less likely** to devote a majority of their charitable giving to LGBT causes: 33% donated more than half of their charitable giving to LGBT causes.

What Portion of their charitable giving goes to LGBT causes?	Over \$750K	Under \$750K
0-25%	36%	37%
25.1-50%	31%	29%
50.1-75%	17%	18%
75.1-100%	16%	16%

# Key Research Questions

Below are data slices aimed at measuring the donor behavior of LGBT people with high household wealth, including questions such as what drives LGBT people with high household wealth to donate to LGBT organizations, how they are asked for donations, and what is likely to discourage their continued donations. Responses to each measure are shown in a color-coded table (darker-shaded cells indicating higher proportions of favorable responses), and key data points are called out.

Each analysis is based on the overall sample of LGBT people with high household wealth, and scores for subsections of this population (e.g., LGBT people with household wealth over \$3 million) are pulled out or noted where statistically significant between-group differences were found. Several survey items are referred to by their shortened names (e.g., Message Frames), and the full text of the items is included in an appendix.

## *What messages motivate them to give?*

People are motivated to give to LGBT organizations differently based on their own experiences and values. The survey presented a series of statements (see box) describing the motivations that some people have given for why they donate to LGBT organizations. Participants were asked to indicate if they share that motivation or not when thinking about giving to LGBT organizations.

### Message Frames

**Frame: American Freedom.** Freedom is one of America's most enduring values. It's a word that gets thrown about a lot, but when you don't have it, you know it – like when you're not able to build a life with the person you love. That's why I give to LGBT organizations.

**Frame: Care for those less fortunate.** From an early age, I was taught to care for those less fortunate. Though I'm doing well in life, many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people, especially those living in more conservative states, don't have it as easy. That's why I give to LGBT organizations.

**Frame: We're no different.** I'm no different than anyone else. I work hard, pay taxes, and try to make my community a better place. That's why, as a **(lesbian/gay person/bisexual person)**, I want to be treated the same as everyone else. That's why I give to LGBT organizations.

**Frame: Equality.** The United States is built on the idea of equality for all. Yet, for too many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans, equality is not a reality. That is why I give to LGBT organizations.

**Frame: Pride.** I've always felt really proud to be a **(gay person, lesbian, bisexual person)**. It has shaped who I am and how I live my life. I support LGBT organizations as an expression of my pride and the pride I have in my community.

**Frame: Giving Back.** I have had so many blessings in my life that it is important to me to give back. I make contributions to LGBT organizations as a way to give back.

**Frame: Legacy.** When I leave this earth, I'd like to know that I made a difference, even a small one. One reason I contribute to LGBT organizations is to ensure that I leave a legacy behind when I pass on.

**Frame: Stronger Together.** I believe we are stronger together than alone. I give to LGBT organizations to make sure that we are able to make progress on behalf of all gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people.

**Frame: Who will care for us?** As lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people, we should take care of one another, because too many of us still face rejection from our families or discrimination in our lives. If we don't support one another and our community, who will?

- ❖ Equality, Stronger Together, and We’re No Different were the most compelling message frames among LGBT people with high household wealth.<sup>2</sup>
- ❖ Equality was slightly less compelling for LGBT people with household wealth over \$3 million, while Giving Back was slightly more compelling for this group.

Messaging Frames	Over \$750k	Under \$750k	\$1-3 Mil	Over \$3 Mil
Equality	48%	47%	49%	47%
Stronger Together	39%	40%	40%	38%
We’re no different	38%	36%	39%	37%
American Freedom	38%	37%	39%	35%
Who will care for us?	34%	37%	36%	33%
Care for those less fortunate	30%	27%	29%	31%
Giving Back	27%	19%	28%	29%
Pride	23%	22%	24%	21%
Legacy	18%	15%	19%	18%

**What “identity frames” make them more likely to give?**

The survey catalogued a number of statements made by organizations about why it is important to give to a particular LGBT organization; these are known as “identity frames” (see box). Participants were asked to indicate if the frame made them more or less likely to want to give to that organization.

**Identity Frames**

**The Advocate.** We must be advocates for our own equality – recognizing the dignity that comes from standing up and being counted.

**The Activist.** We will only create change in America if we fight back against intolerance and hate.

**The Game Changer.** To make progress, we must do what some say cannot be done: Transform our nation’s laws on behalf of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people.

**The Caregiver.** We must care for those less fortunate than us, including gay and transgender youth who are bullied and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people who face employment discrimination.

**Sage.** We must work to change the hearts and minds of Americans – from politicians and pastors to mothers and fathers.

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth indicated that The Activist identity frame was the most likely to motivate them to give (49%), followed by The Game Changer frame (45%).

<sup>2</sup> Excluding items that targeted only transgender respondents, indicated by “- Trans” in the Message Frame name.

	Over \$750K
<b>The Activist</b>	49%
<b>The Game Changer</b>	45%
<b>The Advocate</b>	43%
<b>Sage</b>	40%
<b>The Caregiver</b>	39%

### What messages spur more planned giving?

The survey also presented a number of message frames describing motivations for making planned gifts to LGBT organizations. Respondents were asked which frames resonated most strongly with them.

- ❖ “It’s a way to continue my commitment” (52%), “It’s important to help future LGBT generations” (50%), and “I’ve been a part of the LGBT community” (46%) were ranked as the most important reasons to make a planned gift to an LGBT organization. These were also the highest-ranked reasons for making a planned gift among LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000.
- ❖ Notably, there is a significant drop-off between the four highest-ranked planned giving message frames and the rest of the message frames.

Planned Giving Messaging Frames	Over \$750K	Under \$750K
It’s a way to continue my commitment to an organization or cause I care about, even after I’m gone	52%	49%
It’s important to help future LGBT generations	50%	56%
I’ve been a part of the LGBT community or movement and want to continue to support it, even after I’m gone	46%	48%
I want to leave a legacy that reflects my values and ideals	44%	40%
I’ve built something from my life’s work- and I want to put it to work to make a difference after I’m gone	25%	19%
My friends and relatives don’t need all of it	23%	16%
I don’t have relatives I want to give money to	6%	6%
Other people I respect are making planned gifts	1%	1%

**What are their issue priorities?**

- ❖ The highest-priority issues among LGBT people with high household wealth were “Winning marriage” (66%), “Ending workplace or employment discrimination” (63%), and “Challenging and changing laws to improve the lives of LGBT people” (62%).
- ❖ The lowest-priority issues among LGBT people with high household wealth were “Improving religious acceptance” (16%) and “Providing more social services” (19%).
- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were far less likely to rank “Increasing acceptance for transgender people” highly compared to LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000 (29% vs. 42%).

Issue Priorities	Over \$750K	Under \$750K	\$1-3 Mil	Over \$3 Mil
Winning marriage for same-sex couples	66%	58%	69%	62%
Ending workplace or employment discrimination	63%	62%	63%	64%
Challenging and changing laws to improve the lives of LGBT people	62%	60%	63%	62%
Working for equal rights in general	57%	59%	57%	55%
Supporting LGBT youth	48%	54%	48%	49%
Ending housing and public accommodations discrimination	41%	45%	41%	39%
Combating negative stereotypes of LGBT people	40%	41%	38%	42%
Increasing support services for aging/elderly LGBT people	39%	38%	39%	38%
Winning civil unions or domestic partnerships in your state	33%	31%	34%	32%
Increasing acceptance for people who are transgender	29%	42%	28%	29%
Building a sense of LGBT community and pride	22%	24%	22%	24%
Providing more community and social services for LGBT people	19%	26%	19%	22%
Improving religious acceptance for LGBT people	16%	19%	15%	15%

**What are their key motivations for giving to LGBT organizations?**

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth indicated that “Fighting discrimination and inequality” was the strongest motivation for giving to LGBT organizations (62%), followed by “Bringing about change on a national level” (56%) and “Making it safer and more supportive for LGBT youth” (46%). These were the top-ranked motivations for LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000 as well.

<b>Motivations for Giving to LGBT Orgs</b>	<b>Over \$750K</b>	<b>Under \$750K</b>
To fight discrimination and inequality	62%	62%
To bring about change on a national level	56%	49%
To make it safer and more supportive for LGBT youth	46%	51%
To change hearts and minds	38%	38%
To have a voice	25%	26%
To directly see the impact of my donation through services or programs	22%	22%
To help build a sense of community where I live	20%	23%
Because someone I know died of AIDS or has AIDS or HIV	20%	19%
To support a cause important to a friend or loved one	13%	17%

**Do they believe that most challenges facing LGBT people will be solved in next 20-30 years?**

- ❖ When asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that most challenges faced by LGBT people will be solved in the next 20 to 30 years, 65% of LGBT people with high household wealth indicated that they strongly agreed or somewhat agreed. This was more than the number of LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000 indicating the same (58%).

<b>Do they believe that most challenges facing LGBT people will be solved in the next 20 to 30 years?</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
<b>Over \$750K</b>	14%	51%	23%	10%	3%
<b>Under \$750K</b>	13%	45%	25%	12%	4%
<b>\$1-3 Mil</b>	13%	53%	23%	9%	3%
<b>Over \$3 Mil</b>	14%	47%	24%	13%	2%

### What are their opinions of LGBT organizations?

- ❖ The majority of LGBT people with high household wealth (52%) disagreed with the assertion that LGBT organizations are often male-dominated and focused too much on gay men. Notably, 73% of these respondents identified as men, as discussed on page 6.
- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth did not endorse the belief that LGBT organizations are too focused on winning marriage (70% disagreed), nor did they endorse the belief that focusing on the needs of LGBT people alienates straight people (78% disagreed).
- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were significantly less likely to agree that LGBT organizations should focus more on issues impacting transgender people; 62% of LGBT people with high household wealth agreed with this statement, compared to 73% of LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000.

Opinion of LGBT Orgs		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
LGBT organizations are often male-dominated and focused too much on gay men and not enough on lesbian women	Over \$750K	6%	34%	31%	21%
	Under \$750K	11%	36%	28%	16%
LGBT organizations are too focused on winning marriage rights, and should be working on other issues instead	Over \$750K	7%	21%	33%	37%
	Under \$750K	14%	27%	29%	28%
I think the kinds of problems that people face because they are LGBT will largely be solved in the next 20 to 30 years	Over \$750K	14%	51%	23%	10%
	Under \$750K	13%	45%	25%	12%
I think when it comes to making financial contributions, that other causes or needs are more important than LGBT ones	Over \$750K	4%	23%	37%	32%
	Under \$750K	4%	25%	40%	26%
Focusing only on the needs of LGBT people alienates straight people who could be allies, and makes it harder to promote LGBT acceptance and gain equality	Over \$750K	3%	16%	36%	42%
	Under \$750K	4%	18%	31%	43%
I support the efforts of many LGBT organizations to focus more on issues impacting transgender people	Over \$750K	22%	40%	22%	10%
	Under \$750K	37%	36%	15%	6%

- ❖ The vast majority of LGBT respondents, regardless of household wealth, indicated a very favorable or somewhat favorable opinion of LGBT organizations, including LGBT people with high household wealth (92%). LGBT people with household wealth over \$3 million were slightly less likely than LGBT people with household wealth between \$1 million and \$3 million to indicate a very favorable opinion (45% vs. 50%).

Generally speaking, what is your opinion of LGBT organizations?	Very Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Neutral	Somewhat Unfavorable	Very Unfavorable
Over \$750K	50%	42%	5%	3%	0%
Under \$750K	47%	44%	5%	3%	0%
\$1-3 Mil	50%	42%	5%	3%	1%
Over \$3 Mil	45%	45%	5%	3%	1%

### How are they reached for donations?

- ❖ The most successful established methods to solicit donations from LGBT people with high household wealth (i.e., the methods that resulted in a donation) were by mail (79%), via fundraising events (78%), and through an ask made by someone they knew personally (76%). These were followed by asks made through email (74%) and online or through social media (58%).
- ❖ Fourteen percent of LGBT people with high household wealth said they had not yet been asked for a donation by someone they knew personally but would donate if solicited in this way.
- ❖ The most untapped method appears to be reaching out to donors at a center where services are provided; 30% of LGBT people with high household wealth had not been contacted in this way but would donate if they were. Another untapped method for reaching this subpopulation may be at a gay or lesbian bar; 19% of LGBT people with high household wealth had not been contacted in this way but would donate if they were.
- ❖ Responses suggest that street solicitation and telephone calls are the least successful methods for securing donations from high household wealth donors.

How are they reached for donations? High Wealth	Have donated	Have not been contacted this way, but would donate	Have not donated	Have not been contacted this way, and would not donate
By mail	79%	4%	13%	4%
To attend a fundraising event	78%	7%	10%	3%
By someone you know personally	76%	14%	6%	2%
Through an email	74%	5%	14%	5%
Online or through social media	58%	9%	17%	12%
At a festival, parade, rally, or march	46%	14%	25%	12%
At a center where services are provided	35%	30%	23%	7%
By a telephone call	31%	5%	36%	26%
At a gay or lesbian bar	21%	19%	27%	27%
Approached on the Street	16%	6%	38%	37%

**Which kind of LGBT organizations are they most likely to give to?**

- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth appeared to prefer donating to LGBT organizations with a national focus (31%) versus those focused on their state (11%) or on the local community (7%); however, a near majority (47%) would consider donating to all three equally.
- ❖ LGBT people with household wealth over \$3 million appeared to prefer donating to national organizations slightly more than others with high household wealth.

<b>What kind of organization are they most likely to give to?</b>	<b>Over \$750K</b>	<b>Under \$750K</b>	<b>Over \$3 Mil</b>
All equal	47%	47%	43%
With a national focus	31%	24%	35%
Focused on your own state	11%	15%	9%
Focused on your local community	7%	10%	8%
Would not donate to an organization focused on policy or legal change	1%	1%	1%

- ❖ Similarly, LGBT people with high household wealth appeared to prefer donating to an organization working to change laws and policies at the national or state level (36%), compared to local organizations providing direct services to the community (12%), although 50% of LGBT people with high household wealth would consider donating to the two equally.
- ❖ LGBT people with household wealth over \$3 million appeared to prefer donating to an organization working to change laws and policies at the national or state level (41%) more than others with high household wealth.

<b>What kind of organization are they most likely to give to?</b>	<b>Over \$750K</b>	<b>Under \$750K</b>	<b>Over \$3 Mil</b>
Both equally	50%	50%	46%
An organization working to change laws and policies at the national or state level to promote equality and reduce discrimination	36%	30%	41%
A local organization providing direct services to the community, including health care services, support groups, etc.	12%	18%	12%
Neither	0%	0%	0%

## Why did they stop giving?

- ❖ The top reasons cited by LGBT people with high household wealth when asked why they stopped giving to LGBT organizations were: the impression that the organization was poorly run or seemed ineffective (63%); and the belief that the organization made too many donation requests (56%). These were the same reasons cited most frequently by LGBT people with household wealth under \$750,000, although these reasons were cited by slightly smaller majorities in the latter group.
- ❖ LGBT people with high household wealth were far less likely to stop giving to an organization because of its failure to prioritize issues affecting transgender people (11%) and people of color (14%), and because the organization lacked diversity in staff and leadership (18%).

Why did you stop giving?	Over \$750K	Under \$750K
An organization was poorly run or seemed ineffective	63%	54%
An organization made requests to donate too often	56%	51%
It seemed that the organization had enough support from wealthy donors and corporations, so I felt my donation could make a bigger impact somewhere else	40%	41%
An organization was not transparent or open enough about their finances	38%	34%
An organization became too focused on fringe issues and political correctness	34%	28%
An organization was too elitist	30%	36%
An organization's staff and leadership did not sufficiently reflect the diversity of LGBT people in terms of things like gender, race, class, or gender identity	18%	27%
An organization did not acknowledge my donation with a proper thank you	16%	11%
An organization excluded or failed to prioritize issues affecting LGBT people of color	14%	22%
An organization focused too much on gay men	13%	21%
An organization excluded or failed to prioritize issues affecting lesbian women	13%	17%
An organization excluded or failed to prioritize issues affecting people who are transgender	11%	24%
An organization did not acknowledge or include my current partner	7%	6%

## Future Research Areas

This survey offers some key insights into the perspectives of LGBT people with high household wealth and their engagement as donors to LGBT organizations. The above analyses also suggest several directions for future research, including:

- ❖ Given their strong support for advancing marriage equality, what are the key priorities for LGBT people with high household wealth now that marriage equality has been secured?
- ❖ Given the current political climate, how have the opinions of LGBT people with high household wealth changed on the issue of “religious freedom”?
- ❖ If their current planned giving does not include LGBT organizations, what would motivate LGBT people with high household wealth to change and adjust those plans?
- ❖ How do organizations outside of the LGBT movement solicit and cultivate donors with high household wealth? What can LGBT organizations learn from those organizations?

# Endnotes

---

- i Moore, Brendan, "U.S. Economic Indicators Improve in 2013." Gallup, January 9, 2014, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/166784/economic-indicators-improve-2013.aspx>.
- ii Human Rights Campaign, "HRC National Survey of Likely Voters," [http://hrc.org/TransgenderPollFAQ?\\_ga=1.179138855.223239819.1466010602](http://hrc.org/TransgenderPollFAQ?_ga=1.179138855.223239819.1466010602).
- iii "Here's How Often You Should Mail to Your Donors," Clairification, November 24, 2014, <http://clairification.com/2014/11/24/heres-often-mail-donors/>.
- iv "Where is the Wealth?"; U.S Census Bureau, accessed June 15, 2017, [https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/newsroom/releases/2014/cb14-156\\_net\\_worth\\_graphic.pdf](https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/newsroom/releases/2014/cb14-156_net_worth_graphic.pdf)