Developing a children's rights approach to fundraising with children in primary schools and the ethics of cultivating philanthropic citizenship.

Alison Body*, Emily Lau**, Lindsey Cameron* & Shazza Ali***

*University of Kent

**Canterbury Christ Church University

***University of Bristol

Abstract

Fundraising literature predominantly focuses on adult donors, with limited literature addressing younger donors, particularly children, and virtually no discussion on the normative ethics which inform fundraising with children. Addressing this gap, this article examines the ethical dilemmas posed by the mainstreaming of charity fundraising in primary schools. Regardless of high levels of participation, research with primary school pupils shows that children's engagement in fundraising activities is often passive, with little decision making afforded to children. First, we question the ethics of passively engaging children in the fundraising relationship. Second, we question the role of fundraising more broadly in helping to cultivate children's philanthropic citizenship, suggesting that current fundraising mechanisms in schools are counter-intuitive to fostering long-term philanthropic engagement. We argue that by critically engaging children in the process of giving, children develop a deeper understanding of the cause areas that matter to them, which cultivates a longer-term commitment to philanthropy. This is potentially a different goal than that of many organisations involving schools in fundraising, where the focus is on incentivising transactional fundraising efforts aiming to raise as much money as possible and thus raises particular ethical challenges which must be considered. In this paper we draw on previous research and established frameworks for understanding philanthropic behaviour to explore the ethical challenges of fundraising with children in schools and present a pathway towards a more child-led, children's rights approach to fundraising in primary schools.

Key words: Fundraising ethics; children's rights; primary schools; children; citizenship; philanthropic citizenship

1. Introduction

Primary schools provide crucial learning spaces where children engage in fundraising as donors and are therefore vital in cultivating children's longer term philanthropic behaviours, whilst simultaneously providing an important source of fundraised income for many charities. This paper discusses the ethical considerations of engaging children as donors. We argue that much of the current debate on fundraising ethics largely ignores children and fails to acknowledge the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (UN, 1989). We draw on the

case study of fundraising in primary schools as an example of this and lay out arguments as to why this should be addressed. Through this lens we suggest children are not always clearly recognised as donors in fundraising practices and thus have been afforded little attention in the literature on fundraising ethics. Drawing on the UNCRC we propose that organisations fundraising through schools not only need to recognise children as donors and act accordingly, but we also urge fundraisers and associated stakeholders to recognise their ethical role in cultivating children's longer term philanthropic citizenship. We define philanthropic citizenship as a dimension of citizenship behaviour associated with intentions and actions that intend to produce social and/or environmental benefit, for example helping, mutual aid, volunteering, social action, charitable giving, advocacy and activism (Body, 2021).

The paper is structured as follows. First, we start by briefly outlining the pertinent literature relating to the context of fundraising in schools, including how children develop giving behaviours and the role of citizenship education. We then examine fundraising in schools from a children's rights and fundraising ethics perspective, identifying two key challenges. Finally, we offer some suggestions about how these challenges may be addressed.

2. Context

Fundraising in Schools

It has become commonplace for large-scale charitable campaigns to recruit schools in their fundraising efforts and establish resource packs to equip schools to fundraise as intermediaries on their behalf; UK examples include Comic Relief's Red Nose Day appeal and the BBC Children in Need appeal, or the Kids Heart Challenge in the US. For example, over 3-million children from more than 17,000 schools in the UK raise funds for BBC Children in Need each year, consistently resulting in more than £5 million of fundraised income for the cause (BBC Children in Need, 2020). This has resulted in charities increasingly becoming mainstream in education (Power & Taylor, 2018). Indeed, research shows that schools often go to great lengths to encourage, support and engage children of all ages in charities and charitable giving, creating a strong enthusiasm for giving and supporting others (Body et al., 2020). However, whilst school and pupil involvement in fundraising campaigns could be a useful means of developing early philanthropy and giving, there is evidence that children's involvement in charitable giving via schools can often be passive, and the tokenistic transactional nature of the giving could be counterintuitive to long-term goals of provoking social change. Research conducted by Body et al. (2020) presented qualitative evidence from an in-depth, 6 week-long, participative action research project with 150 children in the UK, aged 4–8 years old, exploring their experiences, perceptions and preferences regarding charitable giving. Whilst limited in size, this research highlighted that most children positively engage in charitable giving and recognise the national brands of large, established fundraising campaigns. However, conversely, the qualitative data also suggested that less than 20% of children are aware of the charitable cause area that sits behind the campaign they are being asked to support, and even

less children are afforded decision-making in this giving. This includes a lack of discussion about which causes they support, how they support those causes and why.

Importantly, the findings also suggest that through engagement with tokenistic fundraising mechanisms, where children for example are encouraged to give £1 for a reward such as a cup cake or to dress-up, we potentially teach giving as a transactional act, negating to support children to critically engage in the cause behind the giving. This is counter-intuitive to cultivating active, long-term philanthropic citizenship (Body et al., 2020). So, whilst research suggests children are often naturally altruistic (Power & Smith, 2016), concern is raised that by encouraging giving as a transactional act we risk overriding these intrinsic behaviours with external rewards (Body et al., 2020; Worle & Paulus, 2018). Additionally, Power and Taylor (2018), researching with 10–14-year-olds, suggest the mainstreaming of charities in schools presents charities as the 'solution' to a range of social ills, such as child poverty, homelessness, and animal welfare, and risks downplaying other approaches to address social inequality, including government responsibilities. They concluded that for this reason, mainstreaming charities in schools is not always in the service of the public good. Furthermore, additional research highlights that increasingly habitual activities such as non-school uniform days and dress-up days are problematic for families facing poverty (Mazzoli Smith & Todd, 2019), with voluntary activities in primary schools varying significantly across socio-demographic areas (Body & Hogg, 2021). In short, some children and families can afford to participate in fundraising activities more easily than others. A different approach to engaging with children around fundraising, which supports a more democratic participation of children in decision making, may support children's altruistic impulses in a more inclusive manner.

How Children Develop Giving Behaviors

Calls for a more democratic approach to involving children in fundraising is further supported by educational, social and psychology theory and research which highlights the primary school years (ages 4-11 years) as crucial in the development and normalisation of civic behaviours (e.g., Arthur et al., 2017; Duong & Bradshaw, 2017; Housman et al, 2018; van Deth et al., 2011; Wörle & Paulus, 2018). Indeed, the known research into children's engagement with fundraising suggests children are often willing and generous with their time, talents and treasure (Body et al., 2020; Power & Smith, 2016). Additionally, US based research highlights charity as a 'deeply rooted norm' in younger children (Worle & Paulus, 2018) and research with young adolescents reveals they are positive about charity, with high expectations of charities to solve social ills (CAF, 2013; Power & Taylor, 2018). Theoretical understandings of children's giving behaviours tends to come from two different bodies of research; some assuming that philanthropic behaviours are driven by situational factors (e.g. Ottoni-Wilhelm et al., 2017) whilst others focus on the individual characteristics of children, highlighting intrinsic ideas of kindness and empathy (Warneken & Tomasello, 2009). Indeed, from the ages of four, children begin to develop their moral identity (i.e. children become increasingly aware of how important being a moral person is to them), which is a crucial factor in their participation in moral actions (Duong & Bradshaw, 2017; Housman et al, 2018).

Across these debates there is one consistency - the positive role of giving and social action programmes within schools in increasing children's propensity to give (Body et al., 2020; Silke et al., 2018), with research highlighting that schools provide a vital space for the development of these philanthropic behaviours (CAF, 2013; Silke et al., 2018; Power & Taylor, 2018). The school-age years see several psychological developments that are crucial for children in their developing ability to give. This is in part because when children start school, they have an opportunity to meet and interact with many new people, including school staff and other children. This provides further opportunities to engage in, practice, observe and model prosocial behaviours. Prosocial behaviours, that is behaviours that are intended to help others, such as comforting and helping are displayed early in life, and the frequency and the complexity of these behaviours, increases during the primary school years (Paulus & Moore, 2012). For example, studies looking at sharing tendencies have shown that 3-4- and 7-8-year-olds are willing to share things such as toys and food, however the number of children who share and the number of resources they give increases with age (e.g., Fehr et al., 2008).

There are also several socio-cognitive and socio-emotional factors that support the development and display of prosocial behaviours. An increasing number of psychological researchers have highlighted the underlying mechanism of emotions, like empathy, sympathy and guilt, and cognitive developments such as perspective taking, in children's prosociality (e.g. Eisenberg et al., 2006; Sierksma et al., 2014). Relatedly, psychological research and child development theories provide evidence that children's empathy, sympathy and perspective taking skills, develop from around 4 years of age and increase with encouragement, becoming more advanced over the course of middle childhood (Ongley et al., 2014; Weller & Lagattuta, 2013). Furthermore, from this same young age, research suggests that children are also capable social actors who can debate and articulate complex arguments about inequalities and justice (van Deth et al., 2011). The middle childhood period between the ages of 4–11 is, therefore, a critical age for learning about philanthropy and giving, as evidence shows that children form their moral identity and moral reasoning during this period. Thus, children are more advanced than people may expect in terms of critical engagement with giving. With the right support and scaffolding it is possible that children can be supported to engage with and be consulted on the complex issues of which charities or causes to support, how and why.

The Role of Education and Citizenship

Given the breadth of knowledge about children's developing altruism, helping and pro-social behaviours, it is surprising how relatively little we know about the development of philanthropic citizenship at primary school, and how this can best be encouraged within schools. Schools are increasingly encouraged to incorporate charitable fundraising into their syllabus, as means of advancing children's personal development and civic engagement (Cabinet Office, 2018; CAF, 2014). For instance, within the UK, the OFSTED school inspection framework, which all public schools are subject to, encourages schools to invest in the personal development of all students including 'equipping them to be responsible, respectful, active citizens who contribute positively to society' (OFSTED, 2019). However, there is no universal approach for how children learn about charity, fundraising or philanthropy when they start school. Almost all schools integrate charity activities, voluntary action and community participation as part of their daily activities

both alongside and extra to the curriculum, while some schools embed these activities as part of a formal programme of moral, citizenship or character education. Deeper exploration into these programmes exposes tensions regarding the ideological drivers behind them, frequently drawing criticism from those who advocate a moral or value driven education rooted in exploring and understanding human values, rather than prescribing particular practices to encourage particular habits or activities (Berkowitz, 2011).

Character education, in particular, often uses an approach that suggests we must cultivate 'good' habits in our children and young people but has experienced many shifts both in understanding and practice following periods of popularity in government policy and policy-making both in the US and UK (Jerome & Kisby, 2019). In the UK, character education became a key part of education policy under Nicky Morgan as Education secretary in 2016, with critics arguing that this version of character education, presented as a solution to challenging behaviour in children and young people is: 'a collection of exhortations and extrinsic inducements designed to make children work harder and do what they're told' (Kohn, 1997). Indeed, critics of character education point out that a focus on personal ethics means broader social, political and environmental issues are addressed at an individual level rather than a community, local or global level (Jerome & Kisby, 2019; Kisby, 2017). Suissa (2015) states 'without a more radical conception of just what "the political" means, and without engaging children in debates about how political aims, ideas and values are intertwined with, yet importantly distinct from, moral values, there is no hope of engaging children in the pursuit of a more socially just and less oppressive society' (p.107). Therefore, a citizenship approach to philanthropic giving which embraces justice-orientated enquiry, encourages children to be simultaneously encouraged to respond to social needs whilst critically exploring and engaging with the wider issues which sit behind notions of charity (Body et al., 2020; Simpson, 2017). Similar ideas have been promoted by organisations such as the Philosophy for Children Cooperative, which seek to develop a 'community of enquiry' (Williams, 2016), and support the development of moral reasoning in children by asking them to question and consider different issues of social justice and inequality. The value of adopting this enquiry approach for children and philanthropy lies in helping children to learn to think, rather than tell them what to think, while still encouraging and allowing children to participate in actions of giving and ensuring they have their own agency and decision-making within the process.

In conclusion, we recognise that schools often go to great lengths to encourage, support and engage children of all ages in charities and charitable giving, creating a strong enthusiasm for giving and supporting others. This culture of giving should be celebrated, and almost all children can identify key national fundraising campaigns and associate these with various activities that they have taken part in. However, less common is a deeper, more critical engagement in the reasons for this fundraising activity and the cause issues that sit behind this giving (Body et al., 2020). This surface-level giving, led and decided on by adults, is often viewed as fun, but rarely acts as a space within which children could explore their own ideas and values in a more democratic way. Large scale mainstreaming of charity fundraising in schools also serves the purposes of the fundraising organisations rather than focusing on developing the child as philanthropic donors. In this way these spaces remain more transactional, rooted in a sense of giving for a reward, and defined in an idea of good character and service. We argue that this is

problematic on two levels, first it does not actively engage children in giving decisions, a right enshrined in the UNCRC, and second it is counter-intuitive to fostering long term philanthropic citizenship.

3. Examining Fundraising in Primary Schools from a Fundraising Ethics Perspective

The UK Institute of Fundraising defines fundraising as 'the act of raising resources (especially, but not only money) by asking for it, to fund the work the organisation carries out, including front-line activity and overheads' (cited in Breeze, 2017: p.3). This is an important role as 'charities cannot run on goodwill alone' (Breeze, 2017: p.3). We do not seek to provide a detailed account of fundraising ethics here, that is covered well by other scholars (e.g. see Kelly, 1998; MacQuillin, 2021; MacQuillin & Sargeant, 2019; O'Neil, 1994). Our focus here is on considering how these normative ethics take into account (or not) children's rights.

Ratified by the UK in 1991, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (UN, 1989) sets out the human rights of every person under the age of 18. It was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1989 and is the most widely adopted international human rights treaty in history. Most pertinent to this paper we highlight the following articles:

- Article 12 (respect for the views of the child): Every child has the right to express their views, feelings and wishes in all matters affecting them, and to have their views considered and taken seriously.

- Article 13 (freedom of expression): Every child must be free to express their thoughts and opinions and to access all kinds of information, as long as it is within the law.

Put simply, these two articles reflect a child's right to be consulted and listened too in matters that affect their life (Nolas, 2016). A children's rights discourse goes beyond the idea of viewing the child as competent in their own right and moves towards how children's rights education can promote 'democratization of human rights' (Jerome, 2016: p.152). Indeed, Culhane and McGeough (2020) propose that bottom-up, school-led charity events, as opposed to top-down large campaigns, can provide vital learning spaces for human rights education. Thus, a children's rights approach focuses on children's rights *to* and *in* education (Quennerstedt, 2011). As a result, children's rights education was 'formally adopted in 2014 by UNICEF's Private Fundraising and Partnership Division (UNICEF PFP, 2014) as a key objective to clarify that children should learn about rights through education programmes which emphasise their status as rights holders, and which connect learning to their lives' (Jerome, 2016: p.145). UNICEF's Private Fundraising and Partnership Division (UNICEF PFP, 2014) 'Child Rights Education Toolkit' specifically highlights how engaging children in fundraising activities can enable a rights-learning approach but warns of children developing cynicism through 'one-off', tokenistic or 'ad-hoc' fundraising events. Fundamentally they argue that a children's rights approach to fundraising facilitates children to lead on how funds are raised and which causes are supported, and supports this through critical engagement with the underpinning cause.

According to MacQuillin, 'normative ethics is concerned with the content of moral judgements, and the criteria for what is right or wrong. Normative ethical theories attempt to provide a general theory of how we ought to live' (2016: p.5). There are three major approaches to normative ethics: consequentialism, deontology and virtue ethics (MacQuillin, 2021). According to MacQuillin (2021), consequentialism, identifies that we are morally obliged to act in a manner which produces the best consequences, therefore the morality of the act depends only on the consequences; deontology focuses on ethical acts which conform to established social norms, therefore an act is moral if it is the established 'right thing to do'; whereas virtue ethics focuses on the role of an individuals character and virtues, therefore the moral act would be one which a 'virtuous person would do in the same situation' (ibid: p.7).

Based on these approaches to normative ethics, MacQuillin and Sargeant (2019) and later MacQuillin (2021) present three ideas from their review of the professional and academic literature which they feel could serve as the bases for normative ethical theories of fundraising ethics, adding the fourth in part as response to finding the literature wanting. These are:
1. Protection of public trust or "trustism", which assumes fundraising is ethical when it protects public trust.
2. Servicing the donor's needs, wants and aspirations, which assumes fundraising is ethical when it meets the donors needs.
3. Service of philanthropy, which assumes fundraising is ethical when it is in the service of philanthropy.
4. Rights-balancing fundraising ethics, which assumes fundraising is ethical when it appropriately balances fundraisers duties to their donors and beneficiaries.

Testing dominant fundraising practices with children in primary schools against the normative theories on fundraising ethics (Table 1) reveals two central challenges on our pathway towards a more child-led, children's rights approach to fundraising in primary schools:

· *Challenge 1: Children are not always recognised as donors by fundraising charities and thus have been given little ethical consideration.*

· *Challenge 2: Current fundraising mechanisms in schools are counter-intuitive to fostering long-term philanthropic engagement.*

Ethical Theory	Formulation	Condition Met by Dominant Fundraising Practices in Schools (Body et al., 2020)
TRUSTISM (Anderson, 1996; Rosen, 2005)	Fundraising is ethical when it promotes, sustains, protects or maintains public trust, and unethical when it damages these things.	No – Children's passive participation in fundraising activities damages trust by undermining their rights as enshrined in the UNCRC (Body et al., 2020).

DONORCENTRISM	Consequentialist perspective: Fundraising is ethical when it gives priority to the donor's wants, needs, and wishes provided that this maximizes sustainable income for the non profit.	No – Encouraging giving as a transactional act may achieve short-term gain for the fundraising organisation, but in the longer term is unlikely to foster children's philanthropic citizenship (Bhati & Hansen, 2020; Body et al., 2020).
	Deontological perspective: Fundraising is ethical when it gives priority to the donor's wants, needs, desires and wishes.	No – Without active knowledge and engagement in decision making and understanding why they are giving, as promoted by the UNCRC, children's wants, needs and wishes are ignored (Lundy, 2018). Essentially the child is not recognised or treated as the 'donor'.
SERVICE OF PHILANTHROPY (Rosso, 1991; O'Neil, 1994)	Fundraising is ethical when it brings meaning to a donor's philanthropy.	No – A donor cannot experience meaning in their philanthropy if they have had little say in the philanthropic decision-making process (Body et al., 2020), therefore the activity can be understood as tokenistic (Hart, 1992) and counter intuitive to fostering children's philanthropic citizenship.
RIGHTS BALANCING	Fundraising is ethical when it balances the duty of fundraisers to ask for support (on behalf of their beneficiaries), with the relevant rights of donors, such that a mutually beneficial outcome is achieved and neither stakeholder is significantly harmed.	No – Whilst this theory offers the most plausible lens to view current fundraising practices in schools as ethical, the argument here comes down to 'balance' – as we argue above many fundraising practices in schools do not meet children's rights as the donor.

Table 1: Testing normative ethical theories (adapted from MacQuillin and Sargeant (2019)) against current fundraising practices in schools.

We now consider these challenges in more detail before moving on to consider pathways forwards for child-led fundraising, informed by children's rights.

Challenge 1: Children are rarely recognised as donors by fundraising charities and thus have been given little ethical consideration, as a result their rights have been overlooked.

Fundraising, via schools, is often very successful in meeting the needs of the fundraising organisation. Indeed, research highlights the importance of these large scale, often televised appeals, in lifting donations for causes and ensuring valuable funds are distributed to smaller charities delivering a plethora of much needed support and services (Butera & Houser, 2018).

However, in doing so the needs and rights of the children as donors are often neglected, something which drawing on the fundraising ethics literature is problematic.

The first preoccupation, and core foundation of thinking within a children's right agenda, is the right for children to participate in decision making processes which affect them, and to have freedom of expression in their views as highlighted by the UNCRC. Our previous research in the UK shows that children are often not aware of who they are giving money too and/or have little decision making in who they are giving too (Body et al., 2020), highlighting that there is some way to go before children's rights are recognised. This presents us with a twofold dilemma, one, largescale fundraising appeals in schools often do not appear to recognise children as capable, current citizens who have the right to actively participate in decisions making processes which affect them, as enshrined in the UNCRC (Hart, 1992; UNCRC, 1992); and two, it is prone to passive tokenistic participation. Tokenistic participation means that children are engaged in serious issues yet, crucially, only at a superficial level, rather than engaging in decision-making or taking roles of power and responsibility. Indeed, without conscious recognition of the giving process, children's charitable giving risks becoming tokenistic (Hart,1992) and performative (Horgan et al., 2016), potentially 'trivialising their involvement in important issues' (Hart, 1992: p.1). Without critical discussion and debate, children remain distanced from and unaware about the charitable cause that they are seeking to support (Lundy, 2018). This is not to suggest that children giving in mainstream appeals is unethical, but more that the way in which they are engaged needs further consideration.

Part of the problem lies in who is responsible for how children engage in the fundraising activities - does responsibility fall to the fundraising organisation, school or parents/carers of the child? Furthermore, who is the donor in this scenario? Is it the parent/carer who is likely to have supplied the money, the school who are hosting the fundraiser, or the child who gives the money, often in exchange for a token or reward, for example dressing up or participating in some form of activity? Within the primary school scenario, schools act as the intermediary fundraiser - those that raise money that will then be sent to a charity (Coffman, 2017). From a children's rights perspective we recognise the child as the donor, as they are the ones participating in the act of fundraising (consciously or not).

When we view the child as the donor in this scenario, fundraising ethics literature is consistent and clear on the ethics and importance of actively and meaningfully engaging donors in the giving decision. For example, donorcentrism/ donor-centred fundraising literature advocates putting the donor at the heart of the activities and accept it is fully their decision to donate (Breeze, 2017). Whilst other studies such as De Bock and Faseur's (2017) study of Belgium donors highlights how fundraising is unethical if it fails to meet six core values, which includes freedom of choice, within which they are explicit, 'A donation should be the consequence of one's free choice and should not be explicitly or implicitly forced by the organisation in whatever way' (p.6). Furthermore, drawing on Anderson (1996) we can recognise the sense of 'giving for reward' with little engagement with the cause, as we highlight is so common in children's experiences of fundraising, as unethical as it overrides the sense of being charitable and lacks meaning for the donor (Rosso, 1991).

Thus, we conclude that to counter this challenge, fundraising from a children's rights perspective must ensure that children, as donors, are fully engaged in decision making; that it is their free-choice to donate; and that it is meaningful (Anderson, 1996; Rosso, 1991). This addresses one side of the issues we raise in this paper under the UNCRC, children's right to participate in decision-making. Nonetheless children's rights extend beyond this and include the right for processes in which methods of engagement should invite and respect children as rightful participants in the entire learning process (Quennerstedt, 2011), which includes meaningful, critical engagement with the subject. This leads us onto our second challenge.

Challenge 2: Current fundraising mechanisms in schools are counter-intuitive to fostering long-term philanthropic citizenship.

We now consider the ethical duty of fundraisers to positively foster children's long-term philanthropic citizenship. Our conceptualisation of philanthropic citizenship is informed by a children's rights pedagogy, drawing on the ideas of educational philosophers such as Biesta, Friere, Lipman and Dewey, who argue that education should be a space of moral reasoning, democratic questioning, and critical enquiry, which ultimately seeks to serve social justice and equality. Within the classroom, educational philosophers such as Biesta (2011) have suggested that the whole purpose of education is to give pupils space for this democratic reasoning and moral questioning. Approaches based on this philosophy would encourage teachers and children to engage in critical debate and discussion around the topics of charity, prosociality and giving, from the earliest age. Not only is this likely to increase a child's long-term propensity to give, but it promotes the ideas of inclusion, social good and social justice which extends beyond the ad-hoc moment of fundraising and engages children in consideration about how they may seek to engage in and help address wider social issues. Westheimer (2015) offers a good example of this, highlighting that we can teach children to give food to the foodbank, or we can teach children to give food to the foodbank whilst simultaneously questioning why that foodbank exists and understanding the structural inequalities which surround food poverty. He argues this would be a better outcome for the beneficiaries of food poverty, by increasing understanding and compassion, and equipping children with the skills to help dismantle existing structural inequalities which result in food poverty. Indeed, this ties in with Power and Taylor's (2018) concern that the mainstreaming of charities in schools presents charities as the 'solution' to a range of social ills, normalising these issues and risks downplaying other approaches to address social inequality, including government responsibilities.

Charity, philanthropy and giving provide the ideal platform for children to consider these ideas and debates, but without meaningful engagement, this is not only a missed opportunity, but can indeed be counter-intuitive to fostering children's philanthropic citizenship by over-riding children's often natural altruistic tendencies and normalising charity, rather than social justice, as a response to social issues. Therefore, from a children's rights education perspective charitable giving should engage children critically in the cause they are supporting, balancing both their needs as the donor, but also recognising the needs of the beneficiaries and promoting a democratisation of human rights (Jerome & Starkey, 2021). As in our response to challenge 1, here we recognise the co-creation of these learning opportunities, placing expectations on both fundraisers and schools alike.

Exploring this from a fundraising ethics perspective however raises some tensions. Donorcentrism clearly promotes prioritising the needs of the donor, as discussed above in challenge one. However, the needs of the beneficiaries or wider public good are left untouched within this theory. Normative statements that are in line with a service of philanthropy from a consequentialist approach promote fundraising as being ethical when it brings meaning to the donor's philanthropy (MacQuillin, 2021), by adding 'greater meaning' to donors lives (Rosso, 1991) and reflecting 'the fundamental convictions of the donor' (Sievers, 2013). Whereas considering fundraising as a service for philanthropy from a public good perspective, adopts a more deontological perspective, proposing that fundraisers serve the public good and thus should support the common good of society (Pribbenow, 1994). This is potentially both a different aim from fundraising for a specific cause (Koshy, 2019) and different from the focus of 'meaningful philanthropy' (Rosso, 1991); it is however more in keeping with a children's rights agenda and our conceptualisation of philanthropic citizenship. This leads us to consider the point at which ethical theory and children's rights literature potentially intersect, within a rights-balancing framework, thus the final section of this paper considers a potential pathway forwards to consider fundraising ethics which are in line with children's rights and help overcome the challenges we have outlined here.

4. Pursuing a Children's Rights Approach to Fundraising in Schools

According to MacQuillin (2021) 'fundraising is ethical when it balances the duty of fundraisers to ask for support (on behalf of their beneficiaries), with the relevant rights of donors, such that a mutually beneficial outcome is achieved and neither stakeholder is significantly harmed' (p.19). Under this perspective, the context of fundraising in schools could be considered ethical from a children's rights perspective when paying attention to both the right of fundraisers to solicit support on behalf of their beneficiaries and the 'relevant' rights of the donor. From a children's rights perspective we would contend that this 'support' extends beyond financial support, and highlights that fundraisers have an ethical duty to critically engage children in 'moral justification for moral intervention that provides the justification for fundraising' (Rosso, 1991: p.4), reflecting on issues of social justice and cultivating children's meaningful engagement with giving (Simpson, 2016; also see section on how children develop giving behaviours). Furthermore, the rights-balancing approach allows for the consideration of 'each case in context' (MacQuillin & Sargeant, 2019), therefore we can argue that children's giving provides a context in which the concept of the 'relevant rights of the donor' are of particular importance, with children's rights enshrined in the UNCRC. Thus, a rights-balancing approach brings these rights to the fore as a core consideration as we move forwards.

Furthermore, our argument to include children as donors and involve them in democratic decision-making around how the money is distributed and accounted for, encourages a more collaborative relationship between beneficiaries and donors, which recognises the role of children as donors but moves further away from the donor-centered approaches discussed in Table 1. Adopting Westheimer's (2011) concept of fostering justice-orientated citizenship in schools, it is important children investigate any potential structural problems which create

inequality and the complex decision-making involved with the distribution and impact of fundraised money and indeed consider alternative responses, such as policy and/or government action, decentering philanthropy as the solution to social ills (Power & Taylor, 2018). To ensure that school fundraising is ethical and in line with principles recognising children as decision-makers (van Deth, 2011) we suggest fundraising organisations engage in more community-centric donor approaches. Community-centric fundraising is based on principles of social justice, collective missions, partnership, and holistic transformation. MacQuillin (2011) suggests the two philosophies underpinning donor-centric and community-centric fundraising can reach an accord, by building partnerships and relationships between donors and communities (2011: p17).

The fact that fundraising takes place 'in schools' is particularly important, as this is a space where children have the right to expect to engage in meaningful and democratic citizenship education, and, as discussed, education provides an important and unique context for engaging children in philanthropic giving. The lessons we teach children in this context matter and have lasting consequences for their propensity to give, engagement in social justice and democratic thinking as both current and future citizens. Discussing community issues in the classroom often informs a sense of collective responsibility, with collective opportunities to act on those issues, empowering the children involved (Covell & Howe, 2001). This leaves us with the pressing consideration, what can ethical fundraising in primary schools actually look like from a children's rights perspective? We suggest fundraising organisations should not only seek to engage children in what charitable cause they are supporting, but also provide a framework to facilitate schools in critically engaging children, in age appropriate ways, in why the cause exists and other mechanisms by which these causes may be tackled, for example governmental responses and/or social action, and for teachers to be provided with support and time necessary to facilitate these discussions (Horgan et al., 2017). Drawing together the arguments presented in this paper and considering our knowledge of children's evolving capacities to consider social issues and social justice, we suggest that fundraising in schools should be a process of co-creation between the fundraising charity, the school/teachers and the children themselves. In recruiting schools as an intermediary fundraising body, fundraisers hold an ethical responsibility to ensure schools adopt a children's rights approach and supply support material to facilitate this. For example, by supplying resources for teachers such as online videos which help build understanding of different communities and need. These should not only consider fundraising themes and activities but also address, where appropriate, the issues of race, gender, socio-economic and ethnic inequalities, the impact of the fundraising organisation's work and the way they make their decisions. In turn, schools hold an ethical responsibility to actively and meaningfully involve children as co-decision makers in all aspects of the fundraising process, including involving children in decisions about if and how schools should (or should not) take part in large scale fundraisers. Children should be encouraged to consider the ethical and moral aspects of philanthropy before making decisions about giving. In doing so, children should be facilitated to consider other mechanisms of giving, for example to their local community, through social action, advocacy or campaigning and alternative societal responses such as government or political action. This approach recognises children's rights to engage in their versions of

meaningful philanthropy, and not to have philanthropic activities imposed upon them, alongside recognising the wider context in which the philanthropy is taking place.

The great news is that there are several fundraising organisations who are already considering these challenges and counter challenges, providing information about the cause for schools to present in assemblies and to explore in class, and taking steps to consider children and young people's agency in giving decisions. Less common is information to help children critically engage in the cause area. In addressing this, we argue that a children's rights approach to fundraising offers exciting opportunities for children to explore real issues and real responses and opens-up the spaces where children can meaningfully engage in conversations about charity and giving (Body et al., 2020). For example, the co-construction of fundraising activities between organisations, schools and children provides a real opportunity for exciting curricula development in character and citizenship education. Along the lines of the philosophy for children movement, it presents an exciting opportunity for a 'philanthropy for children' movement, where debates on our roles as philanthropic citizens are embedded in the school curricula. We recognise these are ambitious ideals for fundraisers, and do not want to criticise the many positive fundraising activities going on in schools every day, which raise valuable funds for many worthy causes, instead the idea is that fundraisers keep these ethical considerations in mind when developing and implementing their fundraising strategy and tactics in schools.

In this paper we have focused on the ethical issues raised in donating of money to charity in primary education. We acknowledge that children engage in charity in various different ways including volunteering, selling of goods (such as cookies and cakes) to raise funds, and social action; such acts also raise particular ethical considerations which whilst outside the scope of this paper require further consideration. Our final reflections consider how this paper contributes to the wider discussion on fundraising ethics. We see this contribution as threefold. First, this paper explicitly seeks to challenge thinking and practice regarding the engagement of children in fundraising. It calls for key stakeholders, such as fundraising and education professional bodies, grant making boards, and relevant CEOs and development directors, to recognise the need for and champion change. Second, a children's rights perspective provides a lens in which children, as the donor, have the enshrined right to critically engage in the subject matter. As we argue above, this extends the idea of support for beneficiaries beyond simply financial aid and highlights the need to critically engage donors in justice-orientated enquiry regarding the cause area, a concept which can extend across fundraising more generally. Third, this paper calls into question the ethics and role of intermediary bodies in fundraising. The co-creation of fundraising practices can potentially dilute donors' interaction, knowledge of and meaningful engagement with the cause. Fundraisers need to carefully consider how this may be counteracted, especially in circumstances where potential donors' voices may already be marginalised. Finally, we propose that further work is now necessary on considering how this suggested pathway may work in practice, and how fundraising practices may be co-constructed by organisations, schools and children, and meaningfully embedded as part of citizenship education in schools.

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

References:

Anderson, A., 1996. *Ethics for Fundraisers.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Arthur J, Harrison T, Taylor-Collins E, & Moller F,. 2017. *A Habit of Service: The Factors that Sustain Service.* Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, University of Birmingham Report.

BBC Children in Need (2020) *Annual Report and Accounts Year to 30 June 2020.* BBC Children in Need.

Berkowitz, M., 2011. What works in values education. *International Journal of Educational Research.* 50. 153-158. 10.1016/j.ijer.2011.07.003.

Berkowitz, M. & Bier, M., 2007. What Works In Character Education. Journal of Research in Character Education. 5. Bhati, A. & Hansen, R., 2020. A literature review of experimental studies in fundraising. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration,* 3(1).

Biesta G., 2011. *Learning Democracy in School and Society*: Education, Lifelong Learning, and the Politics of Citizenship. Springer Science & Business Media: Rotterdam.

Body, A., 2021. *Teaching Philanthropic Ctizenship.* Compact Guides, Chartered College of Teaching. https://my.chartered.college/2021/01/teaching-philanthropic-citizenship/

Body, A. and Hogg, E., 2021. Collective co-production in English public services: the case of voluntary action in primary education. *Voluntary Sector Review.*

Body, A., Lau, E. & Josephidou, J., 2020. Engaging children in meaningful charity: Opening-up the spaces within which children learn to give. *Children & Society,* 34(3), pp.189-203.

Breeze, B., 2017. *The New Fundraisers: Who organises charitable giving in contemporary society?.* Policy Press.

Butera, L. & Houser, D., 2018. Delegating altruism: Toward an understanding of agency in charitable giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *155*, pp.99-109.

Cabinet Office. 2018. *Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future that Works for Everyone*. HMSO: London

Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). 2013. *Growing Up Giving:* Insights into How Young People Feel about Charity. Charities Aid Foundation: London.

Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) 2014. *Creating An Age of Giving:* Conclusions from the Growing Giving Parliamentary Inquiry. Charities Aid Foundation: London.

Coffman, L., 2017. Fundraising Intermediaries Inhibit Quality-Driven Charitable Donations. Economic Inquiry, 55(1), pp.409-424.

Committee on the Rights of the Child. 2001. General Comment No. 1 (2001): The aims of education. UN/CRC/GC/2001/1 (Geneva, United Nations).

Committee on the Rights of the Child. 2002. Concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. UN/CRC/C/15/Add.188 (Geneva, United Nations).

Covell, K. and Howe, R.B., 2001. Moral education through the 3 Rs: Rights, respect and responsibility. *Journal of moral education,* 30(1), pp.29-41.

Culhane, L., & McGeough, E., 2020. *Respect, equality, participation:* exploring human rights education in Great Britain. Equality and Human Rights Commission https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/respect_equality_participation_exploring_human_rights_education_in_great_britain.pdf

Cuevas-Parra, P., 2021. Thirty years after the UNCRC: children and young people's participation continues to struggle in a COVID-19 world. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law,* pp.1-18.

De Bock, T., and Faseur, T., 2017. *Ethical fundraising from the donor's viewpoint:* An exploratory study. International Conference on Research in Advertising, 2017/06/29-2017/07/01, Location: Ghent, Belgium. Available at: http://ernop.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/De-Bock-Faseur-Ethical-Fundraising-from-the-Donors-viewpoint-4.pdf

Duong, J., & Bradshaw, C. P., 2017. Links Between Contexts and Middle to Late Childhood Social-Emotional Development. *American journal of community psychology*, 60(3-4), 538-554.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L., 2006. Prosocial Development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (p. 646–718). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..Fehr, E., Bernhard, H. and Rockenbach, B., 2008. Egalitarianism in young children. Nature, 454(7208), pp.1079-1083.

Freeman, M., 1996*. Children's education; a test case for best interests and autonomy*, in: R. Davie& D. Galloway (Eds) Listening to children in education (London, David Fulton).

Hart, R., 1992. *Children's participation*: from tokenism to citizenship (No.inness92/6). Available at https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/childrens_participation.pdf

Horgan, D., Forde, C., Martin, S. and Parkes, A., 2017. Children's participation: Moving from the performative to the social. *Children's Geographies,* 15(3), pp.274-288.

Housman, D. K., Denham, S. A., & Cabral, H., 2018. Building Young Children's Emotional Competence and Self-Regulation from Birth: The" Begin to… ECSEL" Approach. *International Journal of Emotional Education,* 10(2), 5-25.

Jerome, L., 2016. Interpreting Children's Rights Education: Three perspectives and three roles for teachers. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education,* 15(2), pp.143-156.

Jerome, L. & Kisby, B., 2019. *The rise of character education in Britain:* Heroes, dragons and the myths of character. Springer Nature.

Jerome, L., & Starkey, H., 2021. *Children's Rights Education in Diverse Classrooms:* Pedagogy, Principles and Practices. London: Bloomsbury.

Kelly, K. S., 1998. *Effective Fund-raising Management.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erbaum Associates, New Jersey.

Kohn, A., 1997. *How not to each values: A critical look at Character Education.* Phi Delta Kappan, v78 n6 p428-39 Feb 1997

Koshy, K., 2019. *The end of donor-centred fundraising and the last fundraiser.* Critical Fundraising, 7 October. https://criticalfundraising.com/2019/10/07/opinion-the-end-of-donor-centred-fundraising-and-the-last-fundraiser/ – accessed 24th March 2021.

Leimgruber, K., Shaw, A., Santos, L., & Olson, K., 2012. *Young children are more generous when others are aware of their actions.* PLoS ONE 7(10): e48292.

List, J.A. and Samak, A.C., 2013. Exploring the origins of charitable acts: Evidence from an artefactual field experiment with young children. *Economics Letters*, 118(3), pp.431-434.

Lundy, L., 2018. In defence of tokenism? Implementing children's right to participate in collective decision-making. *Childhood*, *25*(3), pp.340-354.

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

MacQuillin, I. R., 2021. *Normative fundraising ethics* – a review of the field. London: Rogare – The Fundraising Think Tank.

MacQuillin, I.R, & Sargeant, A., 2019. Fundraising Ethics: A Rights-Balancing Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 160(1), 239-250.

Mazzoli Smith, L. & Todd, L., 2016. *Poverty proofing the school day:* evaluation and development report. Project Report. Research Centre for Learning and Teaching, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Nolas, S.M., 2015. Children's participation, childhood publics and social change: a review. Children & Society, 29(2), pp.157-167.

OFSTED. 2019. Education inspection framework, OFSTED https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-inspection-framework Accessed 26th March 2021

O'Neil, M. (1994). Fundraising as an ethical act. New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising, 1994(6), 3-14.

Ongley, S. F., Nola, M., & Malti, T., 2014. Children's giving: Moral reasoning and moral emotions in the development of donation behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, Article 458. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00458

Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Zhang, Y., Estell. D., & Perdue, N., 2017. Raising charitable children: the effects of verbal socialization and role-modeling on children's giving. *Journal of Population Economics* 30(1): 189–224.

Paulus, M. & Moore, C., 2012. Chapter 8 - Producing and Understanding Prosocial Actions in Early Childhood, Editor(s): Janette B. Benson, *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, JAI, Volume 42,

Power S, & Smith K. 2016. Giving, saving, spending: what would children do with £1 million? *Children & Society* 30(3): 192–203

Power S, & Taylor C., 2018. The mainstreaming of charities into schools. *Oxford Review of Education* 44 (6): 702–715.

Pribbenow, P.C., 2013. Fundraisers and the good life, in: Pettey, J.G. (editor). *Ethical Fundraising – A Guide for Nonprofit Board and Fundraisers*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Rosso, H., 1991. A philosophy of fundraising, in: Temple E.R. (editor) *Hank Rosso's Achieving Excellence in Fundraising.* San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Rosen, M.J., 2005. Doing well by doing right: a fundraiser's guide to ethical decision-making. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 10.3: 175-181

Sierksma, J.& Thijs, J. & Verkuyten, M., 2014. Children's intergroup helping: The role of empathy and peer group norms. *Journal of experimental child psychology.* 126C. 369-383. 10.1016/j.jecp.2014.06.002.

Sievers, B., 2013. Both sides now: The ethics of grantseeking and grantmaking, in: Pettey, J.G. (editor). *Ethical Fundraising – A Guide for Nonprofit Board and Fundraisers.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Silke, C., Brady, B., Boylan, C., & Dolan, P., 2018. Factors influencing the development of empathy and prosocial behaviour among adolescents: a systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review* 94 (2018): 421–436.

Simpson, J., 2016. A study to investigate, explore and identify successful 'interventions' to support teachers in a transformative move from a charity mentality to a social justice mentality. *GLP Innovation Fund Series, paper*, 2.

Quennerstedt, A., 2011. The construction of children's rights in education – A research synthesis. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 19(4): 661–678.

United Nations (UN). 1989. *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* (UNCRC). Treaty no. 27541. Available at https://www.unicef.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2010/05/UNCRC_united_nations_convention_on_the_rights_of_the_child.pdf

UNICEF Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division (UNICEF PFP) (2014) Child Rights Education Toolkit. Geneva: UNICEF PFP

Van Deth, JW., Abendschon, S., & Vollmar, M., 2011. Children and politics: An empirical reassessment of early political socialization. *Political Psychology* 32: 147–173.

Warneken, F. and Tomasello, M., 2009. The roots of human altruism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 100(3), pp.455-471.

Weller D, & Lagattuta K. 2013., Helping the in-group feels better: children's judgments and emotion attributions in response to prosocial dilemmas. *Child Dev.* 2013 Jan-Feb;84(1):253-68. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01837.x.

Westheimer, J., 2015. *What kind of citizen?: Educating our children for the common good.* Teachers College Press.

Williams, S. (2016) A brief history of p4c, especially in the UK. p4c. Available at: https://p4c.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/History-of-P4C.pdf

Wörle, M. and Paulus, M., 2018. Normative expectations about fairness: The development of a charity norm in preschoolers. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology,* 165, pp.66-84.