

# The Role of Philanthropy in Shaping Cultural Institutions

Sarah Sachar

Humanities Education Kampala International University Uganda

Email: [sarah.achar@studmc.kiu.ac.ug](mailto:sarah.achar@studmc.kiu.ac.ug)

## ABSTRACT

Philanthropy plays a crucial role in shaping cultural institutions by providing financial resources, influencing infrastructure development, and fostering programmatic innovation. This paper examines the historical evolution of philanthropy in the cultural sector, examining key donors, funding mechanisms, and the motivations behind philanthropic contributions. It also delves into the positive and negative impacts of philanthropic support, including concerns about donor influence, power dynamics, and sustainability. Through case studies of successful philanthropic partnerships, the paper highlights best practices and ethical considerations for donor engagement. Finally, emerging trends, including digital philanthropy and participatory funding models, are analyzed to offer insights into the future of philanthropy in cultural institutions.

**Keywords:** Philanthropy, cultural institutions, arts funding, donor influence, infrastructure development, sustainability, program innovation.

## INTRODUCTION

**Philanthropy and the Cultural Sector: An Interconnected Relationship.** Philanthropy and cultural institutions are fundamentally tied to one another. A more detailed understanding of the transformative effect of financial contributions on institutions of cultural expression will be gained through the examination of the broader discourse within which these two subjects have recently emerged. Popular accounts of philanthropy often focus on well-publicized individuals who donate huge sums of money to particular causes. Headlines in newspapers and lifestyle magazines proclaim the generosity of the rich and famous, detailing the large checks they write to fund charitable organizations and social programs. At the same time, the cultural sector garners considerable attention for its exciting and innovative programming, challenging academic research, and lively political debate. Nevertheless, an examination of this discourse reveals a troubling lack of connection between the two fields. For the most part, analyses of philanthropy focus on the motivations behind giving and how donations are made, while discussions of culture center on a detailed analysis of both artistic and political expression. As a result, the broader significance of philanthropic funding for the many and varied cultural initiatives undertaken by cultural institutions is often overlooked. This article surveys some of the broad ways in which philanthropic giving intersects with the development of contemporary cultural institutions. It also lays out a context within which to evaluate the broad spectrum of recent historical trends and current practices that are the object of inquiry. Driven primarily by the history of philanthropy in America, areas of particular concern are identified. First, a brief taxonomy of the many types of donors must be ventured, along with an attempt to understand why they give. Similarly, it will be vital to explore the many and unique ways in which cultural institutions participate in the philanthropic process. Shot through this survey will be observations about both the possible positive and negative impacts of giving on cultural institutions, a distillation of a diverse academic and popular conversation on this subject. Finally, broad attention is drawn to the various reflective and frequently contentious points of view on the larger stakes of philanthropy that involve culture [1, 2].

### **Historical Overview of Philanthropy in Cultural Institutions**

This paper briefly reviews the cultural development of film, music, sports, and visual arts, analyzing historical trends and the economic factors leading to the breakdown and failure to establish cultural institutions. It highlights three notable cultural entities: the Merce Cunningham Dance Company (1953–2011), the public radio program American Top 40 with Casey Kasem (1970–present), and the video game Tetris (1984). Cultural institutions, while diverse, aim to effect lasting changes within their domains. Historical examples demonstrate that these institutions gained significant influence due to their accessibility and capacity to generate a variety of works. However, there was a failure to create cultural institutions outside of film, particularly in music, sports, and visual arts. The paper discusses this failure, identifying narrative and empirical dimensions to analyze employment and economic trends. Narratively, they focus mainly on arguments regarding intellectual property challenges in music and sports, while empirically, they utilize government statistics for support [3,4].

### **Key Concepts and Definitions in Philanthropy and Cultural Institutions**

There is an urgent need for a shared lexicon to describe the complex landscape of philanthropic practice. Currently, stakeholders in the cultural sector lack definitions of key terms for meaningful dialogue. This paper overviews the literature, presenting specialized terms related to philanthropy and cultural institutions alongside their definitions. It also reviews theoretical frameworks that conceptualize the intersection of philanthropy and culture. It is hoped that these definitions will lay the groundwork for more substantive discussions ahead. The definitions serve as common denominators extracted from diverse practices and, while anticipated to be contested, are expected to provide a solid foundation for exploring philanthropy's many dimensions. The terminology of philanthropy varies significantly, with different meanings based on context. Despite this, it is possible to outline a general understanding of philanthropy, characterized by its engagement in creating public goods, as well as examining its impact and constraints. Key practices central to philanthropic engagement within the cultural sector are highlighted, suggesting ways to capture the broad grantscape. Distinguishing the varied means by which arts organizations receive financial contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations is crucial for nuanced reflections on the cultural outcomes of philanthropy, along with the broader societal implications of these engagements [5, 6].

### **The Impact of Philanthropy on Cultural Institutions**

While essential to the spirit of inquiry and the arts, an understanding of the unique impacts of philanthropy on cultural institutions is still nascent. Thousands of such establishments develop across the world as philanthropic engagement brings significant capital and resources to otherwise underfunded and underserved organizations. The philanthropic sector in the US was valued at almost \$97 billion, supporting a range of causes from human services and international aid to arts and culture. Larger institutions receive millions of dollars while smaller institutions, no less important, receive a proportionately scaled sum. The impact of financial support, nevertheless, extends well beyond the bounds of the dollar as philanthropists across the world make considerable, and sometimes controversial, contributions to associated infrastructural developments and governance. Unpacking these multifaceted effects, critically and quantitatively, is therefore crucial to a nuanced understanding of philanthropy's relationship to cultural institutions. While funding imperatives are central to institutional management, they provide a critical lever for both the acceleration and the stifling of influences from development. There has thus far been only a limited attempt to engage with an evidence-based examination of the impacts of donations on the various aspects of cultural institutions. In keeping with the nascent scholarship of the field, there will be more streams of approach throughout the piece, each illustrated with several case studies and wider datasets. This is to provide a robust discussion, extensive both in the exploration of various key avenues of inquiry and in the use of a diverse range of quantitative and qualitative sources [7, 8].

### **Financial Support**

One important aspect of the art world that has not been broadly covered concerns financial support of the arts in the U.S. Many people donate money, fundraise or serve on boards to support music performance, visual arts, museums, and similar artistic endeavors. These institutions are different from any other recipient of philanthropy. People have also formed the companies. Ministries, schools, advocacy groups, and more are spread across 29 distinct categories denoted by double digits parenthetical to the 501(c), (e.g., 501(c)(3), 501(c)(12)). These groups annually file what is known as an IRS 990, which discloses a wide range of financial and activity-related information. All but the very smallest non-profit corporations are required to file this form, leading to a dataset of over 37 million filings since 2014. An analysis of this dataset was undertaken, focusing on activities between thrift stores and the broader category of art and

culture. Four main results are derived. First, it is observed that thrift stores play an observable role in the arts funding ecosystem. Second, the data demonstrates high degrees of locality and donor retention characterizing arts funding. Third, an analysis of art museum data discloses the influence of institutional prestige on funding levels. Fourth, exploring the district-level relationship between state and federal funding serves as an illustrative case of the general pattern. Moreover, it also addresses a critique of the use of this corpus hidden in the veiled language of tax policies aimed at enforcing privacy laws [9, 10].

### **Infrastructure Development**

Public and private funders have a critical working relationship that shapes infrastructure development for cultural institutions, efforts designed to renovate or elevate the physical and programmatic spaces where culture is produced, performed, and experienced. Funders have transformed vacant industrial spaces and dilapidated factory buildings into gleaming new cultural centers, adding space for galleries, theaters, exhibitions, screening rooms, and installations where artists can work and show their art. One private funder, who wishes to remain anonymous, gave money to a large museum to convert five industrial buildings on the fringe of a rapidly developing neighborhood into new galleries, administrative spaces, and a café, a renewal of the museum's historic commitment to pairing visual art with cutting-edge architecture. A few cultural institutions, mostly museums, have built entirely new homes in the last few years, with monumental new buildings cropping up in affluent cities across the globe. A city funder intends to give some of their money to a large ballet company which will use it to build a new theater. These are merely a selection of infrastructure projects across the cultural sector; another could point to renovated galleries for less than \$500,000, strings of new poetry reading series in borrowed spaces, theaters that became technically obsolete twenty years after they were built, or coffee shops that fortune had turned into a hip hangout. For cultural organizations, the space in which culture is presented and consumed is as central to the production of art as the art itself. The renovation marathon and building boom have already yielded many wonderful spaces that are beloved by arts administrators, artists, and audiences alike. They also raise significant concerns as public and private investment transforms how communities access and interact with culture. The following text details some of the dual benefits of infrastructure development raises some often-ignored challenges and concerns, and questions how well-designed spaces can operate sustainably over time, especially if future funding is uncertain and remote. Efforts draw on multiple outside sources and a small sample of cultural grantees across a single funder. Like much cultural philanthropy, funding aims to ensure the health of the sector and ultimately competitiveness for high-demand, low-odds funder money. These investments usually come in the form of major capital projects, with some focus on the newly popular areas of galleries and literary nonprofits. This text is rooted in developing projects intended to create or extend permanent cultural spaces and assumes that well-equipped spaces are intrinsically important for a culture to thrive in any community, large or small, rich or poor. Some well-documented benefits are excluded, such as increased cultural offerings, products, or audiences, and the fact that major infrastructure projects are statistically correlated with an increase in incremental giving or earned income. Instead, efforts speak to the less-documented benefits of attractive cultural offerings located in well-equipped communities. Another concern is that many successful cultural spaces, particularly non-traditional locales or with limited existing resources, face challenges as buildings age or as surrounding neighborhoods improve and costs rise [11, 12].

### **Program Expansion and Innovation**

Philanthropy, typically viewed as separate from independent journalism, can obstruct cultural discourse for marginalized groups. Despite challenges, strides are being made to bolster American democracy. Public engagement sits at an alarmingly low 0.5%, which contradicts efforts to diversify cultural institutions, leading to expensive borrowing rights. Consequently, initiatives for ambitious but ethically dubious exhibits arise, making success measurement complex. Key issues often overshadow aesthetic choices, inspiring innovative proposals historically supported by foundations, including: - Education aimed at diverse audiences with specific needs. - Reduced ticket prices to separate disengaged individuals from those priced out. - Outreach to rejuvenate Civil War narratives. - Adaptive programming addressing current events. Exhibitions frequently depend on seed funding, emphasizing the necessity of financial support to connect vision with reality. Despite changes in sovereign debt, there remains hope for transformative creativity, motivated by concerns over stunted artistic visions from prior collegiate experiences. Funding systems tend to favor initial concepts, complicating the emergence of transformative paradigms, while arts philanthropy often hesitates to embrace innovation due to the lack of dependable evaluation metrics [13, 14].

### **Case Studies of Successful Philanthropic Partnerships in Cultural Institutions**

As budget cuts impact arts and cultural institutions in the U.S. and Canada, individual wealth is at an all-time high. A sustainable funding model is essential for these institutions to preserve and enhance their cultural integrity. This responsibility is driving cultural institutions to foster philanthropy urgently, as individual efforts alone are insufficient. Collaborative philanthropy offers a significant opportunity to leverage societal wealth, benefiting the cultural sector through shared funding for exhibitions and programs that invest in culture. This argument is supported by five successful philanthropic collaborations among various art institutions in the U.S., showcasing partnerships that boost cultural output, engagement, and revenue. Despite diverse contexts, these cases highlight the need for a giving culture among individual donors, as well as the challenges and successes of nuanced collaborations to ensure mutual benefits. Transparency is emphasized, allowing each case to illustrate its strengths and weaknesses. The first four cases involve single institutions partnering with multiple philanthropists or foundations, while case five features a collaboration between two institutions [15, 16].

### **Challenges And Criticisms of Philanthropy in Cultural Institutions**

The announcement of the conversion of a gallery at New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art to the David H. Koch Plaza, after a donation of \$65 million, caused quite a stir in the museum world. It brought up for many museum professionals, academics, and critics, the more general issue of philanthropy in cultural institutions. Among the questions provoked are: What should be the balance of power between donors and cultural institutions? How much influence and control is proper? When is the influence of major donors apt to have negative effects? And what are the implications for cultural programming when exhibitions, the purchase of work, or other activities are shaped by donor agendas? One common criticism of philanthropic funding, shared by the museum and the arts, and by NGOs more generally, is that it does not always support what is most needed, but what donors are interested in. Why is it, as a researcher asked about Australia, that arts organizations receive monies for capital works, for example building a new wing, or funding for special projects but are unable to attract funding for the basic running costs? Funding pressure, especially where it biases priorities in favor of what makes an attractive fund-raising case, adds to the precariousness of the situation for many cultural organizations. Why is it that poor consumers of cultural organizations do not get the benefit of funding and end up permanently dependent on the privileged? Two broad sets of criticisms follow from these questions: that philanthropy does not effectively meet addressing the sustainability of the sector, and that there is a fundamental question about the propriety of the interventions of wealthy individuals in the sphere of publicly funded cultural institutions. On sustainability, on the one hand, it is suggested that it is unhealthy for organizations to have an increasing reliance on what remains an external source of income which may be withdrawn unexpectedly or reduced after an initial period. On the other, this intensifies competition and factions and leads to selection based on the ease with which one section of the elite can dominate a culture that fails to reflect the society within which it exists. That cultural investment remains concentrated heavily towards a small number of large institutions is viewed as "not only dysfunctional but morally wrong" [17, 18].

### **Power Dynamics**

Power dynamics are crucial in philanthropic engagements within cultural institutions. Donors, through financial contributions, often shape organizational priorities, programming, and decision-making. Conflicts arise when donor intentions differ from the institution's values or the community's needs. This issue is part of organizational philanthropy, involving financial investments by private or corporate donors in cultural, educational, or third-sector organizations. The relationship between donor and recipient is typically non-reciprocal, with the cultural institution committed to sustaining the donor's philanthropic act. However, this can lead to imbalances of power, as those with financial resources often exert significant control. Such power dynamics are particularly challenging in creative industries, which are vulnerable due to slim revenues and tendencies toward risk. The relationship between benefactors and cultural institutions influences the latter's creative freedom, often promoting repetition over innovation. Smaller cultural institutions, reliant on a few major donors, are especially prone to these vulnerabilities, which heighten the need for transparency and accountability. Nevertheless, financial dependence on individual donors can be mitigated through established systems and education. Recent strategies promote equitable relationships that facilitate dialogue and respect. Effective policies and organizational structures must be publicly binding and uphold core values. Decisions should involve diverse voices and consider community impacts. Partnerships where donor contributions are valued, and projects are jointly developed, can foster mutual benefits. Over time, this can create a landscape where cultural institutions and philanthropic organizations thrive collaboratively. Ultimately, these power structures reflect broader

societal and global climates and stimulate dialogue and resistance within the cultural consultancy sector [19, 20].

### **Sustainability and Dependence**

The recent international symposium on the role of philanthropy put forward various significant points on philanthropy's increasing significance in shaping cultural institutions. Organizations all over the world can learn from diverse types of models. The questions of Joanna's presentation, however, direct focus away from the instruments of philanthropy to the bigger and more important scale. Two dimensions of the scale question are addressed here: 'sustainability and dependence' and the conditions for getting beyond 'corporatist voluntarism' in philanthropy. Funded in partnership with the Arts Council of Great Britain, the research project Developing New Audiences between 1998 and 2005 was the largest social science research in the arts ever conducted in the UK. In the first phase, a nationally representative sample of 1,025 of the UK's 180,000 civil society organizations involving cultural activities – known as cultural organizations, were investigated. Besides an annual budget of US\$120 billion, most of this funding is from over 3 million unpaid volunteers. It is a global sector foundational to economic, social, and political life. Most public sponsorship, however, goes to a small number of professional National Arts Companies. Civil society's local foundations are one of the exceptions; but much of their funding – 54% by 2006 – is not philanthropic but government money widely recognized as lacking independence. Moreover, most other cultural organizations receive less than 1% corporate funding. There is, therefore, little guarantee of a complete cultural ecology even in the richest G7 countries. As the first question of the philatron presentation states, how does this foster innovative models and sustainable practices? An essential element to sustainability is how grant money reproduces grant money once funding from modest sources has been awarded. One of the rapid conclusions to derive from the first grant-money award by corporations, foundations, and trusts is that the possibility of sustained funding was remote. There are 12 key issues here [21, 22].

### **Best Practices and Ethical Considerations in Philanthropic Engagement with Cultural Institutions**

The cultural and intellectual transformation of the world, intensified by the global pandemic, necessitates a focus on philanthropy for organizations involved in cultural production and heritage. A new generation of donors has emerged with differing expectations regarding philanthropy, making it crucial to consider its role in the cultural sector. Key ethical and practical considerations for philanthropy in museums, galleries, libraries, theaters, and similar institutions are essential for guiding future discussions. Aligning donor goals with the organization's mission and expertise is vital for a mutually beneficial partnership and helps decline unsuitable offers. Both parties should ensure transparency about resources, expectations, and overall plans to avoid misrepresentation. Accountability to stakeholders fosters trust and should be pursued with due diligence to meet legal requirements. Public trust requires honesty, transparency, and the safeguarding of assets while managing conflicts of interest and ensuring open communication with stakeholders [23,24].

### **Future Trends and Opportunities for Philanthropy in Cultural Institutions**

Donors desire more participatory and socially impactful philanthropy. Baby boomers, born between 1946 and 1964, may step back from influential roles, making way for a new generation accustomed to digital crowdfunding and direct engagement in philanthropy. This younger demographic seeks more than traditional donations; they want involvement in community projects and educational workshops with tangible social benefits. Non-profit organizations can transition from a product-centric to a consumer-oriented approach, recognizing cultural activity consumers as individuals with distinct interests. Enhancing access and communication may involve leveraging digital platforms. A notable example is the National Theatre in the UK, which is expanding fundraising through digital solutions, reflecting a broader shift in cultural institutions toward online distribution. This technological advancement alters audience preferences and engagement patterns in the cultural sector [23, 25].

### **CONCLUSION**

Philanthropy remains a vital force in supporting and shaping cultural institutions, providing the necessary financial backing to sustain artistic expression, innovation, and accessibility. However, challenges such as donor influence, sustainability concerns, and inequitable distribution of funding highlight the need for greater transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations in philanthropic engagement. As cultural institutions adapt to evolving donor expectations and technological advancements, embracing participatory and digital funding models can ensure a more inclusive and sustainable future for arts and culture. By fostering collaborative partnerships and aligning philanthropic

efforts with the broader mission of cultural institutions, the sector can continue to thrive while maintaining artistic integrity and public trust.

## REFERENCES

1. Maclean M, Harvey C, Yang R, Mueller F. Elite philanthropy in the United States and United Kingdom in the new age of inequalities. *International journal of management reviews*. 2021 Jul;23(3):330-52. [wiley.com](https://www.wiley.com)
2. Haddad N. Philanthropic foundations and higher education: The politics of intermediary organizations. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 2021 Sep 19;92(6):897-926.
3. Butterfield A. Museums, Public Service, and Funding: Today's Conundrum, Tomorrow's Partnership?. *Curator: The Museum Journal*. 2001 Jan;44(1):35-46.
4. Betzler D, Loots E, Prokūpek M, Marques L, Grafenauer P. COVID-19 and the arts and cultural sectors: Investigating countries' contextual factors and early policy measures. *International journal of cultural policy*. 2021 Sep 19;27(6):796-814. [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)
5. Ingram G, McArthur JW, Vora P. How can digital public technologies accelerate progress on the Sustainable Development Goals. *Brookings*, last modified May. 2022 May 25;25.
6. Peck J, Kirk CP, Luangrath AW, Shu SB. Caring for the commons: Using psychological ownership to enhance stewardship behavior for public goods. *Journal of Marketing*. 2021 Mar;85(2):33-49. [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)
7. Causevic A, Macura B, Haque N, Solujic S, Ploskić A. Analyzing development finance flows in the Western Balkans' energy sector: a 2008–2020 perspective. *Energy, Sustainability and Society*. 2023 Dec 15;13(1):47. [springer.com](https://www.springer.com)
8. Nel de Koker J. Regulating volunteer directors' duties in companies registered with the Australian charities and not-for-profits commission. *The University of New South Wales Law Journal*. 2022 Jul 1;45(2):764-97.
9. Scott C, Wu J. Exploring the Impact of Retail Atmospherics on Plus-Size Consumers' Fashion Thrift Shopping Experiences. *Fashion Practice*. 2024 Nov 27:1-29.
10. Lang C, Liu C, Xia S. Mapping the Mind: Motivators and Barriers to Consumer Continuance of Online Fashion Resale. In *International Textile and Apparel Association Annual Conference Proceedings 2025* Jan 18 (Vol. 81, No. 1). Iowa State University Digital Press.
11. Rejeb A, Rejeb K, Appolloni A, Zailani S, Iranmanesh M. Navigating the landscape of public-private partnership research: a novel review using latent Dirichlet allocation. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2025 Feb 25;38(2):213-37. [emerald.com](https://www.emerald.com)
12. Bayliss K, Van Waeyenberge E, Bowles BO. Private equity and the regulation of financialised infrastructure: the case of Macquarie in Britain's water and energy networks. *New political economy*. 2023 Mar 4;28(2):155-72. [tandfonline.com](https://www.tandfonline.com)
13. Anderson MG, Clark M, Olivero AP, Barnett AR, Hall KR, Cornett MW, Ahlering M, Schindel M, Unnasch B, Schloss C, Cameron DR. A resilient and connected network of sites to sustain biodiversity under a changing climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2023 Feb 14;120(7):e2204434119. [pnas.org](https://www.pnas.org)
14. Meutia AA, Bachriadi D, Gafur NA. Environment degradation, health threats, and legality at the artisanal small-scale gold mining sites in Indonesia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2023 Sep 17;20(18):6774. [mdpi.com](https://www.mdpi.com)
15. Challoumis C. HOW TO TRANSFORM YOUR BUSINESS BY UNDERSTANDING THE AI AND MONEY CYCLE RELATIONSHIP. In *XVII International Scientific Conference 2024* Nov (pp. 393-426).
16. Chukwu E, Adu-Baah A, Niaz M, Nwagwu U, Chukwu MU. Navigating ethical supply chains: the intersection of diplomatic management and theological ethics. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts*. 2023 Jun 16;2(3):127-39. [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)
17. Alatawi IA, Ntim CG, Zras A, Elmagrhi MH. CSR, financial and non-financial performance in the tourism sector: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *International Review of Financial Analysis*. 2023 Oct 1;89:102734. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)
18. Akomea-Frimpong I, Kukah AS, Jin X, Osei-Kyei R, Pariafsai F. Green finance for green buildings: A systematic review and conceptual foundation. *Journal of cleaner production*. 2022 Jul 1;356:131869. [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)

19. Gruby RL, Enrici A, Betsill M, Le Cornu E, Basurto X, Co-Designers R. Opening the black box of conservation philanthropy: A co-produced research agenda on private foundations in marine conservation. *Marine Policy*. 2021 Oct 1;132:104645. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)
20. Yu Y, Appiah D, Zulu B, Adu-Poku KA. Integrating rural development, education, and management: Challenges and strategies. *Sustainability*. 2024 Jul 29;16(15):6474.
21. Maatman R, Broekhuizen K. Asset Manager, Pension Fund & ESG. *Pension Fund & ESG* (December 29, 2023). 2023 Dec 29.
22. Coelho R, Jayantilal S, Ferreira JJ. The impact of social responsibility on corporate financial performance: A systematic literature review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2023 Jul;30(4):1535-60. [wiley.com](https://www.wiley.com)
23. Elbers W, Arts B. Keeping body and soul together: Southern NGOs' strategic responses to donor constraints. *International review of administrative sciences*. 2011 Dec;77(4):713-32.
24. Kumar A, Chakrabarti S. Charity donor behavior: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*. 2023 Jan 1;35(1):1-46. [\[HTML\]](#)
25. Nolan C, Howard KA, Gulley KD, Gonzalez E. More than listening: harnessing the power of feedback to drive collaborative learning. *The Foundation Review*. 2019;11(2):11.

**CITE AS: Sarah Sachar (2025). The Role of Philanthropy in Shaping Cultural Institutions. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 6(3):95-101**