

# Giving and Volunteering in California



*Giving and Volunteering in California*

ISBN 0-9648477-6-0

Copyright © 2000, University of San Francisco

Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management  
College of Professional Studies  
University of San Francisco

2130 Fulton Street  
San Francisco, California 94117-1047

415.422.6867

Website: [www.inom.org](http://www.inom.org)

### *Dedication*

We dedicate this report to the memory of Richard J. Orend, Director of Research at the University of San Francisco's Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management from 1996 until his untimely death in September 1999. Dr. Orend conceived and designed this study and oversaw the data collection. All interviews had been completed at the time of his death. In his short time at the Institute, he initiated several important projects and became a respected figure in the world of nonprofit and philanthropic research.

### *Appreciation*

This study was funded by grants from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund.

The following colleagues made helpful comments on earlier drafts of this report: Eleanor Brown, Kevin Delucchi, William Diaz, Joseph Galaskiewicz, Michael Hall, Susan Saxon-Harrold, and Paul Schervish. Their suggestions greatly strengthened the report; any remaining faults are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Michael O'Neill  
William L. Roberts

*May 2000*

# Giving and Volunteering in California



Michael O'Neill  
William L. Roberts

---

Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management  
College of Professional Studies  
University of San Francisco

## CONTENTS

<i>Introduction and Executive Summary</i> .....	1
Purpose .....	1
Methodology .....	1
Outline of report .....	1
Principal findings .....	2
<i>Chapter 1. General Findings</i> .....	3
Giving.....	3
Volunteering.....	6
Informal giving and volunteering.....	6
How people make decisions about giving.....	8
Reasons for not giving.....	8
Initial contacts, reasons for volunteering .....	9
Reasons for not volunteering.....	10
Alternative forms of giving.....	11
Giving to political organizations .....	12
General attitudes.....	12
<i>Chapter 2. Demographic Characteristics and Charitable Behavior</i> .....	13
Gender .....	13
Age .....	14
Educational attainment .....	16
Religious affiliation.....	18
Religious activity.....	22
Income .....	25
Employment status .....	29
Sector of employment .....	31
Marital status .....	33
Parental status.....	35
Immigration status.....	37
Residential stability .....	39
Home ownership.....	41
Voter registration.....	43
<i>Chapter 3. Giving and Volunteering to Different Charitable Causes</i> .....	45
Recipients of organization-related volunteering .....	45
Recipients of time given to individuals.....	49
Religion as a recipient of charitable giving.....	50
<i>Chapter 4. Race/Ethnicity and Charitable Behavior</i> .....	51
<i>Chapter 5. Giving and Volunteering in Different Regions of California</i> .....	57
<i>Appendix A. Methodology</i> .....	61
Instrument design and data collection and processing .....	61
Weighting procedures.....	64
<i>Appendix B. Multivariate Analysis of Race/Ethnicity-Based Differences in Charitable Behavior</i> .....	66
Method.....	66
California sample .....	67

<i>Charitable giving</i> .....	67
<i>Individual giving</i> .....	69
<i>Charitable volunteering</i> .....	69
<i>Individual volunteering</i> .....	70
Alameda County sample .....	71
<i>Charitable giving</i> .....	72
<i>Individual giving</i> .....	72
<i>Charitable volunteering</i> .....	73
<i>Individual volunteering</i> .....	74
<i>References</i> .....	75

## TABLES

Table 1.1	Dimensions of Giving, California and U.S.....	5
Table 1.2	Dimensions of Volunteering, California and U.S.....	6
Table 1.3	Percentage of Households Giving and Amounts Given to Individuals, by Type of Recipient.....	7
Table 1.4	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering and Hours/Week Volunteered to Individuals, by Type of Helping Activity .....	8
Table 1.5	Percentage of Nongivers Reporting Various Reasons for Not Giving .....	9
Table 1.6	Volunteers' Initial Contacts with Charitable Organizations.....	9
Table 1.7	Reasons for Volunteering to Charitable Organizations .....	10
Table 1.8	Reasons for Not Volunteering to Charitable Organizations .....	11
Table 1.9	Percentage of Households Giving as a Result of Selected Fundraising Strategies.....	12
Table 2.1	Gender and Volunteering.....	14
Table 2.2	Age and Giving.....	15
Table 2.3	Age and Volunteering.....	16
Table 2.4	Educational Attainment and Giving.....	17
Table 2.5	Educational Attainment and Volunteering.....	18
Table 2.6	Religious Affiliation and Giving .....	20
Table 2.7	Religious Affiliation and Volunteering .....	21
Table 2.8	Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Catholics, and Giving .....	22
Table 2.9	Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Catholics, and Volunteering .....	22
Table 2.10	Giving and Frequency of Attendance at Religious Services .....	24
Table 2.11	Volunteering and Frequency of Attendance at Religious Services .....	25
Table 2.12	Household Income and Giving .....	27
Table 2.13	Household Income and Volunteering .....	28
Table 2.14	Employment Status and Giving .....	30
Table 2.15	Employment Status and Volunteering .....	31
Table 2.16	Sector of Employment and Giving .....	32
Table 2.17	Sector of Employment and Volunteering .....	33
Table 2.18	Marital Status and Giving.....	34
Table 2.19	Marital Status and Volunteering.....	35
Table 2.20	Parental Status and Giving.....	36
Table 2.21	Parental Status and Volunteering.....	37
Table 2.22	Immigration Status and Giving.....	38
Table 2.23	Immigration Status and Volunteering.....	39
Table 2.24	Residential Stability and Giving .....	40
Table 2.25	Residential Stability and Volunteering .....	41
Table 2.26	Home Ownership and Giving .....	42
Table 2.27	Home Ownership and Volunteering .....	43
Table 2.28	Voter Registration and Giving .....	44
Table 2.29	Voter Registration and Volunteering.....	44
Table 3.1	Percentage Volunteering for Different Types of Charitable Organizations .....	45
Table 3.2	Hours Per Week Volunteered to Different Types of Charitable Organizations .....	46

TABLES (Continued)

Table 3.3	Percentage of Volunteers Performing Type of Work in 12 Categories of Charitable Activity.....	47
Table 3.4	Distribution of Six Helping Activities Given to Individuals .....	49
Table 3.5	Distribution of Recipients Who Received Help From Volunteers in Six Helping Activities .....	50
Table 3.6	Distribution of Three Types of Giving to Religious Organizations .....	50
Table 4.1	Distribution of Race/Ethnicity in Alameda County and Statewide Samples.....	52
Table 4.2	Percentage Reporting Giving and Volunteering, by Race/Ethnicity .....	53
Table 4.3	Levels of Charitable Activity, by Race/Ethnicity .....	55
Table 5.1	Distribution of Unweighted Sample and Percentage of Adult Population in Designated Areas of California.....	58
Table 5.2	Charitable Activity, by Four Regional Areas in California .....	59
Table A-1	Comparison of Sample and California Population Percentages in 1999 .....	64
Table A-2	Results for Demographic Variables Used to Weight the California Sample to the Population .....	65
Table B-1	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying First Sequential Multiple Regression .....	67
Table B-2	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	68
Table B-3	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Second Sequential Multiple Regression .....	69
Table B-4	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	69
Table B-5	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Third Sequential Multiple Regression .....	70
Table B-6	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	70
Table B-7	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Fourth Sequential Multiple Regression .....	71
Table B-8	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	71
Table B-9	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying First Sequential Multiple Regression .....	72
Table B-10	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	72
Table B-11	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Second Sequential Multiple Regression .....	73

TABLES (Continued)

Table B-12	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	73
Table B-13	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Third Sequential Multiple Regression .....	73
Table B-14	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	74
Table B-15	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Fourth Sequential Multiple Regression .....	74
Table B-16	Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration.....	74

## *Introduction and Executive Summary*

This is a report on the first-ever statewide study of charitable giving and volunteering in California, the largest state in the United States and the world's seventh largest economy. California had an estimated 34 million residents in 1999, with an estimated 24.5 million adult residents (18 years of age or older). This study reports on the charitable behavior of a representative sample of those adult Californians.

**Purpose.** The objectives of the study were:

- to present a detailed picture of the charitable behavior of Californians in the late 1990s
- to lay the groundwork for future studies of this type in California, thus generating trend data
- to collaborate with other states and regions doing such research
- to contribute to the national and international quest for the best methods of conducting research on charitable behavior
- to investigate relationships between charitable activity and a variety of behavioral and demographic variables, especially race/ethnicity
- to elucidate possible differences in charitable activity in various regions of the state.

**Methodology.** Telephone interviews averaging 30 minutes were conducted from July 1998 to May 1999 with a statewide probability sample of 2,406 California adults and a probability sample of 1,210 African American, Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander adults in Alameda County, which includes Oakland, Berkeley, and other communities. Each of these three ethnic groups accounted for approximately one third of the respondents in the Alameda County sample. A detailed description of the methodology of the study is presented in Appendix A.

The survey instrument was designed following examination of several instruments used to study giving and volunteering, especially the one used by Independent Sector (IS) in several surveys done in the United States (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix E) and the one used by the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy in a 1997 survey in Canada (Hall et al., 1998). The California instrument is characterized by multiple questions eliciting respondents' recollections of various types of volunteering and giving. The California instrument devotes many more questions to "informal" giving and volunteering (charitable behavior directed immediately to persons rather than to or through organizations) than does the IS instrument, which includes one question about informal giving and one question about informal volunteering. The instrument used in the California study can be found at [www.inom.org/gvques.htm](http://www.inom.org/gvques.htm).

**Outline of report.** Chapter 1 presents information on general findings in the statewide survey, including total giving, total volunteering, and respondent attitudes on matters such as government spending on poverty. Chapter 2 reports on the relationship between charitable behavior and the demographic and behavioral characteristics of the individuals and households surveyed, except race/ethnicity. Chapter 3 summarizes findings on the organizational and individual recipients of Californians' charitable behavior. Chapter 4 analyzes the relationship between race/ethnicity and charitable behavior. Chapter 5 investigates whether there are differences in the extent of charitable behavior in different parts of the state. Chapters other than

Chapter 4 present data only from the statewide sample; Chapter 4 includes data from both the statewide sample and the Alameda County sample.

**Principal findings.** Following are some of the major findings of the California study of giving and volunteering.

- Californians report more formal giving than Americans generally.
  - Ninety percent of California households give to charitable organizations, as compared with 70% of households nationally.
  - California donors contribute 3% of their household income to charitable organizations, as compared with 2% given nationally.
- Californians and other Americans report the same rate of formal volunteering, but Californians give twice as much time.
  - Fifty percent of Californians volunteer for charitable organizations, consistent with national figures.
  - California volunteers give 8.5 hours per week to charitable organizations, compared to just over 4 hours nationally.
- California donors report mean household contributions of \$1,866 and median household contributions of \$628 in total giving (to both charitable organizations and individuals).
- Whites, African Americans, and Asian/Pacific Islanders report comparable levels and participation rates of giving and volunteering. Latinos report lower participation rates, especially in volunteering, but comparable or higher levels of giving and volunteering. However, when statistical controls for income, education, and immigration status are applied, differences in charitable behavior among the four ethnic/racial groups disappear.
- Charitable behavior in California is much less clearly associated with gender, age, income, educational attainment, marital status, and religious affiliation and activity than is the case with Americans generally.
- Nonprofit organization employees report giving and volunteering at higher levels than for-profit or government employees.
- People in different regions of the state report giving and volunteering at comparable levels and participation rates.

## Chapter 1. General Findings

**Giving.**<sup>1</sup> Ninety-two percent of households in the statewide sample reported giving some money or goods for charitable purposes in a 12-month period in the late 1990s<sup>2</sup>; 90% gave to charitable organizations and 57% gave informally, person to person. The mean gift of contributing households was \$1,866 and the median gift was \$628. Those who reported both household income and some giving contributed a mean of 4.5% and a median of 1.9% of household income.<sup>3</sup>

Table 1.1 shows total, informal (person-to-person), and formal (person-to-organization) giving for California, with comparisons to national figures on formal giving. The percentage of households giving to charitable organizations (90%) is considerably higher than the figure (70%) consistently reported in national studies by Independent Sector (IS).<sup>4</sup> The percentage of household income reported given to charitable organizations is 50% higher in California than in the nation as a whole.

While giving to organizations is the dominant mode of charity, nearly 60% of Californians reported giving money or goods to individuals, outside a charitable organization context. Although the amount given to individuals is less than half the amount given to organizations, the former is still substantial, with a mean of nearly \$600 contributed by all respondents and a mean

---

<sup>1</sup> This report will, when appropriate, include comparable data from Independent Sector (IS), which has conducted six surveys of giving and volunteering in the United States between 1987 and 1998. It is important to note that, although the IS questionnaire contains two questions on person-to-person giving and volunteering, their reported statistics generally include only giving to and volunteering for charitable organizations. Therefore comparisons will be made only between California and IS data with respect to volunteering for and giving to charitable organizations. As will be seen, reported levels of giving and volunteering in California are generally higher than reported giving and volunteering in the IS national surveys. There are many possible reasons for the reported differences. For example, Californians

- might be more generous than other Americans;
- might be more likely to overstate their giving and volunteering;
- might have more leisure time;
- might have greater tax incentives to practice charity;
- might be more attuned to charity or more effectively solicited by nonprofits.

It is also possible that the observed differences are due to methodological factors, such as the greater level of detail on both formal and informal charity in the California survey instrument, different interviewing methods (telephone vs. in-home), and the like.

<sup>2</sup> Interviews were conducted between July 1998 and May 1999, and questions about household giving included the phrase “in the last 12 months.” Therefore the giving reported would cover the time period July 1997 to May 1999. It was necessary to extend the planned interview period in order to complete the 3,600 interviews; see Appendix A.

<sup>3</sup> Of the unweighted statewide sample (n = 2,406), 72% of respondents (n = 1,732) reported household income. Throughout this report, data on “giving as a percentage of household income” include only respondents who reported household income as well as some household contributions.

<sup>4</sup> It is, however, consistent with the figure of 88% in a 1997 national study of Canadian giving, using a questionnaire more similar to that used in the California study (Hall et al., 1998). It is also consistent with studies of giving in the Boston area using a different methodology (Havens and Schervish, 1997).

of about \$1,000 given by contributors. This finding suggests that informal or person-to-person giving needs more attention in research on charitable behavior.

There is a substantial difference between mean and median contributions. While the present study will generally report means, consistent with IS, which reports only means, it is important to note this difference. Medians may be a more realistic way to portray the extent of giving and volunteering, because medians are not affected by skewed distributions. To give a common statistical example: if in a certain neighborhood 99 households have incomes of \$10,000 each and one household has an income of \$10 million, the mean household income in the neighborhood would be nearly \$110,000 but the median would be only \$10,000. For most purposes, median household income would be a more representative way to describe the neighborhood.

Table 1.1

Dimensions of Giving, California and U.S.								
Categories of Giving	%	<u>Contributing Households</u>			<u>All Households</u>			
		<u>California</u>		<u>U.S.</u>	<u>California</u>		<u>U.S.</u>	
		Median	Mean	Mean	Median	Mean	Mean	Mean
Total giving	91.7	\$628	\$1,866	na	\$538	\$1,712	na	
Total giving as % of income		1.9	4.5	na	.8	3.0	na	
Giving to individuals	57.4	\$200	\$1,006	na	\$20	\$577	na	
Giving to individuals as % of income		.5	2.4	na	>.1	1.0	na	
Giving to charitable organizations	89.9	\$375	\$1,247	\$1,017	\$300	\$1,121	\$696	
Giving to charit. orgs. as % of income		1.2	3.0	2.2	.5	2.2	1.7	
Income	71.7	\$37,000	\$49,198	\$46,637	\$35,000	\$47,685	\$41,484	

Income and giving data are for households, not individuals. The first column of figures gives the percentage of households reporting some positive activity relative to that row (e.g., giving to individuals). The median and mean dollar figures are based on households reporting contributions of a particular type (e.g., giving to charitable organizations). All figures in this table and throughout the report, except when noted, are based on the weighted statewide sample (n = 2,350); see Appendix A, "Weighting Procedures."

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Complete data from IS's 1998 study were not available at the time of this report. Therefore, all comparisons are to the 1996 IS study.

**Volunteering.** As shown in Table 1.2, 78% of Californians reported some formal (organization-related) or informal (person-to-person) volunteering activities in a 12-month period in the late 1990s. Californians who volunteered gave a mean of 16 hours and a median of 9 hours per week. Fifty-four percent of respondents reported volunteering for a charitable organization, and 73% said they had directly helped people other than household members.

The 54% engaged in formal volunteering is consistent with the findings of six IS studies, which have reported an average of about 50% of Americans volunteering for charitable organizations. However, the 8.5 hours per week of formal volunteering reported by Californians is more than twice the average level of about 4 hours per week reported in the IS studies (Saxon-Harrold, 1999, p. 2).

The formal/informal pattern seen in giving is reversed in volunteering: more people give to charitable organizations than give to individuals who are not household members, but more people help individuals than volunteer for charitable organizations. Also, far more people (90%) give to charitable organizations than volunteer (54%) for charitable organizations.

Table 1.2

Categories of Volunteering	Dimensions of Volunteering, California and U.S.				
	Percentage of Respondents		Hours/Week Volunteered*		
	Volunteering		California		U.S.
	California	U.S.	Median	Mean	Mean
	%	%			
Total volunteering	78.2	na	9.0	15.6	na
To individuals	72.9	na	5.0	10.3	na
To charitable organizations	54.2	48.8	4.8	8.5	4.2

\* By volunteers engaged in a particular kind of volunteering, e.g., giving time to individuals.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

**Informal giving and volunteering.** One of the chief objectives of this study was to get a clearer understanding of the extent and dynamics of informal (person-to-person) as distinguished from formal (person-to-organization) giving and volunteering. The substantive part of the interview began with the statement, “In the following questions, we will distinguish between volunteer work done for an organization, like a church or other charitable group, and the help you provide informally to family, friends, neighbors, or other people in your community.”<sup>6</sup> There is reason to believe that informal charity may be particularly important in some demographic groups, e.g., immigrant, minority, and low-income people (Smith, Shue, Vest, and Villareal, 1999). As reported above, informal giving and volunteering constitute a significant proportion of total giving and volunteering in California. Table 1.3 gives percentages of respondents who reported

<sup>6</sup> The introduction to the questions on informal volunteering began, “Now I have some questions about the other type of volunteering. Some people help on their own, not through a particular organization. Please try to recall any unpaid help you may have given to others in the past 12 months that was not done through or for an organization. Include all help given to relatives, friends, neighbors, or strangers. Please do not include help given to family members living in your household, or activities you have already mentioned [in the questions on formal volunteering]. If you help the same person in several different ways, be careful not to double count your time.”

giving person-to-person donations to various recipients (immediate family living in the household are excluded).

As Table 1.3 shows, nearly 40% of respondents reported giving money to homeless or street people, with median giving of \$25 during the 12-month period. A third of respondents gave to needy relatives, friends, or neighbors in the U.S., with median giving of \$200. While only 15% of respondents gave money or goods to needy relatives, friends, or neighbors in a foreign country, the mean giving from that group of donors was \$1,158, a substantial amount of charitable giving directed out of the U.S.

Table 1.3

Percentage of Households Giving and Amounts Given to Individuals, by Type of Recipient			
Types of Recipient	%	Mean	Median
Gave to homeless or street people	36.9	\$65	\$25
Gave to needy relatives, friends, or neighbors in this country	32.6	\$992	\$200
Gave to needy relatives, friends, or neighbors in a foreign county	15.4	\$1,158	\$500
Gave to other needy persons	7.5	\$676	\$100

Calculations for mean and median giving are based on amounts donated by those who gave to particular types of individuals, e.g., homeless or street people.

*Question: "People help each other in ways besides giving money, time or other things to organized groups. Now I have some questions about financial donations that you may have made directly to individuals. During the past 12 months, approximately what was the value of money, food or clothing given by you (and members of your family) to any of the following types of people?"<sup>7</sup>*

Respondents were also asked a series of questions about their practices of informal volunteering with respect to five different helping activities. Table 1.4 gives percentages of respondents who reported some help given to relatives, friends, neighbors, or strangers (family members living in the household are excluded). Like the preceding table, Table 1.4 indicates that informal, person-to-person charity is a significant part of Californians' lives. For example, nearly 60% of respondents reported providing emotional support to others, and more than half reported helping others with household tasks.

<sup>7</sup> When the data in a table relate to only one question in the survey instrument, that question will be quoted.

Table 1.4

Percentage of Respondents Volunteering and Hours/Week Volunteered to Individuals,  
by Type of Helping Activity

Types of Helping Activity	%	Mean	Median
Provided emotional support	56.6	3.6	2.0
Helped with household tasks	51.7	4.9	2.0
Helped with transportation and other special tasks	37.5	2.9	1.1
Provided health-related care or support	16.9	5.8	2.0
Taught or coached	13.5	3.4	2.0
Other type of help	13.2	3.9	1.0

Calculations for mean and median hours/week volunteered are based on respondents reporting some helping activity of a particular type, e.g., providing emotional support.

**How people make decisions about giving.** Married/partnered respondents were asked: “How are decisions made about financial giving in your household? Do you or your (spouse)(partner) each make your own decisions about the charitable organizations to which you make donations, do you make joint decisions, or is it a mixture of both?” Of the married/partnered respondents, 53% percent reported making joint decisions, 23% said “each decide on their own,” 23% said it was a mixture of both methods, and 1% said they didn’t know or declined to answer the question.

**Reasons for not giving.** Ten percent of households reported no contributions to charitable organizations. These respondents were asked to rate the importance of 12 possible reasons for not giving. As Table 1.5 shows, the reasons most often rated very important or somewhat important were related to personal financial ability: “could not afford to give money” (68%) and “want to save money for own future needs” (66%).<sup>8</sup> However, the next three highest rated reasons had to do with charitable organizations and their fundraising strategies: “money will not be used efficiently” (60%), “don’t have enough information about the charities” (52%), and “don’t like the way requests are made” (51%).

<sup>8</sup> These findings are consistent with those of IS: “The major reasons for not contributing at all among those respondents who reported no household contributions were that they could not afford to give money (62 percent); they were making less money this year than last year (44 percent). . . .” (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 104).

Table 1.5

Percentage of Nongivers Reporting Various Reasons for Not Giving.					
Reasons for Not Giving	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at all Important	Don't Know	No Answer
Because you didn't get around to it.	16.2	28.0	47.1	2.5	6.1
Because no one you know personally asked you to give.	27.5	11.5	54.2	3.5	3.4
Because you don't think there are any charities that deserve your support.	19.6	14.4	58.6	3.7	3.7
Because you want to save your money for your own future needs.	42.9	23.5	27.7	3.2	2.7
Because you do not know where to make a contribution.	18.9	14.3	56.9	5.6	4.3
Because you think the money will not be used efficiently.	34.7	25.1	31.5	3.8	4.8
Because you give voluntary time instead of giving money.	24.3	19.2	45.7	4.7	6.0
Because you feel that you already give enough money directly to people on your own, not through an organization.	24.1	16.6	49.5	3.1	6.6
Because you do not like the way in which requests are made for contributions.	23.8	26.9	38.5	3.7	7.1
Because you don't have enough information about the charities which ask you for a donation.	25.2	26.8	39.0	2.9	6.1
Because of tax law changes.	13.8	11.1	62.6	5.5	7.0
Because you could not afford to give money.	44.5	23.0	26.0	2.5	4.0

*Question: "I am going to read you some reasons others have given for not contributing money to charitable causes. For each, please tell me how important the reason was for you (and your family) not making charitable contributions during the last year. Was it a very important, somewhat important or not at all important reason?"*

**Initial contacts, reasons for volunteering.** Respondents (57%) who reported volunteering for charitable organizations were asked about their initial contacts and reasons for volunteering, with respect to the activity area and organization to which they gave the most time. As Table 1.6 shows, the most common initial contact came from the volunteer herself or himself, followed by requests from members of the organization, friends, or relatives.

Table 1.6

Volunteers' Initial Contacts with Charitable Organizations.	
Types of Initial Contact	%
Initiated contact myself	32.3
Member of organization asked me	28.1
Friend or relative outside organization asked me	12.9
Member of an organization	12.8
Responded to public appeal in newspaper, radio, TV	3.7
Boss or employer asked me	3.6
Relative or friend works there	2.3
Other responses	4.2

All calculations in this table are based on respondents who volunteered.

*Question: "How did you first become a volunteer of this organization?"*

As Table 1.7 shows, by far the most frequently given reason for volunteering was “to help others,” named by 42% of respondents. Feeling needed, wanting to do something useful, and anticipation of enjoying the volunteer work each were named by about 20% of the respondents. Previous research on volunteering has shown that people volunteer for both altruistic and self-oriented reasons. In the present study, with the exception of “thought I would enjoy the work” (19%), the non-altruistic reasons—“wanted to learn, get experience” (4%), “for social contact/to meet people” (3%), “job-related” (3%), “for job-like experience” (2%)—ranked well below the altruistic reasons.

Table 1.7

Reasons for Volunteering to Charitable Organizations	
Reasons for Volunteering	Percentage*
To help others	42.4
Felt I was needed	20.7
Wanted do something useful	20.2
Thought I would enjoy the work	18.6
Other reasons	13.2
Concern for specific people being served	11.6
Family member or friend would benefit	11.5
Civic responsibility	10.9
Religious concerns	7.8
Was asked to do it	6.9
Wanted to learn, get experience	4.4
Had lot of free time	4.3
For social contact/to meet people	3.1
Job-related	3.0
For job-like experience	1.8
Previously benefited from the activity	1.6

\* Of all volunteers, the percentage naming a particular reason for volunteering. Up to three reasons for volunteering could be named by the same respondent.

*Question: “Thinking back to when you originally volunteered for this type of organization, why did you first decide to volunteer for this activity?”*

**Reasons for not volunteering.** As reported in Table 1.2, 46 percent of respondents reported no volunteer work for charitable organizations during the past 12 months. These respondents were asked their reasons for not volunteering, and about a third of these individuals stated the reasons shown in Table 1.8. Lack of time was by far the most frequently given reason: no time because of too much work (35%) or family responsibilities (19%) or general reasons (13%) or other interests/hobbies (4%). Lack of time was followed by reasons over which charitable organizations might have more influence: “don’t know how to become involved” (13%) and “no one asked me” (11%).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The responses are generally similar to IS findings; see Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 114, Table 4.16.

Table 1.8

Reasons for Not Volunteering to Charitable Organizations	
Reasons for Not Volunteering	Percentage*
No time because of too much work	35.2
No time because of family responsibilities	18.9
Don't know how to become involved	13.1
No time because of general reasons	12.5
No one asked me	10.5
Health problems	7.7
Other reasons	5.9
Inconvenient because of lack of transportation	4.1
No time because of other interests/hobbies	3.9
Have no interest/just not interested	3.3
Prefer to give money instead of time	2.7
Too old	2.6
Volunteer enough time on own, not through an organization	2.6
Handicapped	2.1
Unwilling to make year-round/long-term commitment	2.0
No advantage to me	1.9
Already made my contribution/done my part <i>re</i> volunteering	1.7
Financial cost of volunteering	1.6
Don't like to	1.5
Just moved or been away	1.2

\* The percentage of respondents naming a particular reason for not volunteering. Up to three reasons for not volunteering could be named by the same respondent.

*Question: "There are many good reasons why people do not volunteer to formal organizations. What are the most important reasons why you have not volunteered during the past 12 months?"*

**Alternative forms of giving.** Much giving to charitable organizations takes place within an interpersonal context: people give as members of a religious congregation, or in response to a personal appeal, or through a workplace donation process, and so forth. Charitable organizations also use direct mail and telephone appeals, and there is increasing interest in fundraising through the internet. Several questions attempted to determine how people were being asked to give and how they were responding to different methods. Table 1.9 reports some of the results. No respondent reported giving as the result of an internet solicitation. Thirteen percent gave in response to mail requests, 10% gave in response to telephone solicitation, and 7% gave in response to media requests.

Table 1.9

Percentage of Households Giving as a Result of Selected Fundraising Strategies	
Fundraising Strategies	%
Gave for mail requests	13.1
Gave as result of telephone solicitation	9.7
Gave for media requests (i.e., TV, radio, articles)	7.1

**Giving to political organizations.** Although giving to political organizations is not recognized as charitable giving and is not reported as such in this study, a question about political giving was included to provide another reference point for charitable giving. People were asked, “In addition to charitable contributions, people also make voluntary contributions to political organizations, including political parties or candidates, and Political Action Committees (PACs). How much, if anything, have you (and the members of your family) contributed to these organizations in the last 12 months?” Only 10% of the respondents reported making political contributions. The mean reported contribution was \$152.76.

**General attitudes.** People were also asked about their general attitudes on a few items.

Asked to compare their financial condition to that of a year earlier, 34% said they were better off, 19% worse off, 45% about the same, and 2% said they didn’t know or refused to answer. Question: “We are interested in how people’s financial situation may have changed. Would you say that you are financially better off now than you were a year ago, are you financially worse off, or are things about the same?”

Asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that “government, at all levels, is currently spending too much money on programs to help the poor in this country,” 11% agreed strongly, 13% agreed somewhat, 24% disagreed somewhat, 31% disagreed strongly, and 21% said “neither” or “don’t know” or refused to answer.

When asked, “Overall, how much impact do you think **people like you** can have in making your community a better place to live—a big impact, a moderate impact, a small impact, or no impact at all?” 37% responded “big,” 31% “moderate,” 23% “small,” 6% “no impact at all,” and 3% refused to answer.

## *Chapter 2. Demographic Characteristics and Charitable Behavior*

This chapter discusses whether there are relationships between certain demographic or behavioral characteristics and charitable activity. Previous research has shown modest to powerful associations between charitable activity and age, gender, race/ethnicity, income, educational attainment, religious affiliation, religious activity, and other variables. Chapter 4 will be fully devoted to the question of whether race/ethnicity is significantly related to charitable behavior. All other demographic and behavioral associations are discussed in the present chapter.

**Gender.** In both the California study and the Independent Sector (IS) national studies, questions about giving relate to household not individual activity. It is clear from the California and other studies that men and women who are married or partnered often make giving decisions together. In the California study, 53% of married/partnered respondents said they made joint decisions about giving. Therefore household giving data cannot yield reliable information on the relative giving behavior of women and men. However, questions about volunteering relate to individual behavior, and therefore one can compare women and men with respect to volunteering.

Table 2.1 shows no differences between women and men in the percentage participating in total volunteering, volunteering to individuals, or volunteering to charitable organizations. By contrast, IS has consistently reported that women are somewhat more likely than men to volunteer to charitable organizations, with differences ranging from 3 to 13 percentage points (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 54; Saxon-Harrold, 1999, p. 7). Table 2.1 shows no significant difference between men and women with respect to number of hours per week volunteered, consistent with IS findings.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Strength of association between gender and volunteering was tested using Pearson correlations. Results from the California sample data indicated no association between gender and hours/week volunteered for total ( $r = .03$ ), individuals ( $r = .01$ ), or charitable organizations ( $r = .04$ ).

Table 2.1

Gender	Gender and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Male	78	na	15.0	na
Female	78	na	16.1	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Male	73	na	10.2	na
Female	73	na	10.5	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Male	54	45	8.1	4.2
Female	55	52	9.0	4.2

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Tables 2 and 3.

**Age.** Comparing the giving levels of various age groups is complicated by the fact that questions about giving relate to household not individual behavior. Also, the respondent was randomly selected within the household, by the criterion of most recent birthday. It is therefore possible, in an extreme case, to have an 18-year-old answering for a household that includes people in their 40s or 60s or older. However, this problem is somewhat mitigated by the fact that 24% of the households in the survey were single-adult households and an additional 42% were two-adult households where the two adults were married or partnered.<sup>11</sup>

Table 2.2 shows the percentage of households making charitable contributions, by age of respondent. With respect to total giving and giving to organizations, neither Californians nor Americans generally show major or consistent differences by age group of respondent. In the giving to individuals category, the percentage of households giving goes down with increase in respondent age.

Table 2.2 also reports giving as a percentage of household income, by age of respondents. The California data indicate that there is a general though not consistent association between giving as a percentage of household income and age. IS studies have reported that people of age 55 and above report a higher level of giving than do younger people and that, in general, “giving as a percentage of income increased with the age of the respondent” (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Table 1.9, p. 52; p. 142).

Although the reported giving figures are higher in California than in the U.S., the rank order is often the same or similar; e.g., in both studies, respondents aged 45-54 reported the highest percentage of participation, and respondents aged 55-64 reported the highest mean giving.

<sup>11</sup> The study did not collect data on age of the respondent’s spouse or partner, but such relationships tend not to be characterized by extreme age differences.

Table 2.2

Age Group	Age and Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	91.6	na	3.9	na
25 to 34 year olds	91.0	na	4.2	na
35 to 44 year olds	92.9	na	4.1	na
45 to 54 year olds	95.4	na	3.8	na
55 to 64 year olds	90.8	na	6.2	na
65 to 74 year olds	93.3	na	5.4	na
75 years or older	87.2	na	7.7	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	68.2	na	2.7	na
25 to 34 year olds	63.7	na	2.2	na
35 to 44 year olds	60.2	na	2.3	na
45 to 54 year olds	57.5	na	1.5	na
55 to 64 year olds	51.3	na	3.2	na
65 to 74 year olds	40.7	na	4.8	na
75 years or older	36.5	na	3.1	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	90.2	57.1	1.7	.7
25 to 34 year olds	88.1	66.9	2.7	1.6
35 to 44 year olds	91.3	68.5	2.6	2.6
45 to 54 year olds	93.8	78.5	2.9	1.8
55 to 64 year olds	89.9	71.7	4.4	3.6
65 to 74 year olds	93.3	73.0	3.2	2.8
75 years or older	85.1	61.5	6.4	3.7

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What year were you born?"

Is there an association between age and volunteering? Table 2.3 suggests that, both in California and nationally, formal volunteering tends to peak in the 35-54 age brackets; respondents at the younger and especially older ends of the age spectrum reported somewhat lower rates of volunteering related to charitable organizations. Informal volunteering—helping others on a person-to-person basis—is less clearly related to age.

Table 2.3 shows that California respondents 75 years of age and older reported fewer hours per week of volunteering, and respondents aged 18 to 24 reported more hours per week, than the age

groups between. Aside from the two age extremes, there was no association between age and hours per week volunteered, across age groups.<sup>12</sup>

Table 2.3

Age Group of Respondents	Age and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	79.5	na	18.5	na
25 to 34 year olds	69.9	na	16.1	na
35 to 44 year olds	81.1	na	15.2	na
45 to 54 year olds	86.4	na	15.2	na
55 to 64 year olds	80.7	na	15.3	na
65 to 74 year olds	79.9	na	16.1	na
75 years or older	69.6	na	9.8	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	78.3	na	11.9	na
25 to 34 year olds	65.6	na	11.3	na
35 to 44 year olds	76.5	na	9.6	na
45 to 54 year olds	78.6	na	9.9	na
55 to 64 year olds	75.5	na	10.8	na
65 to 74 year olds	73.3	na	11.3	na
75 years or older	64.9	na	6.2	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
18 to 24 year olds	47.7	38.4	11.3	2.8
25 to 34 year olds	47.9	50.8	8.0	4.3
35 to 44 year olds	62.3	55.0	8.0	4.3
45 to 54 year olds	57.9	55.3	9.2	4.5
55 to 64 year olds	54.6	47.9	7.6	4.8
65 to 74 year olds	51.0	44.7	8.9	4.1
75 years or older	49.7	33.7	5.6	4.4

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What year were you born?"

**Educational attainment.** The survey asked about the educational attainment of the respondent and the respondent's spouse/partner, if any. Assessing the relationship between educational attainment and giving presents the same problem noted above: measures of giving relate to household not individual behavior, and in some cases the household member randomly selected

<sup>12</sup> Eta square was calculated for each volunteering category as a measure of association between hours per week volunteered and age. No association with age was found for total volunteering (eta squared = .01), giving help to individuals (eta squared = .01), or volunteering to charitable organizations (eta squared = .01).

to be interviewed will not reflect the educational attainment of other adults in the household. This problem is somewhat mitigated by the fact that 24% of the respondents were from single-adult households and an additional 42% were from two-adult households where the two adults were married or partnered; of this group, 47% had the same educational level.

Educational attainment has in previous research generally been associated with higher levels of giving and volunteering. The California data reported in Table 2.4 provide little support for the idea that giving of any type is associated with educational level.<sup>13</sup> People with less education are slightly less likely to give; but they give at comparable or even higher levels, as measured by percentage of household income.

Table 2.4

Educational Attainment Levels	Educational Attainment and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	77.7	na	6.2	na
Some high school	86.9	na	4.8	na
High school graduate	92.3	na	4.2	na
Technical, trade, or business school	96.4	na	4.6	na
Some college	97.0	na	4.0	na
College graduate	96.7	na	4.4	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	49.5	na	6.1	na
Some high school	49.3	na	2.9	na
High school graduate	54.3	na	2.5	na
Technical, trade, or business school	66.2	na	1.7	na
Some college	63.3	na	1.6	na
College graduate	59.2	na	1.9	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	71.2	44.9	2.5	1.7
Some high school	85.5	47.5	3.2	1.1
High school graduate	90.8	67.2	2.6	1.8
Technical, trade, or business school	96.1	70.4	3.4	1.8
Some college	95.9	76.1	2.9	2.2
College graduate	95.3	82.3	3.3	2.8

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What was the last grade or class you completed in school?"

<sup>13</sup> Tests for a relationship between educational attainment and giving were carried out, using eta squared. No relationship of practical importance was found.

Table 2.5 provides some support for the education-volunteering relationship. People with more than a high school education are more likely to volunteer for charitable organizations and to help others. However, there are no significant differences with regard to hours per week given to individuals or to charitable organizations.

Table 2.5

Educational Attainment Levels	Educational Attainment and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	14.9	na	10.7	na
Some high school	64.3	na	20.8	na
High school graduate	88.0	na	16.2	na
Technical, trade, or business school	94.6	na	15.0	na
Some college	91.1	na	16.8	na
College graduate	92.6	na	13.0	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	10.5	na	10.8	na
Some high school	61.3	na	16.8	na
High school graduate	82.3	na	10.9	na
Technical, trade, or business school	89.4	na	9.2	na
Some college	87.6	na	10.9	na
College graduate	84.9	na	7.7	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Elementary to 8th grade	10.8	18.7	4.4	-
Some high school	35.3	26.1	8.7	3.3
High school graduate	55.9	43.1	9.4	4.0
Technical, trade, or business school	69.8	51.2	8.5	4.4
Some college	67.5	56.3	8.6	3.9
College graduate	72.2	70.7	7.6	4.8

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What was the last grade or class you completed in school?"

**Religious affiliation.** Previous research has shown differences between various religious groups with respect to charitable behavior. For example, the IS studies have consistently reported that Catholics give a significantly lower percentage of their household income than Protestants. Within Protestantism, some groups, like Mormons, show notably higher rates of giving and volunteering. As noted above, such findings must be qualified by the fact that, in IS and most other studies, measures of giving relate to household not individual behavior. In an extreme example, the respondent might be a non-religious man with a Protestant wife, an 18-year-old Buddhist son, and a Jewish mother, all living in the same household. This problem is mitigated in the California study by the fact that 24% of the respondents were from single-adult households

and an additional 42% were two-adult households in which the adults were married or partnered; 79% of the latter were of the same general religious affiliation (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other religion, and no religion).

Table 2.6 provides modest support for the hypothesis that religious groups give at different levels and participation rates. Of major religious groups in California, Catholics are slightly less likely to give to charitable organizations (which is not the case in the national data) though equally likely to give to individuals. Catholics report a lower percentage of household income given to charitable organizations than do Protestants, Jews, and people of other religions.<sup>14</sup> Catholics report giving a higher percentage of household income to individuals than the other religious groups.<sup>15</sup> Religious groups report giving a much higher percentage of their household income to charitable organizations than do respondents without any religious affiliation; however, the opposite is the case in giving to individuals.

---

<sup>14</sup> Analysis of variance was used as a test of statistical differences. Statistically significant differences between groups were found for percent of income given to charitable organizations,  $F(4, 1566) = 10.36$ , and for percent of income given to individuals,  $F(4, 1018) = 5.52$ . Follow-up analysis using Scheffe post hoc multiple comparisons revealed that Protestants were higher than Catholics and “no religion” households in giving to charitable organizations. “Other religion” households were higher than “no religion” households in giving to charitable organizations. “No religion” households were higher than Protestants in giving to individuals. No other group differences were found. These results may have occurred by chance because the test of homogeneity among groups was rejected for both types of giving.

<sup>15</sup> For further exploration of the possible “Hispanic effect” here, see Tables 2.8 and 2.9, and related text.

Table 2.6

Religious Affiliation	Religious Affiliation and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Catholic	89.5	na	4.2	na
Protestant	93.8	na	5.0	na
Jewish	95.8	na	4.8	na
Other religion	88.7	na	4.7	na
No religion	92.0	na	3.9	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Catholic	58.4	na	2.7	na
Protestant	59.1	na	1.7	na
Jewish	59.6	na	1.9	na
Other religion	55.2	na	1.6	na
No religion	52.5	na	3.5	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Catholic	86.7	73.2	2.4	1.4
Protestant	93.1	69.2	3.8	2.9
Jewish	95.8	67.7	3.5	1.2
Other religion	83.9	71.9	3.8	3.0
No religion	90.4	51.0	1.9	1.1

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What, if any, is your religious affiliation?"

The picture regarding volunteering is similarly mixed. As indicated in Table 2.7, Catholics are significantly less likely than other religious groups or those with no religion to volunteer for charitable organizations or give time to individuals.<sup>16</sup> Protestants report a higher rate of volunteering for charitable organizations than do Jews, but the two groups are comparable with respect to giving time to individuals. The Protestant-Catholic differences disappear with respect to the number of hours per week volunteered to charitable organizations, and Catholics report more time given to individuals than any other religious affiliation group. Protestants, Catholics, and people of other religious groups report a larger number of hours per week volunteered than do Jews, with respect to both volunteering for charitable organizations and giving time to individuals.

<sup>16</sup> Chi-square was used as a test of statistical differences.

Table 2.7

Religious Affiliation	Religious Affiliation and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Catholic	59.3	na	17.3	na
Protestant	89.5	na	15.7	na
Jewish	91.5	na	10.5	na
Other religion	81.1	na	16.1	na
No religion	86.1	na	13.6	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Catholic	53.0	na	11.9	na
Protestant	85.1	na	9.9	na
Jewish	85.4	na	6.9	na
Other religion	75.5	na	10.0	na
No religion	80.9	na	9.9	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Catholic	44.3	49.1	8.8	4.4
Protestant	64.6	48.8	8.7	4.2
Jewish	55.3	49.7	6.6	na
Other religion	56.3	60.8	9.8	5.3
No religion	50.2	39.7	7.3	2.7

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What, if any, is your religious affiliation?"

One of the unique characteristics of California's population is its high percentage of Latino residents: 24% of the unweighted statewide sample (n = 2,406) identified themselves as Hispanic, which is consistent with the most recent estimate (26%) of the percentage of Hispanics in the state's adult population (State of California, Department of Finance, 1998). As will be seen in Chapter 4, Hispanics differ sharply from non-Hispanic whites and from other minority groups relative to giving and volunteering. Because 74% of the Hispanic respondents identified themselves as Catholic and 58% of Catholic respondents were Hispanic, we tested for a possible "Hispanic effect" in the data on Catholic giving and volunteering, the hypothesis being that Hispanic Catholics give and volunteer less than non-Hispanic Catholics, possibly for reasons relating to economic and educational level, culture, and recency of immigration.

As shown in Table 2.8, the findings generally support the hypothesis: Hispanic Catholic households report a somewhat lower rate of participation in all three categories of giving than do non-Hispanic Catholic households, and Hispanic Catholic households report a somewhat lower

percentage of household income given to charitable organizations. However, Hispanic Catholic households report a higher percentage of household income given to individuals.<sup>17</sup>

Table 2.8

Categories of Charitable Giving	Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Catholics, and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	Hispanic Catholic	Non-Hispanic Catholic	Hispanic Catholic	Non-Hispanic Catholic
Total giving	84.6	96.1	4.6	3.9
To individuals	55.6	62.5	3.8	1.8
To charitable organizations	80.5	95.2	2.1	2.7

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

The findings on volunteering also partially support the hypothesis. As Table 2.9 shows, there are large differences between the two groups with respect to rates of participation in volunteering. Non-Hispanic Catholics were three times as likely as Hispanic Catholics to give time to charitable organizations and to individuals outside the home. However, there were no detectable differences found between Hispanic Catholics and non-Hispanic Catholics with respect to the average number of hours per week volunteered, in any category of volunteering.<sup>18</sup>

Table 2.9

Categories of Volunteering	Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Catholics, and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered	
	Hispanic Catholic	Non-Hispanic Catholic	Hispanic Catholic	Non-Hispanic Catholic
Total volunteering	33.3	94.9	16.1	17.8
To individuals	28.7	86.2	12.1	11.9
To charitable organizations	21.9	74.8	8.6	8.9

**Religious activity.** Previous research has shown that religious involvement (e.g., frequent church attendance) is a powerful predictor of both giving and volunteering. Historically, Californians

<sup>17</sup> Chi-square was used as a test of comparison that revealed no significant differences between Catholic groups on percentage of households giving to any category of charitable giving. Independent groups t tests revealed mixed results with regard to giving as a percentage of household income. A statistically significant difference was found between Hispanic Catholic households and non-Hispanic Catholic households with respect to giving to individuals [ $t(325)=3.76, p < .05$ ]. A moderate effect size of .42 indicated practical importance for this difference. No other statistically significant differences were found.

<sup>18</sup> Chi-square tests revealed statistically significant differences between the two groups on percentage of respondents volunteering for all three categories: Hispanic Catholics were lower than non-Hispanic Catholics in total volunteering, Chi-square(1) = 30,  $p < .001$ , volunteering to individuals, Chi-square(1) = 29,  $p < .001$ , and volunteering to charitable organizations, Chi-square(1) = 29,  $p < .001$ . Comparison of the two Catholic groups using a t test statistic showed no statistical significance in the average hours/week given for any categories of volunteered time.

and residents of Western states have been somewhat less likely than Americans generally to be members of a religious congregation and attend religious services. However, as this survey shows, Californians' religious activity is not greatly different from that of the nation. Gallup and other polls have shown consistently over several decades that about 40% of Americans say they attend religious services weekly and about 70% say they belong to some religious body. The California study found that 33% of the respondents said they attended religious services at least once a week, and 70% said they attended at least once a year.

Is there any evidence in the California study that frequent religious attendance is associated with more charitable activity? The data in Table 2.10 paint a mixed picture. On the one hand, there are no significant differences among the religious activity groups with respect to the percentage of households engaged in total giving or giving to charitable organizations; with respect to giving to individuals, there is a difference only for the group that reports not going to religious services at all. On the other hand, the data on percentage of household income given to charity provide some support for the hypothesis. People who attend religious services at least once a week give about twice the percentage of household income to charitable organizations as people who are less religiously active. As the table shows, this pattern is consistent with IS findings. There are no significant differences in the reported amounts given to individuals.

Table 2.10

Giving and Frequency of Attendance at Religious Services				
Frequency of Religious Attendance	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
At least once a week	92.2	na	6.4	na
About once a month	94.3	na	3.9	na
About 4 or 5 times	91.6	na	3.4	na
Once or twice	91.0	na	3.7	na
Not at all	91.4	na	3.8	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
At least once a week	61.9	na	2.5	na
About once a month	60.4	na	2.0	na
About 4 or 5 times	56.6	na	1.9	na
Once or twice	63.0	na	2.0	na
Not at all	48.8	na	2.9	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
At least once a week	89.5	83.1	4.7	3.4
About once a month	93.6	69.3	2.7	1.6
About 4 or 5 times	90.3	na	2.2	na
Once or twice	89.1	62.3	2.2	1.4
Not at all	89.8	48.9	2.2	1.1

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

*Question: "Other than on special occasions, such as weddings, funerals or baptisms, how often have you attended religious services or meetings in the past 12 months?"*

The findings with regard to religious attendance and volunteering provide modest support for the religiosity-charity hypothesis. Table 2.11 indicates that weekly and monthly church attenders are somewhat more likely than others to volunteer for charitable organizations, although there are no consistent differences with regard to giving time to individuals. By contrast, weekly church attenders nationally are twice as likely to volunteer for charitable organizations as people who don't attend at all. Californians who attend religious services at least once a week report more hours per week given to charitable organizations and to individuals than do people who attend religious services less frequently or not at all, consistent with national findings.

Table 2.11

Volunteering and Frequency of Attendance at Religious Services				
Frequency of Religious Attendance	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
At least once a week	75.9	na	18.7	na
About once a month	88.0	na	14.5	na
About 4 or 5 times	79.3	na	14.0	na
Once or twice	63.3	na	15.7	na
Not at all	84.8	na	13.4	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
At least once a week	69.8	na	12.0	na
About once a month	83.0	na	8.5	na
About 4 or 5 times	71.5	na	9.0	na
Once or twice	60.2	na	10.2	na
Not at all	80.8	na	10.2	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
At least once a week	59.8	63.8	9.7	4.7
About once a month	65.7	48.4	8.7	3.8
About 4 or 5 times	55.3	na	8.3	na
Once or twice	45.8	41.3	8.3	3.7
Not at all	47.2	30.9	6.7	3.8

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

*Question: "Other than on special occasions, such as weddings, funerals or baptisms, how often have you attended religious services or meetings in the past 12 months?"*

In summary, the California data provide only modest support for the hypothesis that religious activity is associated with charitable giving and volunteering; the relationship is not nearly as strong as is reported in IS national studies. Tests for a relationship between volunteering and religious activity and between giving and religious activity were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

**Income.** Are the poor more generous than the wealthy, or vice versa? Table 2.12 shows that, with the exception of households reporting less than \$10,000 annual income, there is no noticeable difference among various income groups with respect to the percentage of households reporting some giving, giving to charitable organizations, or giving to individuals.

Nor does Table 2.12 show any consistent relationship between household income and the percentage of household income given. Two things should be noted. First, the data on giving as a percentage of income in lower income groups are somewhat deceptive, because these figures do not include non-contributing households; when non-contributing households are added, giving levels in the lower income groups decline to approximately the same level as that of middle and

higher income groups.<sup>19</sup> Second, “giving as a percentage of household income” is a less reliable proxy for “generosity” as one goes up the income scale: as Rosenberg (1994) and others have argued, generosity among the affluent is better measured by percentage of income *and* percentage of wealth contributed.

---

<sup>19</sup> This phenomenon has been noted in other studies as well; see Schervish and Havens, 1995.

Table 2.12

Household Income	Household Income and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Under \$10,000	80.0	na	8.3	na
\$10,000 to 19,999	90.6	na	5.8	na
\$20,000 to 29,999	93.9	na	4.3	na
\$30,000 to 39,999	94.6	na	4.3	na
\$40,000 to 49,999	98.9	na	3.6	na
\$50,000 to 59,999	96.8	na	3.8	na
\$60,000 to 74,999	68.2	na	4.0	na
\$75,000 to 99,999	97.9	na	3.0	na
\$100,000 or more	98.6	na	3.6	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Under \$10,000	49.3	na	4.3	na
\$10,000 to 19,999	58.5	na	3.6	na
\$20,000 to 29,999	58.0	na	2.7	na
\$30,000 to 39,999	61.2	na	2.6	na
\$40,000 to 49,999	64.0	na	1.9	na
\$50,000 to 59,999	56.1	na	1.0	na
\$60,000 to 74,999	66.5	na	1.7	na
\$75,000 to 99,999	70.9	na	1.0	na
\$100,000 or more	65.0	na	2.0	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Under \$10,000	77.1	47.3	5.8	4.3
\$10,000 to 19,999	90.3	51.1	3.5	2.8
\$20,000 to 29,999	91.4	64.9	2.7	2.3
\$30,000 to 39,999	93.0	71.8	2.6	2.1
\$40,000 to 49,999	98.9	75.3	2.3	1.3
\$50,000 to 59,999	96.2	85.5	3.2	1.8
\$60,000 to 74,999	98.2	78.5	2.8	1.9
\$75,000 to 99,999	97.9	79.7	2.3	1.8
\$100,000 or more	97.9	88.6	2.3	3.4

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Table 2.13, by contrast, shows that participation rates in volunteering for charitable organizations rise with income level, consistent with national findings. On the other hand, the number of hours

per week volunteered to individuals is unrelated to household income for any of the three categories of volunteering.<sup>20</sup>

Table 2.13

Household Income	Household Income and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	Volunteering		California	U.S.
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Under \$10,000	77.1	na	12.8	na
\$10,000 to 19,999	71.5	na	17.0	na
\$20,000 to 29,999	80.0	na	16.1	na
\$30,000 to 39,999	87.2	na	18.6	na
\$40,000 to 49,999	93.7	na	17.0	na
\$50,000 to 59,999	96.2	na	14.0	na
\$60,000 to 74,999	96.5	na	14.3	na
\$75,000 to 99,999	94.3	na	13.0	na
\$100,000 or more	97.1	na	16.3	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Under \$10,000	71.9	na	9.3	na
\$10,000 to 19,999	68.6	na	10.4	na
\$20,000 to 29,999	76.3	na	11.6	na
\$30,000 to 39,999	84.3	na	13.3	na
\$40,000 to 49,999	87.9	na	11.1	na
\$50,000 to 59,999	89.8	na	8.5	na
\$60,000 to 74,999	91.2	na	8.7	na
\$75,000 to 99,999	84.4	na	8.3	na
\$100,000 or more	91.4	na	9.7	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Under \$10,000	44.3	34.7	7.3	3.6
\$10,000 to 19,999	46.2	34.3	11.1	3.2
\$20,000 to 29,999	51.0	45.2	8.0	3.7
\$30,000 to 39,999	56.2	46.0	9.0	3.7
\$40,000 to 49,999	62.6	52.7	9.9	5.8
\$50,000 to 59,999	67.5	64.1	8.2	5.1
\$60,000 to 74,999	71.2	56.4	8.2	4.4
\$75,000 to 99,999	80.9	64.8	6.5	4.0
\$100,000 or more	77.1	69.4	8.9	4.4

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

<sup>20</sup> Eta squared used as a test of association revealed no relationship of practical importance between household income and hours/week volunteered for any of the three categories of volunteering.

**Employment status.** Common sense suggests that a person's employment status might be related to both giving and volunteering. For example, people who are employed outside the home full time may have more money to contribute but less time to volunteer than people who are unemployed, retired, not working outside the home, or only working outside the home part-time. However, Table 2.14 reveals no clear relationship between respondents' employment status and percentage of the respondents' households making contributions, with the unsurprising exception of the unemployed, fewer of whom report giving to charitable organizations. Similarly, Table 2.14 shows no association between employment status and giving as a percentage of household income, with two unsurprising exceptions: unemployed people (with presumably lower household income) give amounts that are smaller in absolute terms but larger in relation to income, and retired people (with presumably lower incomes but some accumulated wealth) give a higher percentage of their income. The latter is consistent with IS findings: "Retirees gave the highest percentage of household income of all employment status groups" (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 53).<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> U.S. data are not reported in Tables 2.14 and 2.15 because the relevant questions in the California instrument (Q184) and the IS instrument (Q911, Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 208) are different.

Table 2.14

Employment Status	Employment Status and Giving	
	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Giving as % of Household Income*
<i>Total Giving</i>		
Full-time	94.0	4.0
Part-time	93.0	4.2
Mixed: full-time and part-time	89.9	3.9
Retired	91.1	6.2
Student	92.6	3.8
Unemployed	83.0	7.4
Not working outside of home	88.7	4.8
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Full-time	59.0	2.3
Part-time	62.7	1.9
Mixed: full-time and part-time	67.1	2.2
Retired	43.1	3.5
Student	59.3	2.5
Unemployed	57.7	2.9
Not working outside of home	58.7	2.2
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Full-time	92.2	2.6
Part-time	92.5	2.9
Mixed: full-time and part-time	88.0	2.3
Retired	89.9	4.5
Student	90.7	2.1
Unemployed	75.7	5.5
Not working outside of home	86.9	3.4

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

*Question: "Which category best describes your employment status during the past year?"*

Counter-intuitively, Table 2.15 shows that fewer unemployed people and people not working outside the home volunteer for charitable organizations than do any other employment group, including people who are working full-time. Students report the highest rate of volunteering for charitable organizations and giving time to individuals. Volunteering rates among retirees are comparable to those of people working full- or part-time. While a "common-sense" prediction would hold that a higher percentage of those with more discretionary time (retirees, unemployed, people not working outside the home) would volunteer, this does not prove to be the case. However, among those who volunteer, those with more discretionary time report comparable or higher number of hours per week volunteered.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Tests for a relationship between volunteering and employment status and between giving and employment status were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

Table 2.15

Employment Status and Volunteering		
Employment Status	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
<i>Total Volunteering</i>		
Full-time	80.3	14.4
Part-time	87.1	17.0
Mixed: full-time and part-time	76.5	22.8
Retired	77.1	14.6
Student	90.7	17.7
Unemployed	71.2	15.4
Not working outside of home	60.0	16.6
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Full-time	74.5	9.7
Part-time	85.1	11.4
Mixed: full-time and part-time	70.7	13.3
Retired	71.3	10.5
Student	90.6	9.8
Unemployed	67.9	10.4
Not working outside of home	55.7	10.1
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Full-time	55.0	7.9
Part-time	62.4	8.2
Mixed: full-time and part-time	57.7	13.8
Retired	51.7	7.3
Student	74.1	10.0
Unemployed	42.9	9.1
Not working outside of home	43.5	9.9

\* By volunteers only.

Question: "Which category best describes your employment status during the past year?"

**Sector of employment.** Does sector of employment have any relationship to giving and volunteering? For example, are people who work for nonprofit charitable organizations any more likely to give to and volunteer for these organizations? The following tables present some information related to this question. The same caveat about mixing household and individual characteristics applies: measures of giving are related to households, not individuals, and the respondent could be working in a different sector than are other adult household members.

The data in Table 2.16 show no association between the respondents' sector of employment and the likelihood of the respondents' households making contributions. Nonprofit employees are no more or less likely to report household giving to charitable organizations or to individuals. However, nonprofit respondents report higher levels of giving to both charitable organizations and to individuals, as measured by giving as a percentage of household income. In fact, nonprofit

employees give nearly twice as much of their household income to charitable organizations than do for-profit and government employees.<sup>23</sup>

Table 2.16

Sector of Employment and Giving		
Sector of Employment	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Giving as % of Household Income*
<i>Total Giving</i>		
Self-employed	91.0	5.7
Work for for-profit	93.1	4.2
Work for nonprofit	94.6	6.8
Work for federal govt.	98.0	3.8
Work for state govt.	98.9	3.6
Work for local govt.	94.6	3.7
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Self-employed	55.6	2.5
Work for for-profit	59.2	2.4
Work for nonprofit	60.0	2.9
Work for federal govt.	63.0	2.6
Work for state govt.	52.2	1.9
Work for local govt.	54.5	1.3
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Self-employed	90.1	4.1
Work for for-profit	90.9	2.6
Work for nonprofit	94.6	4.8
Work for federal govt.	94.0	1.9
Work for state govt.	96.7	2.6
Work for local govt.	92.0	2.8

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

*Question: "Which of the following categories best describes the type of business (you work in) (worked in before you retired) (work in when you have a job)? Are/were you . . ."*

Similarly, as shown in Table 2.17, nonprofit employees are more likely to volunteer than for-profit and government employees. There is a 20-25 percentage point difference between nonprofit and for-profit employees with respect to volunteering for charitable organizations and giving time to individuals. There are smaller differences between nonprofit, for-profit, and government employees with respect to hours per week volunteered. While nonprofit employees report slightly more hours of volunteering for charitable organizations than do for-profit and government employees, for-profit employees report more time given to individuals.

<sup>23</sup> No U.S. data are reported in Tables 2.16 and 2.17 because there is no comparable question in the IS instrument.

Table 2.17

Sector of Employment and Volunteering		
Sector of Employment	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
<i>Total Volunteering</i>		
Self-employed	83.5	15.9
Work for for-profit	75.2	16.2
Work for nonprofit	96.9	15.0
Work for federal govt.	90.0	12.1
Work for state govt.	91.2	13.7
Work for local govt.	93.8	14.0
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Self-employed	78.9	9.6
Work for for-profit	70.8	11.5
Work for nonprofit	93.1	8.6
Work for federal govt.	72.0	8.6
Work for state govt.	88.9	8.8
Work for local govt.	91.9	7.6
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Self-employed	59.0	9.7
Work for for-profit	49.2	8.1
Work for nonprofit	74.6	8.9
Work for federal govt.	69.0	6.9
Work for state govt.	70.0	6.8
Work for local govt.	71.2	8.7

\* By volunteers only.

*Question: "Which of the govt. following categories best describes the type of business (you work in) (worked in before you retired) (work in when you have a job)? Are/were you . . ."*

**Marital status.** Independent Sector's national studies have consistently shown higher participation rates and levels of giving and volunteering among married persons than among single or divorced, separated, or widowed persons (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, pp. 49-50, 54). The California study does not support this finding.

Table 2.18 shows no relationship between marital status and percentage of households giving to charitable organizations and at best a mixed relationship between marital status and giving to individuals, for the California respondents. With respect to giving as a percentage of household income, widowed Californians report higher levels of giving to both charitable organizations and individuals than do any other marital status category.

Table 2.18

Marital Status	Marital Status and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Married	91.1	na	4.4	na
Living with a partner	93.5	na	3.1	na
Single	92.5	na	4.0	na
Divorced or separated	93.4	na	5.0	na
Widowed	89.3	na	6.7	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Married	56.5	na	2.2	na
Living with a partner	71.0	na	2.0	na
Single	62.4	na	2.2	na
Divorced or separated	55.1	na	2.7	na
Widowed	42.6	na	4.6	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Married	89.2	78.0	3.0	2.4
Living with a partner	88.7	49.5	1.6	1.3
Single	91.3	54.9	2.5	1.3
Divorced or separated	92.3	58.7	3.4	2.2
Widowed	85.9	57.1	4.9	3.3

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What is your marital status?"

Similarly, Table 2.19 shows no relationship between marital status and percentage of people volunteering or hours per week volunteered, either to charitable organizations or to individuals.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Tests for a relationship between volunteering and marital status and between giving and marital status were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

Table 2.19

Marital Status	Marital Status and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Married	74.6	na	15.1	na
Living with a partner	96.8	na	13.3	na
Single	81.4	na	17.3	na
Divorced or separated	86.1	na	14.4	na
Widowed	73.2	na	15.6	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Married	68.4	na	10.0	na
Living with a partner	83.9	na	9.7	na
Single	77.7	na	11.3	na
Divorced or separated	83.6	na	9.9	na
Widowed	67.8	na	10.2	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Married	54.4	55.8	8.2	4.6
Living with a partner	64.5	31.0	7.2	na
Single	53.8	39.5	9.8	2.8
Divorced or separated	54.4	44.6	7.6	3.9
Widowed	50.3	36.5	8.8	3.7

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "What is your marital status?"

**Parental status.** As with marital status, there could conceivably be an association between parental status and charitable behavior. For example, parents with school-age children may become more involved in volunteering, because of school-related activities. The following tables investigate this relationship in the California sample.

Table 2.20 shows no association between parental status and the percentage of households making charitable contributions, in any category of giving. The table shows no consistent relationship between parental status and giving as a percentage of household income. The amount given to charitable organizations is comparable for all parental status groups except respondents with only college-age children, which respondents give more; however, these respondents report a comparable or lower level of giving to individuals.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> U.S. data are not reported in Tables 2.20 and 2.21 because the parental status questions in the California instrument (Q175-183) and in the IS instrument (Q901-903, Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 206) are different.

Table 2.20

Parental Status and Giving		
Parental Status	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Giving as % of Household Income*
<i>Total Giving</i>		
No children in household	91.5	4.6
Only school age children	90.7	4.2
Only college age children	96.2	5.7
School & college age children	94.6	3.8
<i>To Individuals</i>		
No children in household	53.6	2.8
Only school age children	61.7	2.0
Only college age children	64.9	1.6
School & college age children	58.1	1.2
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
No children in household	89.8	2.9
Only school age children	89.0	2.9
Only college age children	90.8	4.6
School & college age children	94.6	3.1

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

As shown in Table 2.21, respondents with only school-age children report somewhat lower rates of participation in volunteering for charitable organizations and giving time to individuals than do respondents in other parental status categories. This may suggest that parents with younger children have less discretionary time to give to outside agencies and individuals. However, people with no children in the household report lower rates of volunteering than do people with college-age or school- and college-age children, which does not seem to support the “discretionary time” hypothesis. Similarly, Table 2.21 shows no consistent relationship between parental status and hours per week volunteered. People with both school- and college-age children report a surprisingly large number of hours per week volunteered for charitable organizations and to individuals outside the household.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Tests for a relationship between giving and parental status and volunteering and parental status were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

Table 2.21

Parental Status	Parental Status and Volunteering	
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
<i>Total Volunteering</i>		
No children in household	80.9	15.7
Only school age children	70.6	14.8
Only college age children	91.7	14.0
School & college age children	90.7	21.2
<i>To Individuals</i>		
No children in household	75.7	11.0
Only school age children	65.8	9.6
Only college age children	88.5	8.0
School & college age children	82.7	10.6
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
No children in household	53.6	8.2
Only school age children	51.7	8.1
Only college age children	59.5	9.6
School & college age children	78.7	13.4

\* By volunteers only.

**Immigration status.** California is a state with a high percentage of foreign-born residents. Nativity status and recency of immigration may be importantly related to giving and volunteering. For example, a study of charitable behavior in eight minority groups concluded that immigrants and first-generation residents give and volunteer in different ways than groups who have lived longer in the United States, with the former more likely to engage in person-to-person charitable behavior and the latter more likely to engage in person-to-organization charitable behavior (Smith, Shue, Vest, and Villareal, 1999).

Table 2.22 shows a relationship between percentage of households making contributions and the respondents' nativity status and recency of immigration. People born in the United States were more likely than people born elsewhere to give to charitable organizations and, among the latter group, participation in giving increased as years in the U.S. went up. Giving to individuals shows no consistent differences among the groups.

Table 2.22 also indicates that Californians born in the U.S. gave a higher percentage of household income to charitable organizations than those born elsewhere, and that for the latter group, level of giving tends to increase the longer one has lived in the U.S. However, immigrants gave a much higher percentage of household income to individuals than did the native-born, and the giving level of recently arrived immigrants is much higher than that of immigrants who have lived here longer. The data presented in Table 2.22 provide support for the conclusion of the study cited above (Smith et al., 1999) with regard to differences in types of charitable behavior as related to nativity status and recency of immigration. The data also underline the importance of studying both formal and informal giving and volunteering.

Table 2.22

Immigration Status	Immigration Status and Giving			
	Percentage of Households Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household Income*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Born in U.S.	94.1	na	4.4	na
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	82.7	na	7.7	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	75.5	na	6.3	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	90.0	na	4.0	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	89.1	na	4.5	na
Resident for 40 or more years	88.6	na	6.9	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Born in U.S.	57.0	na	1.8	na
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	55.6	na	9.1	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	50.5	na	5.7	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	63.3	na	3.3	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	58.5	na	2.9	na
Resident for 40 or more years	68.9	na	4.5	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Born in U.S.	93.1	69.9	3.2	2.2
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	79.0	na	1.7	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	72.6	na	1.9	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	86.9	na	1.8	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	82.5	na	2.5	na
Resident for 40 or more years	88.6	na	3.2	na

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "In what country were you born? [If not born in U.S. ask] How long have you lived in the United States?"

Table 2.23 shows dramatic differences in the percentage of individuals volunteering, as related to nativity status and recency of immigration. People born in the U.S. are far more likely to report volunteering for charitable organizations and giving time to individuals, and the participation rate rises with more years in the U.S. However, the hours per week volunteered are comparable between immigrants and people born in the U.S., and there are no clear patterns in hours per week volunteered as related to recency of immigration.

Table 2.23

Immigration Status	Immigration Status and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Born in U.S.	92.8	na	16.0	na
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	40.7	na	9.9	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	24.8	na	10.8	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	37.5	na	12.3	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	57.4	na	11.7	na
Resident for 40 or more years	73.3	na	29.0	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Born in U.S.	87.6	na	10.4	na
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	40.7	na	6.3	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	20.0	na	11.5	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	27.6	na	9.0	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	53.8	na	8.1	na
Resident for 40 or more years	72.7	na	20.8	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Born in U.S.	65.7	49.9	8.7	4.3
Not born in U.S.				
Resident for 5 or fewer years	12.3	na	11.9	na
Resident for 6 to 9 years	13.2	na	2.8	na
Resident for 10 to 19 years	25.5	na	8.2	na
Resident for 20 to 39 years	37.5	na	6.3	na
Resident for 40 or more years	56.8	na	11.0	na

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "In what country were you born? [If not born in U.S. ask] How long have you lived in the United States?"

**Residential stability.** Are people who have lived in a particular community or neighborhood for a long time more likely to be involved in giving and volunteering? Such a relationship would be particularly relevant to California, long the "golden dream" magnet for many migrants from other parts of the U.S. and, especially in the last few decades, for immigrants from other countries. Also, changing economic and other conditions have led to considerable movement within the state. There may be considerably less residential stability in California than in most other states (about a third of the respondents in this study had lived in their present communities for five or fewer years), and this may have a detrimental effect on giving and volunteering.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> No U.S. data are reported in Tables 2.24 and 2.25 because there is no comparable question in the IS instrument.

Table 2.24 shows no relationship between residential stability and the percentage of households giving to either charitable organizations or individuals. Also, the data show no association between residential stability and the percentage of household income given to charity, for households that made some contributions.<sup>28</sup>

Table 2.24

Residential Stability and Giving		
Years in Same Community	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Giving as % of Household Income*
<i>Total Giving</i>		
Less than one year	91.5	4.3
One to 2 years	91.5	5.6
Three to 5 years	89.9	4.4
Six to 10 years	92.0	4.7
Eleven to 20 years	90.5	4.4
More than 20 years	93.7	4.1
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Less than one year	61.6	2.8
One to 2 years	64.2	3.6
Three to 5 years	58.1	1.9
Six to 10 years	61.6	2.7
Eleven to 20 years	60.9	2.4
More than 20 years	48.6	1.5
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Less than one year	89.4	2.2
One to 2 years	88.9	3.0
Three to 5 years	86.8	3.3
Six to 10 years	89.9	2.9
Eleven to 20 years	89.7	2.8
More than 20 years	92.8	3.3

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

*Question: "How long (in years) have you resided in your community? [If questioned, say "neighborhood."]"*

Table 2.25 shows no clear support for the residential stability hypothesis, although people who have lived in the same community for more than 20 years are somewhat more likely to volunteer and to give more time than are people who have lived in the same community for shorter periods.

<sup>28</sup> Tests for a relationship between giving and residential stability and volunteering and residential stability were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

Table 2.25

Residential Stability and Volunteering		
Years in Same Community	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
<i>Total Volunteering</i>		
Less than one year	76.9	14.2
One to 2 years	73.4	10.9
Three to 5 years	74.0	17.7
Six to 10 years	69.3	15.7
Eleven to 20 years	76.0	15.4
More than 20 years	90.7	16.5
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Less than one year	71.9	9.5
One to 2 years	66.8	8.1
Three to 5 years	69.0	12.3
Six to 10 years	64.0	10.7
Eleven to 20 years	71.9	10.0
More than 20 years	84.7	10.4
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Less than one year	48.2	8.6
One to 2 years	43.9	5.9
Three to 5 years	56.3	8.3
Six to 10 years	52.4	7.7
Eleven to 20 years	51.4	8.8
More than 20 years	63.0	9.6

\* By volunteers only.

*Question: "How long (in years) have you resided in your community? [If questioned, say "neighborhood."]"*

**Home ownership.** A similar question is whether people who own their own homes are more or less likely to engage in charitable activity than people who rent or make other residential arrangements. Californians have a lower home ownership rate than other Americans, due primarily to the high cost of residential property in California. Only about half the respondents in the present study said they owned their own home, as compared with two thirds of the respondents in the IS 1996 national study (Hodginson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1).

Table 2.26 indicates that there is no difference between owners and non-owners with respect to the percentage of households making contributions. This is inconsistent with IS data, which show sharp differences in favor of homeowners. California homeowners report a somewhat higher level of giving, as measured by the percentage of household income given, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 2.26

Home Ownership Status	Home Ownership and Giving		Mean Giving as % of Household	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Giving</i>				
Own	93.8	na	4.7	na
Rent	89.7	na	4.4	na
Other	95.5	na	3.2	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Own	55.9	na	2.2	na
Rent	58.5	na	2.6	na
Other	66.3	na	.9	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Own	92.5	76.1	3.3	2.4
Rent	87.0	53.7	2.7	1.4
Other	95.5	55.5	2.5	1.9

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "Do you own or rent your primary home?"

Similarly, Table 2.27 shows no consistent differences between owners and non-owners in the California data, with respect to the percentage of people giving time or the amount of time given.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Tests for a relationship between giving and home ownership and between volunteering and home ownership were carried out, using eta squared. No relationships of practical importance were found.

Table 2.27

Home Ownership Status	Home Ownership and Volunteering			
	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering		Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
<i>Total Volunteering</i>				
Own	86.0	na	15.7	na
Rent	70.0	na	15.4	na
Other	86.5	na	15.6	na
<i>To Individuals</i>				
Own	79.7	na	10.1	na
Rent	65.5	na	10.8	na
Other	84.3	na	9.0	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>				
Own	64.0	53.2	8.5	4.2
Rent	43.7	41.5	8.4	4.1
Other	67.4	35.9	8.9	na

\* By volunteers only.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.

Question: "Do you own or rent your primary home?"

**Voter registration.** Theories of civil society going as far back as Alexis de Tocqueville would suggest that there is a strong positive correlation between charitable behavior and civic behavior such as registering to vote and voting regularly. Is voter registration status, in fact, associated with higher rates and levels of giving and volunteering?

Respondents were asked whether they were registered voters; 67% responded "yes" and 33% responded "no." Table 2.28 shows a small difference between registered voters and others, with regard to the percentage of households giving to charitable organizations, and comparable rates of participation in giving to individuals. With respect to the percentage of household income given, registered voters gave more than others to charitable organizations, and people not registered to vote gave much more than registered voters to individuals.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> U.S. data are not presented in Tables 2.28 and 2.29 because the relevant questions in the California instrument (Q161) and the IS instrument (Q920, Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, p. 209) are different.

Table 2.28

Voter Registration and Giving		
Voter Registration Status	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Giving as % of Household Income*
<i>Total Giving</i>		
Registered voter	94.4	4.4
Not registered voter	86.5	4.8
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Registered voter	58.1	1.7
Not registered voter	56.4	3.9
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Registered voter	93.4	3.3
Not registered voter	83.1	2.2

\* By contributing households reporting household income.

Question: "Are you a registered voter in this community?"

Table 2.29 shows large differences in volunteering between people who are registered voters and those who are not. There is a 34-percentage point difference between the two groups with respect to the percentage of people volunteering, in all three categories of volunteering. However, among those who volunteer, there is no difference between registered voters and others with respect to the number of hours per week volunteered.

Tables 2.28 and 2.29 provide some support for the charitable behavior—civic behavior hypothesis, at least with respect to the percentage of people giving and volunteering to both charitable organizations and individuals.

Table 2.29

Voter Registration and Volunteering		
Voter Registration Status	Percentage of Respondents Volunteering	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
<i>Total Volunteering</i>		
Registered voter	89.5	15.9
Not registered voter	55.4	14.8
<i>To Individuals</i>		
Registered voter	84.1	10.3
Not registered voter	50.5	10.7
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>		
Registered voter	65.5	8.5
Not registered voter	32.0	8.7

\* By volunteers only.

Question: "Are you a registered voter in this community?"

### Chapter 3. Giving and Volunteering to Different Charitable Causes

Americans give to and volunteer for a wide variety of charitable causes. This chapter explores the objects of Californians' charitable behavior and examines how these compare with the charitable choices that Americans in general make. In studying volunteering for charitable organizations, the California study, like the Independent Sector studies, used the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE), a classification system for nonprofit organizations.<sup>31</sup>

**Recipients of organization-related volunteering.** Table 3.1 shows that education and religion are the principal recipients of Californians' donations of volunteer work. These are also the leading recipients of volunteering nationally; but in the national studies religion, not education, heads the list. In general, as Table 3.1 indicates, the volunteering priorities of Californians are highly similar to those of Americans generally.

Table 3.1

Percentage Volunteering for Different Types of Charitable Organizations				
Types of Charitable Organization	All Respondents		Volunteers Only	
	California	U.S.	California	U.S.
Education	28.8	17.5	37.3	35.9
Religion	23.5	25.8	37.1	52.9
Youth development or recreation	14.2	15.4	22.5	31.6
Health	13.8	13.2	21.4	27.0
Human or social services	12.5	12.7	18.6	26.0
Neighborhood	11.1	na	15.5	na
Community action, political, or civil rights	6.9	3.8	12.0	7.8
Environmental, conservation, or animal protection	6.9	7.1	9.5	14.5
Work-related	6.0	7.9	10.1	16.2
Civic, social, and fraternal	4.9	6.7	9.1	13.7
Arts, cultural, and humanities	4.4	6.2	7.1	12.7
International	2.0	1.6	3.6	3.3

In both California and national surveys, respondents could name multiple types of charitable organizations for which they volunteered; therefore, percentages may exceed 100%.

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Table 1.6, p. 31.

Table 3.2 shows the mean hours per week volunteered for each of the 12 types of charitable organizations. Volunteers gave approximately the same amount of time to different types of charitable organizations. The apparent exceptions (international, work-related, civic/social/fraternal) may be spurious, due to the low number of respondents selecting these types (see Table 3.1).

<sup>31</sup> A limitation of the questionnaire prevents us from reporting on *giving* to all categories of charitable organizations. However, information will be presented on giving to religion.

Table 3.2

Hours Per Week Volunteered to Different Types of Charitable Organizations	
Types of Charitable Organization	Mean Hours/Week Volunteered*
International	7.8
Environmental, conservation, or animal protection	5.1
Youth development or recreation	4.5
Religion	4.3
Health	4.0
Social service	3.7
Education	3.6
Arts, cultural, and humanities	3.6
Community action, political, or civil rights	3.4
Neighborhood	3.4
Work-related	2.8
Civic, social, and fraternal	2.5

\* By volunteers only.

Table 3.3 shows **how** these volunteers worked for these different types of agencies. For each of the 12 organizational types, people were asked what kind(s) of volunteer work they did. Volunteers could name up to four types of work, for each of the 12 types of agencies. For example, 12% of volunteers said that they collected, served, or delivered food for religious organizations; and 3% of volunteers said that they served as committee members or leaders in education organizations. Most of the findings are unsurprising: for example, the most common type of help given to community action, political, and civil rights organizations was canvassing or campaigning; and the most common type of help given to education organizations was teaching.

Table 3.3

Percentage of Volunteers Performing Type of Work in 12 Categories of Charitable Activity						
Types of Volunteer Work	Religious	Health	Education	Social Services	Youth Development	Civic, Social, & Fraternal
Attended meetings	2.4	2.7	6.9	1.2	3.4	10.9
Canvass/campaigning	1.6	1.2	1.0	.6	.4	2.3
Provided care/support	6.1	20.8	2.6	10.3	3.0	4.5
Committee member or leader	3.2	2.2	3.0	2.4	6.7	4.2
Coach as an unpaid volunteer	.7	1.1	3.9	.2	23.0	.5
Collect, serve, or deliver food	12.0	4.7	3.2	39.9	8.7	16.2
Facilities maintenance	10.2	4.1	3.7	3.9	1.8	3.8
Fundraising or grant writing	6.9	11.5	10.7	8.6	7.7	20.5
Manager or director	.2	.5	.3	1.4	.8	.9
Office or administrative work	3.8	6.7	4.1	3.7	1.6	3.8
Organization activities or events	9.5	7.2	11.3	5.6	12.8	14.3
Protect/clean the environment	.8	.0	.5	.9	.5	2.7
Provide health care	2.1	2.3	14.3	3.7	8.4	1.3
Provide educational information	3.0	2.6	3.8	2.2	1.9	1.8
Religious service assistance	15.9	.3	.3	1.5	.9	.0
Teach	6.2	2.9	20.9	2.2	8.3	1.3
Walkathon/marathon	.3	6.1	.7	1.5	.9	.3
Provide home care	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Crime watch	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Other	15.5	29.6	9.5	11.8	10.2	11.0

Table 3.3 (continued)

Types of Volunteer Work	Percentage of Volunteers Performing Type of Work in 12 Categories of Charitable Activity					
	Community Action, Political, or Civil Rights	Arts, Cultural, & Humanities	Work-Related	International	Environment, Conservation, or Animal Protection	Neighborhood
Attended meetings	6.4	3.2	17.2	.0	1.7	39.5
Canvass/campaigning	28.1	3.6	3.2	.4	7.9	5.6
Provided care/support	.3	1.4	2.5	10.5	5.8	.7
Committee member or leader	6.0	6.2	9.4	11.8	2.8	5.8
Coach as an unpaid volunteer	.2	.0	1.3	5.7	.9	.7
Collect, serve, or deliver food	.9	2.4	7.8	1.2	.8	.1
Facilities maintenance	2.5	6.3	2.7	7.6	13.4	3.7
Fundraising or grant writing	7.5	16.1	6.9	.0	5.9	.1
Manager or director	.8	.7	.4	12.1	.3	3.6
Office or administrative work	11.8	10.2	7.9	.0	3.9	2.7
Organization activities or events	9.1	9.4	14.1	8.0	4.0	5.7
Protect/clean the environment	.7	.9	.0	9.3	29.5	7.2
Provide health care	1.7	2.8	1.2	.7	.8	4.5
Provide educational information	15.6	4.1	7.2	2.5	5.9	4.7
Religious service assistance	.0	.0	.0	2.2	.3	.0
Teach	.0	4.7	4.4	.0	1.5	.2
Walkathon/marathon	2.9	3.6	4.0	.0	1.6	.3
Crime watch	.0	.0	.0	16.9	.0	9.6
Other	8.4	27.8	13.8	11.0	14.5	5.6

**Recipients of time given to individuals.** In addition to formal volunteering (giving time to charitable organizations), the study also reviewed the extent of informal volunteering (helping others outside the home on a person-to-person basis). As Chapters 1 and 2 have demonstrated, person-to-person volunteering is an extensive phenomenon in California: 73% of respondents reported person-to-person helping activities, while 54% reported organization-related volunteering.<sup>32</sup> Respondents were asked whom they helped—friends, neighbors, co-workers, etc.—and which four types of recipients were given the most time.

Table 3.4 shows what types of help were most commonly given to individuals, excluding family members living in the respondent's household. The most common kind of help given was emotional support; more than three fourths of all respondents gave this type of help.

Table 3.4

Distribution of Six Helping Activities Given to Individuals	
Types of Helping Activity	Percentage*
Provided emotional support	77.4
Helped with household tasks	65.1
Helped with transportation and other special tasks	49.8
Provided health-related care or support	28.2
Other type of help	19.2
Taught or coached	17.8

Respondents could report from zero to four types of helping activities given to individuals.

\* Of all respondents, the percentage naming a particular type of helping activity.

As Table 3.5 shows, extended family, friends, and neighbors are by far the most common recipients of helping behavior. In most categories of helping, the numbers drop off quickly after leaving those circles of care, although 15% said they provided emotional support to co-workers or fellow students and 17% said they provided unspecified assistance to strangers.

<sup>32</sup> Even the IS research, which asks only one question about informal volunteering, found that this was the second most common volunteering activity, after volunteering for religious organizations (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Table 1.6, p. 31).

Table 3.5

Recipients of Help	Distribution of Recipients Who Received Help From Volunteers in Six Helping Activities					
	Help around the home	Help with keeping appointments & household tasks	Health-related care	Provided teaching, coaching	Provided emotional support	Help in other ways
Child/grandchild living elsewhere	9.6	6.1	8.8	12.2	11.2	5.1
Parent living elsewhere	24.4	27.3	32.5	1.7	11.0	5.1
Sibling living elsewhere	12.6	6.9	7.4	3.8	15.7	6.0
Other relative living elsewhere	22.1	19.3	15.4	11.7	19.2	11.9
Friend	47.6	41.8	32.2	43.0	73.2	33.4
Neighbor	27.5	19.6	12.4	15.3	15.1	10.8
Coworker or fellow student	2.3	4.0	1.4	7.9	14.7	2.3
Church group member	3.0	2.4	2.4	4.0	5.0	5.3
Stranger	3.6	3.7	3.7	7.0	5.4	17.4
Student/child	.0	.0	.0	1.9	.3	12.5
Other responses	4.3	4.6	6.9	10.3	8.6	13.0

Percentages are based on respondents who reported from one to four types of helping activities.

**Religion as a recipient of charitable giving.** Independent Sector, *Giving USA*, and other sources have reported that religion receives the largest amount of money contributed by households. In the California study, 36% of all respondents reported making contributions to religious organizations during the previous 12 months. The median yearly gift was \$350 and the mean was \$1,168.

People give to religion in different ways. Table 3.6 shows that nearly all respondents (99%) who gave to religious organizations made contributions during regular church attendance; 35% reported religious contributions in response to special requests; and 13% reported other types of religious giving.

Table 3.6

Types of Giving	Distribution of Three Types of Giving to Religious Organizations		
	Percentage of Households Giving	Mean Amount	% of Household Income
Regular contributions	98.8	\$1,063.73	2.3
Special donations for specific causes or programs	35.2	\$257.03	.6
Other donations (e.g., radio/TV evangelists, revival meetings)	13.4	\$198.22	.5

Calculations are based on households reporting some giving to religious organizations. Mean dollar figures represent the average of gifts of a certain type, e.g., special donations. Mean giving as a percentage of household income is based on households reporting some giving to religion and reporting household income.

#### *Chapter 4. Race/Ethnicity and Charitable Behavior*

California will soon become the nation's first "majority minority" state, anticipating a condition demographers predict will occur in the United States as a whole by about the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In spite of the current and growing importance of race/ethnicity as related to giving, volunteering, and the nonprofit sector generally, there has been surprisingly little research on this relationship (see Smith, Shue, Vest, and Villareal, 1999, for an introduction to the research literature).

Of particular note is the apparent disparity between the findings of survey research on minority giving and volunteering and qualitative studies of this issue. The latter report extensive and diverse charitable behavior in communities of color, but the former report levels of giving and volunteering substantially below that of whites. For example, Independent Sector reported in 1996 that, for respondents from contributing households, whites gave 2.3% of their income to charity, while non-whites gave only 1.6% (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1).<sup>33</sup>

Also, only African American and Hispanic charitable behavior have been reported in IS studies. Asian/Pacific Islanders constitute a large and rapidly growing minority group in California: In 1999, Asian/Pacific Islanders represented an estimated 11% of the state's population (State of California, Department of Finance, 1998).

For all the above reasons, the California study included a special effort to assess the relationship between race/ethnicity and charitable behavior, for three of the four major minority groups.<sup>34</sup> In addition to the unweighted statewide probability sample of 2,406 (46% of whom identified themselves as members of one of the four major minority groups), the study included an additional sample of 1,210 African American, Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander adults in Alameda County, which includes Oakland, Berkeley, and other communities. Table 4.1 presents information on the number of minority respondents of various categories in the statewide and Alameda samples.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Hispanics, who may be of any race, reported giving 1.4% of household income to charitable organizations.

<sup>34</sup> Native Americans constitute only .6% of California's population (State of California, Department of Finance, 1998). The unweighted statewide sample of 2,406 included only 30 respondents (1.2%) who identified themselves as Native American or American Indian. Because of this extremely low number of respondents, this study does not report results for the Native American community in the statewide data.

<sup>35</sup> The respondents in the Alameda sample answered exactly the same questionnaire as did the respondents in the statewide survey, and Spanish-speaking interviewers were available to both sets of respondents.

Table 4.1

## Distribution of Race/Ethnicity in Alameda County and Statewide Samples

Race/Ethnicity Group	Alameda County		California	
	n	%	n	%
Black/African American	403	33.3	156	6.6
Latino/Hispanic	402	33.2	613	26.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	405	33.5	265	11.3
Total	1,210	100.0	1,034	44.0

Statewide race/ethnicity group sample sizes and percentages have been calculated from the weighted sample (n = 2,350). The sample for Alameda County is not weighted because ethnic population information for Alameda County is unreliable.

This chapter will present descriptive information on the race/charity relationship, with data from the Alameda County sample, the California statewide sample, and the national sample surveyed by Independent Sector in 1996. The chapter will also present a brief summary of the results of a more rigorous statistical analysis of the Alameda and California data, using multivariate techniques (for a full report on this analysis, see Appendix B). The latter analysis controls for other possibly relevant factors: income, educational attainment, and immigration status.

Table 4.2 reports the percentage of households giving and the percentage of respondents volunteering, by race/ethnicity. The principal findings shown in this table are as follows:

- Whites, African Americans, and Asian/Pacific Islanders report highly consistent rates of participation in giving and volunteering, in both Alameda and California samples and in all three categories of activity. Participation rates are particularly close between African and Asian Americans. By contrast, IS national studies consistently report large differences in participation in giving and volunteering between whites and blacks (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, pp. 49-50, 54).<sup>36</sup>
- Latinos report lower participation rates for giving and volunteering, in both Alameda County and statewide, in all three categories of activity. The differences between Latinos and the other three groups are particularly noticeable with respect to volunteering. For example, non-Hispanics are two and a half times more likely than Hispanics to report volunteering for charitable organizations, in the statewide sample.
- Between Alameda County and statewide respondents, patterns of giving and volunteering are highly consistent for African Americans and Asian/Pacific Islanders; but Latinos in the statewide sample report lower rates of volunteering than do Latinos in Alameda County, with a 15-percentage-point difference in volunteering for charitable organizations and a 27-percentage-point difference in giving time to individuals.

<sup>36</sup> IS studies do not report on the charitable behavior of Asian/Pacific Islanders.

Table 4.2

Percentage Reporting Giving and Volunteering, by Race/Ethnicity			
Race/Ethnicity Group	Alameda County	California	U.S.
	%	%	%
<hr/> <b>Percentage of Households Giving</b> <hr/>			
<i>Total</i>			
Black/African American	95.8	89.7	na
Latino/Hispanic	84.3	84.8	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	96.3	93.6	na
White/Caucasian	na	94.8	na
<i>To Individuals</i>			
Black/African American	68.0	66.0	na
Latino/Hispanic	55.5	55.1	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	67.7	70.3	na
White/Caucasian	na	54.7	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>			
Black/African American	94.3	85.3	52.8
Latino/Hispanic	83.3	80.9	56.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	95.3	90.6	na
White/Caucasian	na	94.5	72.6
<hr/> <b>Percentage of Respondents Volunteering</b> <hr/>			
<i>Total</i>			
Black/African American	92.1	94.9	na
Latino/Hispanic	62.7	36.7	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	95.3	88.3	na
White/Caucasian	na	93.5	na
<i>To Individuals</i>			
Black/African American	87.1	87.8	na
Latino/Hispanic	59.5	32.8	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	90.4	81.1	na
White/Caucasian	na	88.2	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>			
Black/African American	66.5	65.4	35.3
Latino/Hispanic	39.8	25.3	40.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	64.9	63.5	na
White/Caucasian	na	64.3	51.9

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1.  
The California sample is weighted; the Alameda sample is not weighted.

Table 4.3 reports levels of charitable behavior, as measured by giving as a percentage of household income and hours per week volunteered by respondents. The principal findings shown in this table are as follows.

With regard to giving to charitable organizations:

- African Americans report a higher level of giving than any other group, in both Alameda and statewide samples.
- Latinos report a somewhat higher level of giving than Asians, in both samples.
- In the statewide sample, whites report a lower level of giving than blacks but higher than Asians and Latinos.
- These results diverge sharply from IS studies, which generally show whites reporting a higher average percentage of household income given to charitable organizations than either blacks or Latinos (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Table 1.9, pp. 49-50).

With regard to giving to individuals:

- Latinos report a far higher level of giving than Asians, whites, or blacks, in the statewide sample. In the Alameda sample, the three minority groups report comparable levels of giving, with Latinos slightly higher.

With regard to volunteering to charitable organizations:

- African and Hispanic Americans report higher levels of volunteering than either whites or Asian Americans, in the statewide sample. In the Alameda sample, blacks and Latinos report an average of three more hours per week volunteered than Asians.
- In both California and national studies, African Americans, Latinos, and whites report comparable levels of volunteering; although the hours volunteered are twice as high in the California study as nationally.

With regard to giving time to individuals:

- Blacks and Latinos report higher levels of volunteering than whites and Asians, with differences of two to seven hours per week, in the Alameda and statewide samples.

Table 4.3

Levels of Charitable Activity, by Race/Ethnicity			
Race/Ethnicity Group	Alameda County	California	U.S.
Giving as a Percentage of Household Income			
<i>Total</i>			
Black/African American	4.7	5.5	na
Latino/Hispanic	4.1	5.2	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.5	3.9	na
White/Caucasian	na	4.3	na
<i>To Individuals</i>			
Black/African American	1.7	1.8	na
Latino/Hispanic	1.9	4.0	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.6	2.2	na
White/Caucasian	na	1.9	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>			
Black/African American	3.4	4.2	1.6
Latino/Hispanic	2.7	2.5	1.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.4	2.3	na
White/Caucasian	na	3.1	2.3
Hours per Week Volunteered			
<i>Total</i>			
Black/African American	19.2	20.7	na
Latino/Hispanic	16.6	16.6	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	11.8	12.6	na
White/Caucasian	na	15.1	na
<i>To Individuals</i>			
Black/African American	12.6	15.6	na
Latino/Hispanic	11.2	11.6	na
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.8	8.4	na
White/Caucasian	na	9.8	na
<i>To Charitable Organizations</i>			
Black/African American	10.1	9.2	4.5
Latino/Hispanic	9.3	9.1	4.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.5	6.9	na
White/Caucasian	na	8.6	4.2

Source of U.S. data: Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix D, Table 1

In summary, the California data on giving and volunteering show mixed results on the question of possible race/ethnicity-based differences in charitable behavior. Whites, blacks, and Asians are generally comparable in both participation rates and levels of activity. Latinos have lower participation rates, especially in volunteering, but they have comparable or higher levels of

giving and volunteering as measured by percentage of household income given and hours per week volunteered.

The California study included a further analysis of the relationship between race/ethnicity and charitable behavior, using multivariate statistical techniques to examine between-group differences after controlling for household income, educational attainment, and immigration status. When multivariate statistical measures were applied, no relationship of practical importance was found between race/ethnicity and giving as a percentage of household income beyond that accounted for by income, education, and immigration status. Nor was there a relationship of practical importance found between race/ethnicity and hours per week volunteered beyond that accounted for by income, education, and immigration status. The above results were found in both Alameda and statewide samples. For full detail, see Appendix B.

In other words, when the effect of income, education, and immigration status are statistically taken into account, differences in charitable behavior among whites, Latinos, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and African Americans virtually disappear.

## *Chapter 5. Giving and Volunteering in Different Regions of California*

A *Chronicle of Philanthropy* ranking of charitable giving in the nation's 50 largest cities had San Francisco in 12<sup>th</sup> place but six other California cities at the bottom of the list: San Jose (39<sup>th</sup>), San Diego (40<sup>th</sup>), Oakland (42<sup>nd</sup>), Sacramento (43<sup>rd</sup>), Los Angeles (48<sup>th</sup>), Long Beach (49<sup>th</sup>), and Fresno (50<sup>th</sup>) (Greene et al., 1994).<sup>37</sup> Other research and theory (e.g., Wolpert, 1989) describe a "geography of generosity," arguing that factors associated with different geographic areas have an effect on individual and institutional charity—for example, state and local tax rates, home ownership rates, economic health, state and local government spending on human services, local history and traditions, ethnic and immigrant mix, and the like.

Two areas of California (Los Angeles and Silicon Valley) have commissioned special studies of local charity, partly to counteract the negative images those areas were perceived to have (California Community Foundation, 1997; Community Foundation Silicon Valley, 1998). The present study tested the hypothesis of regional differences in giving and volunteering. The statewide sample was stratified into four approximately equal population areas with somewhat different economic, demographic, political, and lifestyle characteristics:

- Area 1: Los Angeles suburban areas, San Diego<sup>38</sup>
- Area 2: Los Angeles County
- Area 3: San Francisco Bay Area<sup>39</sup>
- Area 4: Central Valley, other<sup>40</sup>

Each area contains approximately 25% of the adult population in the state (State of California, Department of Finance, 1998), and approximately 25% of the statewide sample was drawn from each area, as shown in Table 5.1.

---

<sup>37</sup> "The rankings are based on per-capita giving to major charities, including United Way, Jewish federations, the American Red Cross, the American Cancer Society, and Disabled American Veterans, and on grant making by foundations and corporations in the cities" (Greene et al., 1994, pp. 1, 22; for a fuller description of the methodology, see p. 25 of the same article).

<sup>38</sup> Includes Orange, Riverside, San Bernadino, San Diego, and Ventura counties.

<sup>39</sup> Includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

<sup>40</sup> Includes the other 43 counties in California.

Table 5.1

Distribution of Unweighted Sample and Percentage of Adult Population  
in Designated Areas of California

Area	Sample	Percentage*
1	598	27.92
2	602	28.11
3	603	20.99
4	603	22.97
Total	2,406	99.99

Sample sizes in the table are the actual number of respondents in the statewide sample.

\* Of adults 18 years or older residing within the four areas in 1999, as projected by State of California, Department of Finance (1998).

Each area has internal diversity as well as similarity to the other areas, but each region also has characteristics that partially differentiate it from other regions. Area 1, Los Angeles suburban areas and San Diego, is somewhat more affluent, somewhat more politically conservative, and has a high concentration of residents who are or were employed by the U.S. military and various defense contractors. Area 2, Los Angeles County, includes dozens of different ethnic and national-origin groups, a large number of immigrants, great extremes of wealth, the world center of the film and television industry, and a thriving financial and industrial base. Area 3, the San Francisco Bay Area, includes Silicon Valley and other hi-tech centers, a large gay/lesbian community, several major educational and cultural institutions, and many pockets of liberal political thought. Area 4, the Central Valley and other regions, includes one of the world's most productive agricultural areas; extensive lumber, mining, and recreational industries; and the center of state government.

Do these areas also differ in their charitable activities?

As Table 5.2 shows, participation rates (percentage of households contributing to charity) are highly consistent across the four regions with respect to person-to-person giving and generally consistent with respect to giving to charitable organizations, with Area 2 somewhat lower and Areas 3 and 4 somewhat higher.

Relative to total giving as a percentage of household income, Areas 1 and 4 are highly consistent with each other and with the state as a whole, while Area 2 is somewhat higher and Area 3 somewhat lower. There are similar findings with regard to giving to individuals. In the category of giving to charitable organizations, interregional differences disappear almost completely. These findings clearly do not support the "geography of generosity" rankings of Los Angeles and San Francisco cited above. More importantly, these data show relatively little difference among various areas in the state with regard to "generosity" as measured by giving as a percentage of household income.

With regard to volunteering to charitable organizations, the results are similar to those for giving: Areas 1 and 4 are highly consistent with each other and the state; Area 2 has a lower participation rate (percentage of people volunteering) and a higher level of volunteering (hours per week); and Area 3 is just the opposite, with a higher participation rate and a lower level of volunteering. With regard to giving time to individuals, Area 2 is noticeably different from the other areas, with a lower participation rate (fewer individuals reporting such behavior) but a

higher level of activity (more hours per week given to individuals).<sup>41</sup> Rates and levels of giving time to individuals in the other three areas are generally comparable.

Table 5.2

Charitable Activity, by Four Regional Areas in California					
Charitable Activity	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	California
<u>Giving</u>					
<i>Total</i>					
% of households that gave	93.4	89.0	93.1	91.9	91.7
Mean giving as a percentage of income	4.6	5.1	3.9	4.4	4.5
<i>To individuals</i>					
% of households that gave	56.3	62.9	56.8	52.5	57.4
Mean giving as a percentage of income	2.2	3.2	1.7	2.1	2.3
<i>To charitable organizations</i>					
% of households that gave	91.8	86.7	91.5	90.2	89.9
Mean giving as a percentage of income	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0
<u>Volunteering</u>					
<i>Total</i>					
% of individuals who volunteered	84.8	64.1	86.6	79.4	78.2
Mean hours per week volunteered	15.1	18.7	14.1	14.6	15.6
<i>To individuals</i>					
% of individuals who volunteered	81.1	56.9	82.2	74.1	72.9
Mean hours per week volunteered	9.5	13.7	9.1	9.5	10.3
<i>To charitable organizations</i>					
% of individuals who volunteered	57.6	44.7	62.3	54.4	54.2
Mean hours per week volunteered	8.8	9.4	7.5	8.3	8.5

Calculations for mean giving as percentage of income and mean hours per week volunteered are based on the households contributing and individuals volunteering for specific categories (total, to individuals, to charitable organizations).

The data on Area 2 (Los Angeles County) exemplify another problem with drawing conclusions about the relative “generosity” of people in a certain region. Compared to the other three regions, Area 2 respondents generally reported lower participation rates but higher levels of giving and volunteering. For example, fewer Los Angeles residents volunteered for charitable organizations, but those who did volunteer gave more time than volunteers from other regions. Are Los Angeles residents therefore more or less “generous”?

In conclusion, four direct measures of “generosity”—percentage of households giving, percentage of people volunteering, percentage of household income given, and hours per week volunteered—showed no consistent differences among respondents in the four regions studied. There is little evidence in the California study of significant differences in giving and volunteering among these four regions of the state.

<sup>41</sup> Note the similarity to the data on Hispanic volunteering in Tables 4.2 and 4.3; 46% of respondents in the Area 2 (Los Angeles County) sample were Hispanic.



## *Appendix A. Methodology*

The California study of giving and volunteering was designed and managed by Richard Orend, who was Director of Research for the University of San Francisco's Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management from 1996 until his untimely death in September 1999. By that date, all interviews had been completed and all data had been entered, cleaned, and coded. Data analysis and the preparation of this report were conducted by William Roberts and Michael O'Neill, respectively Database Administrator and Director of the Institute.

**Instrument design and data collection and processing.** The questionnaire used in this study may be found at [www.inom.org/gvques.htm](http://www.inom.org/gvques.htm). The questionnaire was designed following careful examination of several other instruments used in studying giving and volunteering, primarily the instrument used by Independent Sector (IS) in its national studies in the United States (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996, Appendix E) and the instrument used in a 1997 national study in Canada (Hall et al., 1998). Briefly, the IS instrument focuses on *charitable organization types* (e.g., religion, health care) that are recipients of giving and volunteering, while the Canadian instrument focuses on *methods of giving and volunteering* (e.g., donation in connection with a walkathon, payroll deduction) which are then related to organization types. The California instrument attempted to capitalize on the strengths of both approaches and owes much to both. The California instrument also made a special effort to distinguish between informal (person-to-person) and formal (person-to-organization) charitable behavior and asked multiple questions about each.

Hebert Research, Inc., of Seattle, Washington, pretested the questionnaire, conducted the interviews, and completed the data processing. From a probability sample of 39,000 statewide and Alameda County telephone numbers a total of 3,616 completed telephone interviews were conducted from July 1998 to May 1999. The sample providing data consisted of two segments: (1) a random statewide sample of 2,406, which was stratified into four sub-areas of approximately 600 respondents each (see Table 5.1); and (2) a special ethnicity-only sample of 1,210 residents in Alameda County (see Table 4.1). There is 95 percent certainty that the survey's margin of error is  $\pm 3$  percent for the state and Alameda County sample. For the state sample, there is 95 percent certainty that the margin of error is  $\pm 4$  percent for each of the four sub-areas surveyed.

The Alameda County sample included an approximately equal number of African Americans, Latinos, and Asian/Pacific Islanders. The questionnaire used for the Alameda sample contained exactly the same questions given in the same order as the questionnaire used for the California sample. Spanish-speaking interviewers were available to respondents in both samples. The purpose of the Alameda County study was to over-sample from major race/ethnicity groups in order to provide more detailed analysis of giving and volunteering patterns within and between these groups.

The questionnaire instrument was drafted and re-drafted many times and was pretested three times by the team of interviewers over a period of two months. The questionnaire was programmed into Ci3 (Sawtooth Software) CATI language for automated data entry of the interviews, and the logic and function were personally checked by Orend and Hebert lead analyst

Paul Irby. Orend personally assisted in the training of interviewers. Interviewers were required to participate in a full training session including two hours of general orientation and role-playing practice before they were allowed to begin making telephone calls.

One of the most important issues in managing a survey with a lengthy questionnaire is how to maximize response rates. Typically, questionnaires longer than 15 minutes have much lower response rates than shorter surveys. The average interview length in this study was 30 minutes, with some interviews taking up to an hour depending on the amount of giving and volunteering reported. An incentive was used to maintain a reasonable response rate. At the start, each potential respondent was told that if he or she completed the interview, a donation would be made on their behalf of up to \$1,000 to one of five charities, depending on how many selected each charity. The number of preferences for statewide donations were United Negro College Fund (227), National Council of La Raza (275), Asian Funds of LA (49), United Way (449), and the National Cancer Institute (1,406).<sup>42</sup> The number of preferences for donations from the Alameda County sample were United Negro College Fund (288), National Council of La Raza (110), Asian Funds of LA (109), United Way (168), and the National Cancer Institute (535).<sup>43</sup> Other ways of maximizing response rates included using a different interviewer to recall refusals after a specified time or scheduling an appropriate time with the interviewee to return a call.

In order to ensure random selection of adults within the household, only the adult (18 years or older) with the most recent birthday was asked to answer the questions. If this person was not available, a call-back was attempted. A total of 39,000 households were contacted to reach the net sample size of 3,616, which is the total of the California ( $n = 2406$ ) and the Alameda County ( $n = 1,210$ ) samples. The interviewers called every name on the sample lists approximately eight times, unless the telephone was disconnected or the interviewer reached a wrong number. The sample was divided separately into statewide and Alameda replicates. Initially there was a total of 10 replicates each of statewide and Alameda samples, with 1,500 and 1,300 names per replicate, respectively. Before administering a new sample of replicates, the initial sample was monitored to ensure it had become largely depleted. After all replicates from the initial sample were heavily depleted, an additional sample was ordered that included three statewide and five Alameda County replicates. Thus, 15,000 names were originally ordered for statewide and 13,000 for Alameda, and these were supplemented with 4,500 additional statewide and 6,500 additional Alameda. The final total was evenly split, at 19,500 for each segment.

Unqualified calls were tracked (e.g., business or phones not answered) and eliminated from the probability sample, which resulted in 6,854 qualified household phone numbers in California and 2,241 qualified household phone numbers in Alameda County. The final response rate for the statewide sample was 35%, or about one out of every three qualified participants completing the questionnaire. The response rate for those willing to participate varied slightly across the four regional areas: the response rate was 33% for the Los Angeles suburban areas, 33% for Los Angeles County, 33% for the San Francisco Bay Area, and 43% for the Central Valley and other counties. The final response rate for the Alameda County sample was 54%, or about one out of every two qualified participants completing the questionnaire.

---

<sup>42</sup> Figures are from the unweighted statewide sample ( $n = 2,406$ ).

<sup>43</sup> Figures are from the Alameda sample ( $n = 1,210$ ).

Table A-1 provides a comparison between unweighted sample percentages and 1999 population estimates (State of California, Department of Finance, 1998). Percentages in the table are calculated for California and Alameda County on key demographic variables where available. Inspection of Table A-1 indicates that the California and Alameda County samples are representative of the respective populations on most key indicators. Largest percentage differences are found for education in the California sample and gender in the Alameda County sample. Slight to small differences in sample and population percentages for most variables indicate minimal response bias.

Table A-1

## Comparison of Sample and California Population Percentages in 1999

	Alameda County <sup>a</sup>		California <sup>b</sup>	
	Sample	Population	Sample	Population
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	38.8	48.8	40.65	49.5
Female	61.1	51.2	59.06	50.5
Refused	na	na	.29	na
<b>Age</b>				
18 to 24 Year Olds	16.8	14.5	10.4	12.7
25 to 34 Year Olds	25.8	24.3	22.1	20.8
35 to 44 Year Olds	24.4	23.6	23.0	23.3
45 to 54 Year Olds	16.8	16.5	20.8	17.5
55 to 64 Year Olds	8.3	9.2	10.5	10.8
65 to 74 Year Olds	4.8	6.6	7.0	7.9
75 Years or Older	3.1	5.2	6.2	6.9
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Black/African American	33.3	32.0	5.2	6.6
Latino/Hispanic	33.2	31.1	23.8	26.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	33.5	36.8	4.6	11.3
Native American Indian	na	na	1.2	.6
White/Caucasian	na	na	59.4	55.4
Mixed	na	na	3.4	na
Refused	na	na	2.3	na
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
No degree	13.6	na	15.1	23.4
High school/2-year college	49.8	na	34.8	55.2
4-year college	34.6	na	49.0	21.4
Refused	2.0	na	1.1	na
<b>Regional Area</b>				
LA/San Diego and surrounding area	na	na	24.8	24.8
Los Angeles County	na	na	25.0	25.8
Bay Area	na	na	25.0	23.8
Central Valley and other counties	na	na	25.0	25.6

<sup>a</sup> The number of adults 18 years or older in 1999 is estimated at 24,485,146. Figures in the table for California population percentages are based on this estimate.

<sup>b</sup> The number of black/African American, Latino/Hispanics, and Asian/Pacific Islander adults 18 years or older for Alameda County in 1999 is estimated at 548,372. Figures in the table for Alameda County population percentages are based on this estimate.

Source for California and Alameda County projections: State of California, Department of Finance (1998).

**Weighting procedures.** Respondents in the California sample were weighted to the population based on 1999 population projections for the four regional areas given by the State of California, Department of Finance (1998), for gender and race/ethnicity. Population estimates for educational attainment were based on the U.S. Census Microdata (1990) provided by Survey Documentation and Analysis located at the University of California at Berkeley. Weighting simultaneously creates interactions between weighting variables that are correlated; therefore, an iterative procedure was used by adjusting the final weight to variables in the following order: gender, educational attainment, race/ethnicity, and regional area. Computation for the final weight was accomplished in two iterations of adjustments on the four weighting variables at an

acceptable error rate as shown in Table A-2. After weighting the California sample to the population, a final adjustment was carried out by reversing weights to the sample using the population mean so that population percentages for each variable are retained. The procedure provides a way to carry out statistical comparisons using sample sizes adjusted to population percentages.

Table A-2

Results for Demographic Variables Used to Weight the California Sample to the Population			
	Sample %	Final Weight	Difference Between Final Weight and California Population
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	40.65	49.5	+.25
Female	59.06	50.5	-.25
Refused	.29	na	na
<b>Educational Attainment</b>			
No degree	15.1	23.4	+1.26
High school/2-year college	34.8	55.2	-.71
4-year college	49.0	21.4	-.55
Refused	1.1	na	na
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American	5.2	6.6	-.0001
Latino/Hispanic	23.8	26.0	-.0003
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.6	11.3	-.0004
Native American Indian	1.2	.6	+.0001
White/Caucasian	59.4	55.4	+.0008
Mixed	3.4	na	na
Refused	2.3	na	na
<b>Regional Area</b>			
LA/San Diego and surrounding area	24.8	24.8	+3.2
Los Angeles County	25.0	25.8	+2.3
Bay Area	25.0	23.8	-2.8
Central Valley and other counties	25.0	25.6	-2.6

The California sample (2,406) is weighted to the 1999 projected adult population of 24,485,146. Note that “na” in the body of the table indicates that weight of zero was given to categories with no available population data.

## *Appendix B. Multivariate Analysis of Race/Ethnicity-Based Differences in Charitable Behavior*

**Method.** The purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent of the relationship between giving/volunteering and racial groups after controlling for variables known to correlate with ethnic groups. Four sequential regressions were employed to determine if race/ethnicity improved the prediction of charitable contributions beyond that of household income, education, and immigration status (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). Regressions were completed using the four types of charitable contributions as dependent variables: giving to individuals as a percentage of household income, giving to charitable organizations as a percentage of household income, hours/week volunteered to individuals, and hours/week volunteered to charitable organizations. It was decided to run separate regression analyses for giving to individuals and giving to charitable organizations instead of using total giving as the dependent variable. Likewise, it was decided to run separate regression analyses for time volunteered to individuals and time volunteered to charitable organizations instead of using total volunteering as the dependent variable. The reason for this decision was to avoid unclear relationships between giving or volunteering and variables that may result from mixing contributions to individuals or charitable organizations into single measures. Household income, education, and immigration status were used as control variables. Race/ethnicity served as the predictor variable. Parallel analyses were carried out, that is, first for the California sample and second for the Alameda County sample.

Each analysis was completed using SPSS (version 10) multiple regression and frequencies for the evaluation and test of assumptions. These initial analyses resulted in the transformation of the four dependent variables and one predictor to reduce skewness, reduce the number of outliers, and improve normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals. Natural logarithmic transformations were carried out for each dependent variable and one predictor (household income). Education was coded in the following order: 1 (Elementary school through 8th grade), 2 (Some high school), 3 (High school graduate), 4 (Technical, trade, or business school), 5 (Some college), and 6 (College graduate). Immigration status was coded into a dummy variable as 0 (Born in U.S.) or 1 (Immigrated to U.S.).

For California, racial groups included Latino/Hispanic, Black/African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, and other racial groups. Four variables representing racial groups were contrast coded in such a way that 1 (identified group), 0 (nonidentified major group), and -1 (other groups). Thus, the first two contrast codes for California included Latino/Hispanic, Black/African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and White. The type of contrast code depended on whether the racial group was identified (1) or not identified (0) in the variable. All other racial groups in the sample were constantly contrast coded with a -1. For Alameda County, only the first three racial groups were represented in the sample. Thus, two variables were contrast coded so that Latino/Hispanic and Black/African American were identified (1) or not identified (0) and Asian/Pacific Islander served as the final group that was constantly coded with a -1.

The coding scheme given above for sequential regression procedures that follow provides the opportunity to present some general guidelines that can be used to interpret the following analyses. First, sequential regression means that not all variables enter the regression equation at

the same time. In this case, control variables (i.e., log income, education, and immigration status) are entered into the regression equation on the first step. Additional variables (i.e., race) are entered on the second step. Thus, it can be determined if predictors contribute additional explained variation in the dependent measure after controlling for variables entered at step one. In effect, correlations between race and variables entered at step 1 have been statistically removed from the equation by step 2.

Regression weights (B) define the regression equation at each step. A regression weight is computed for each of the variables in the equation that can be used to compute a predicted value for the dependent measure by entering a value for each variable in the equation. Standard Errors (SE) are computed for each regression weight as a way to compute confidence intervals around the parameter. If a large proportion of explained variation in the dependent measure is found, then an inspection of beta weights  $\beta$  indicates which variables are important to the relationship. Independent variables and predictors are have been used as interchangeable terms to capture what regression does, that is, construct a line of best fit to determine the amount of variance in the dependent measure explained or predicted by independent variables in the equation. This does not mean, however, that prediction infers causation. The presentation will now turn to the analyses beginning with results from the California sample.

**California sample.** Mahalanobis distance was set at  $p < .001$  as the criterion to identify multivariate outliers with an inspection of standardized residuals exceeding  $\pm 3$ . No outliers were found in any of the regression analyses for California.

*Charitable giving.* A sample of 1,571 respondents provided complete data for the first sequential regression. Log charitable giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-1 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression analyses. Table B-2 displays the regression results. For step 1, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .17$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 1567) = 16.14, p < .001$ . The increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .18$ ) at step 2 was not significant.

Table B-1

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying First Sequential Multiple Regression										
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 Log charitable giving	.13	1.53	1							
2 Log income	10.44	.89	-.10	1						
3 Education	3.71	1.37	.08	.34	1					
4 Immigration status	.20	.40	-.07	-.11	-.19	1				
5 Hispanic	.17	.40	-.03	-.16	-.37	.43	1			
6 Black	.07	.28	.07	-.09	.02	-.09	-.03	1		
7 Asian	.11	.33	-.02	.03	.19	.30	-.07	.01	1	
8 White	.62	.50	.02	.16	.18	-.45	-.48	-.23	-.34	1

n = 1,571

Table B-2

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Giving  
Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	2.35	.45	2.18	.46	
Log household income	-.26	.05	-.25	.05	-.14
Education	.13	.03	.15	.03	.13
Immigration status	-.26	.10	-.24	.12	-.06
Latino			.09	.13	.02
Black			.27	.15	.05
Asian			-.11	.13	-.02
White			.01	.10	.00

Note.  $R^2 = .03$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .03$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .003$  for Step 2 (not significant).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

$R^2$  reveals that 3% of the variability in log charitable giving was predicted by control scores at step 1. The change in  $R^2$  provided an additional .3% variability in log charitable giving indicating no improvement in prediction after entering race/ethnicity variables at step 2. Results indicated that ethnicity does not predict log charitable giving beyond that of education and immigration status.

These results indicated that household income and education shared most of the dependent variable's variance. As shown by  $R^2$  the amount of shared variability was extremely small at both steps. Indeed, by step 2 the change in  $R^2$  was below a 1% increase. What this means is that a large proportion of variance in the dependent variable is unexplained by these variables. Any conclusions based on these results could be attributed to chance findings. For illustrative purposes, however, an interpretation of the remaining statistics in Table B-2 is provided, which may serve as a guide to interpret the other regression analyses found in this appendix.

A linear regression equation is derived from the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) found in Table B-2 at each step of the analysis. A predicted score for percentage of log income is computed by weighting the scores of each variable with its associated unstandardized regression coefficient. Because each ethnic group has been coded uniquely it is possible to compute a percentage of log charitable giving score for each group by entering the unique code for that group. If  $R^2$  is 10% or higher, indicating some prediction, then it is useful to examine each of the standardized and unstandardized regression coefficients for importance and relationship patterns with the dependent variable. For example, because of their size, log income and education are indicated as the only variables in the regression equation important to predicting log charitable giving scores. Because standardized regression coefficients are given in standard units we turn to unstandardized regression coefficients to explain increases or decreases in terms of the original units of the measure.

The unstandardized regression coefficient representing education at step 2 is -.14. What this means is that there is less than a quarter of a log unit decrease in log charitable giving for each score increase in education. Attention given to the unstandardized and standardized coefficients

provide useful information about unique relationship patterns and important variables with the dependent variable if the overall correlation is sufficiently large to have practical importance.

*Individual giving.* A sample of 1,023 respondents provided complete data for the second sequential regression. Log individual giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration status in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-3 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression analyses. Table B-4 displays the results of the regression analyses. For step one, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .37$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 1019) = 56.07, p < .001$ . No significant change in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .38$ ) was found at step 2. Again, results indicated that ethnicity does not predict log individual giving beyond that of log income, education, and immigration status.

Table B-3

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Second Sequential Multiple Regression										
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 Log individual giving	-.78	2.03	1							
2 Log income	10.46	.87	-.28	1						
3 Education	3.73	1.37	-.19	.34	1					
4 Immigration status	.22	.42	.27	-.10	-.21	1				
5 Hispanic	.19	.41	.22	-.18	-.41	.41	1			
6 Black	.08	.30	.01	-.10	.03	-.11	-.06	1		
7 Asian	.12	.35	.04	.08	.22	.32	-.11	-.02	1	
8 White	.56	.51	-.18	.14	.21	-.45	-.47	-.25	-.35	1

n = 1,023

Table B-4

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	4.96	.72	4.64	.74	
Log household income	-.54	.07	-.53	.07	-.23
Education	-.09	.05	-.06	.05	-.04
Immigration status	1.16	.14	1.03	.18	.21
Latino			.41	.19	.08
Black			.12	.21	.02
Asian			.06	.21	.01
White			.03	.16	.01

Note.  $R^2 = .14$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .14$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .005$  for Step 2 (not significant).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

*Charitable volunteering.* A sample of 1,009 respondents provided complete data for the third sequential regression. Log charitable volunteering was regressed on household income as a natural log transformation, education, and immigration status in step 1. Race/ethnicity was

entered in step 2. Table B-5 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations underlying the regression. Table B-6 displays the results of the regression analysis. For step one, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .06$ ) was not significantly different from zero. No significant increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .1$ ) was found at step 2. Results indicated that the slight increase in prediction has no practical effect; therefore, it is concluded that ethnicity does not predict log charitable volunteering beyond that of log income, education, and immigration status. Furthermore, none of the variables entered at step 1 were found to predict log charitable volunteering.

Table B-5

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Third Sequential Multiple Regression

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 Log charitable volunteering	1.40	1.38	1							
2 Log income	10.52	1.00	-.02	1						
3 Education	3.96	1.24	.01	.25	1					
4 Immigration status	.12	.32	-.05	.02	.06	1				
5 Hispanic	.11	.34	.01	-.04	-.14	.12	1			
6 Black	.08	.31	.02	-.16	-.03	-.06	.03	1		
7 Asian	.11	.34	.02	.02	.17	.39	.0	.03	1	
8 White	.65	.50	-.06	.13	.06	-.31	.34	-.26	-.34	1

n = 1,009

Table B-6

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	1.65	.46	1.69	.47	
Log household income	-.03	.04	-.02	.05	-.01
Education	.02	.04	.02	.04	.02
Immigration status	-.22	.14	-.38	.15	-.09
Latino			-.03	.14	-.01
Black			-.06	.15	-.01
Asian			.10	.15	.02
White			-.23	.11	-.08

Note.  $R^2 = .003$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .001$  for Step 1 (not significant); change in  $R^2 = .007$  for Step 2 (not significant).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

*Individual volunteering.* A sample of 1,378 respondents provided complete data for the fourth sequential regression. Log individual volunteering was regressed on log income, education, and immigration status in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-7 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the regression and Table B-8 displays the results of the regression. For step one, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .05$ ) was not significantly different from zero. A statistically significant increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .16$ ) was found at step 2,  $F(4, 1369) = 8.03$ ,  $p < .001$ . Because only 3% of the variance was accounted for in the dependent measure, from a practical point of view, the results indicated that

ethnicity does not predict log individual volunteering beyond that of log income, education, and immigration status. Furthermore, none of the variables entered at step 1 were found to predict hours/week volunteered as a natural log transformation to individuals.

Table B-7

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Fourth Sequential Multiple Regression

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 Log individual volunteering	1.54	1.39	1							
2 Log income	10.44	1.01	.01	1						
3 Education	3.86	1.23	-.04	.25	1					
4 Immigration status	.13	.33	-.02	-.03	.05	1				
5 Hispanic	.11	.33	.01	-.02	-.15	.17	1			
6 Black	.08	.30	.07	-.12	-.01	-.07	.00	1		
7 Asian	.11	.33	-.13	.00	.17	.37	-.02	.00	1	
8 White	.67	.49	.00	.08	.03	-.32	-.38	-.30	-.38	1

n = 1,378

Table B-8

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Volunteering Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	1.40	.39	1.30	.40	
Log household income	.03	.04	.05	.04	.03
Education	-.06	.03	-.03	.03	-.03
Immigration status	-.06	.11	.16	.12	.04
Latino			-.07	.13	-.02
Black			.29	.14	.06
Asian			-.65	.13	-.16
White			-.10	.10	-.04

Note.  $R^2 = .003$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .001$  for Step 1 (not significant); change in  $R^2 = .02$  for Step 2 ( $p < .001$ ).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

The presentation now will turn to applying these four sequential regression analyses to the Alameda County sample. The data collected from Alameda County provide a comparison of the statewide results with those of three oversampled ethnic/racial groups, Latino, African American, and Asian/Pacific Islander, in Alameda County.

**Alameda County sample.** The same analytical method that was used for the statewide sample was also used for the Alameda County sample. That is, four sequential regressions were employed to determine if race/ethnicity improved the prediction of charitable contributions beyond that of household income, education, and immigration status. Scoring and codes for dependent variables, control variables, and the predictor (race/ethnicity) were given at the beginning of Appendix B. Regression results for the Alameda County sample are provided in the following tables. It will be found that the results are similar to what was found statewide.

*Charitable giving.* A sample of 704 respondents provided complete data for the first sequential regression. Log charitable giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-9 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression analyses. Table B-10 displays the regression results. For step 1, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .20$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 700) = 9.80, p < .001$ . A significant increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .23$ ) was found at step 2,  $F(2, 698) = 4.1, p < .05$ .

Table B-9

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying First Sequential Multiple Regression

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 Log charitable giving	.09	1.50	1							
2 Log income	10.52	.89	-.15	1						
3 Education	4.67	1.39	.00	.34	1					
4 Immigration status	.33	.47	-.14	.12	.07	1				
5 Hispanic	-.06	.80	.01	-.21	-.39	-.25	1			
6 Black	.01	.84	.14	-.14	-.24	-.51	.52	1		

n = 704

Table B-10

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	2.63	.66	2.68	.67	
Log household income	-.26	.07	-.26	.07	-.16
Education	.06	.04	.06	.05	.05
Immigration status	-.41	.12	-.26	.14	-.08
Latino			-.17	.09	-.09
Black			.24	.09	.13

Note.  $R^2 = .04$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .04$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .01$  for Step 2 (not significant).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

*Individual giving.* A sample of 527 respondents provided complete data for the second sequential regression. Log individual giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-11 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression. Table B-12 displays the regression results. For step 1, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .28$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 523) = 15.05, p < .001$ . The increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .30$ ) was not significant at step 2.

Table B-11

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Second Sequential Multiple Regression									
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Log individual giving	-.88	1.86	1						
2 Log income	10.52	.89	-.27	1					
3 Education	4.66	1.37	-.04	.32	1				
4 Immigration status	.35	.48	.01	.10	.07	1			
5 Hispanic	-.05	.80	.10	-.17	-.40	-.27	1		
6 Black	.02	.84	.04	-.11	-.23	-.54	.51	1	

n = 527

Table B-12

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Giving Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration					
Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	2.63	.66	2.68	.67	
Log household income	-.26	.07	-.26	.07	-.16
Education	.06	.04	.06	.05	.05
Immigration status	-.41	.12	-.26	.14	-.08
Latino			-.17	.09	-.09
Black			.24	.09	.13

Note.  $R^2 = .08$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .07$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .01$  for Step 2 (not significant).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

*Charitable volunteering.* A sample of 463 respondents provided complete data for the second sequential regression. Log individual giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-13 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression. Table B-14 displays the regression results. For step 1, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .22$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 459) = 7.38$ ,  $p < .001$ . A significant increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .25$ ) was found at step 2,  $F(2, 457) = 4.45$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Table B-13

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Third Sequential Multiple Regression									
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Log charitable volunteering	1.50	1.21	1						
2 Log income	10.59	.88	-.17	1					
3 Education	4.84	1.26	-.01	.30	1				
4 Immigration status	.29	.45	-.14	.16	.21	1			
5 Hispanic	-.11	.77	.17	-.19	-.33	-.32	1		
6 Black	.03	.87	.15	-.13	-.28	-.52	.54	1	

n = 463

Table B-14

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Charitable Volunteering  
Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	3.77	.68	3.43	.68	
Log household income	-.23	.07	-.22	.07	-.16
Education	.06	.05	.10	.05	.10
Immigration status	-.35	.13	-.19	.14	-.07
Latino			.18	.09	.11
Black			.09	.08	.06

Note.  $R^2 = .05$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .04$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .02$  for Step 2 ( $p < .05$ ).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

*Individual volunteering.* A sample of 639 respondents provided complete data for the second sequential regression. Log individual giving was regressed on log income, education, and immigration in step 1. Race/ethnicity was entered in step 2. Table B-15 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations that underlie the regression. Table B-16 displays the regression results. For step 1, the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .23$ ) was significantly different from zero,  $F(3, 635) = 11.76$ ,  $p < .001$ . A significant increase in the multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = .25$ ) was found at step 2,  $F(2, 633) = 3.56$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Table B-15

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Underlying Fourth Sequential Multiple Regression

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Intercorrelations						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Log individual volunteering	1.67	1.31	1						
2 Log income	10.54	.88	-.11	1					
3 Education	4.73	1.34	-.11	.34	1				
4 Immigration status	.30	.46	-.21	.15	.16	1			
5 Hispanic	-.10	.79	.15	-.20	-.36	-.33	1		
6 Black	.00	.86	.21	-.12	-.27	-.53	.54	1	

n = 463

Table B-16

Summary of Sequential Regression Analyses for Race/Ethnicity Predicting Log Individual Volunteering  
Beyond That of Log Income, Education, and Immigration

Variable	Step 1		Step 2		$\beta$
	B	SE B	B	SE B	
Constant	2.99	.61	2.84	.62	
Log household income	-.08	.06	-.09	.06	-.06
Education	-.06	.04	-.03	.04	-.03
Immigration status	-.55	.11	-.37	.13	-.13
Latino			.03	.08	.02
Black			.17	.08	.11

Note.  $R^2 = .05$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .05$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ ); change in  $R^2 = .01$  for Step 2 ( $p < .05$ ).  $\beta$  values reported for Step 2 only.

## References

- California Community Foundation (1997). *Los Angeles County Giving and Volunteering Benchmark Survey: Overview*. Los Angeles: CCF.
- Community Foundation Silicon Valley (1998). *Giving Back, The Silicon Valley Way*. San Jose: CFSV.
- Greene, Elizabeth; Millar, Bruce; and Moore, Jennifer (1994). "The Midwest's Charitable Advantage," *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, vol. 6, no. 9 (February 22, 1994), pp. 1, 22-26.
- Hall, Michael; Knighton, Tamara; Reed, Paul; Bussière, Patrick; McRae, Don; and Bowen, Paddy (1998). *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Havens, John J., and Schervish, Paul G. (1997). *Our Daily Bread: Findings from the First Diary Study on Giving and Receiving Care*. Chesnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Social Welfare Research Institute.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia A., and Weitzman, Murray S. (1996). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey, 1996 Edition*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Rosenberg, Claude, Jr. (1994). *Wealthy and Wise: How You and America Can Get the Most Out of Your Giving*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Saxon-Harrold, Susan K.E. (1999). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey, 1999 Edition, Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Schervish, Paul G., and Havens, John J. (1995). "Do the Poor Pay More: Is the U-Shaped Curve Correct?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1 (Spring), 79-90.
- Smith, Bradford; Shue, Sylvia; Vest, Jennifer L.; and Villareal, Joseph (1999). *Philanthropy in Communities of Color*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- State of California, Department of Finance (1998, December). *County Population Projections with Race/Ethnic Detail* [Online]. Available: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/e-1text.htm>, Sacramento, California.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G., and Fidell, Linda S. (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- U.S. Census Microdata (1990). Available: <http://sda.berkeley.edu:7502/archive.htm>. The University of California at Berkeley, Survey Documentation and Analysis Archive.

Wolpert, Julian (1989). "Key Indicators of Generosity in Communities." In Virginia A. Hodgkinson, Richard W. Lyman, and Associates, *The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Challenges, Changes, and Policy Considerations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.