Social participation and charitable giving revisited: Replication of a multivariate analysis

Authors: Paul G. Schervish, Platon E. Coutsoukis, John J. Havens

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104121

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC, Boston College University Libraries.

Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College, October 20, 1998

These materials are made available for use in research, teaching and private study, pursuant to U.S. Copyright Law. The user must assume full responsibility for any use of the materials, including but not limited to, infringement of copyright and publication rights of reproduced materials. Any materials used for academic research or otherwise should be fully credited with the source. The publisher or original authors may retain copyright to the materials.

BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER ON WEALTH AND PHILANTHROPY

Social Participation and Charitable Giving Revisited: Replication of a Multivariate Analysis

> Paul G. Schervish Platon E. Coutsoukis John J. Havens

Center on Wealth and Philanthropy Boston College October 20, 1998



Social Participation and Charitable Giving Revisited:

Replication of a Multivariate Analysis

Paul G. Schervish Platon E. Coutsoukis John J. Havens Social Welfare Research Institute Boston College October 20, 1998

Introduction

Two years ago, we empirically examined empirically a multiple-cluster, multivariate theory of philanthropy developed by the first author (Schervish and Havens, 1996). We based this analysis on the 1992 national Survey of Giving and Volunteering (SGV) conducted by the Gallup Organization for the Independent Sector. In the present paper, we replicate our empirical analysis using two newer data sets: the 1996 national General Social Survey (GSS) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center and the 1994-95 national Harvard Survey of Health and Life Quality (HSHLQ) conducted by DataStat for the MacArthur Foundation. These additional surveys allow us to investigate whether we can obtain broad support for our initial findings, despite the differences in focus and the specific questions asked, among all the surveys.

The multiple-cluster theory of philanthropy was developed from the analysis of intensive interviews with millionaires in an earlier study of wealth and philanthropy (Schervish, 1992; Schervish et al., 1994). This theory is an 'identification' model of charitable giving, because it focuses on the factors inducing the identification of the self with the needs and aspirations of others, instead of focusing on the mobilizing influence of the absence of the self (altruism theory). Thus, the identification model is fundamentally a relational theory. There are four such relational variable sets in our theory and a fifth one having to do with discretionary resources. The process of mapping particular survey questions into the theoretical clusters led us to discern a new cluster of variables, which we called 'urgency / effectiveness'. We also included one demographic cluster.

Briefly speaking, the theoretical clusters are the following: (1) *communities of participation* are the networks of formal and informal relationships to which people are associated, (2) *frameworks of consciousness* are the ways of thinking and feeling that are rooted deeply enough in one's awareness to induce a commitment to a cause, (3) *direct requests* made to individuals for contributions of time and money, (4) positive *models and experiences from one's youth* which animate adult philanthropy, (5) the existence of *discretionary resources*, the level of one's discretionary resources of time and money is of course a mixture of objective and subjective considerations, (6) the respondents' expectations about the social *urgency for and effectiveness* of their philanthropic involvement.

Original Research Findings

Considering each cluster as a whole, we found strong statistical evidence that five of the theoretical clusters, as measured in the 1992 Survey of Giving and Volunteering and as associated with each theoretical cluster were jointly related to giving behavior as measured by percentage of income contributed per household. For the additional factor, urgency / effectiveness, the empirical evidence was borderline at best. However, community of participation was by far the cluster with the strongest statistical relationship.

Considering all the variables from all clusters simultaneously, we found nine variables significant at the 0.05 level. Of those variables, five were community of participation variables, two were invitation to participate variables, one was a resource variable and one was a demographic characteristic. Our conclusion was that youthful experiences, framework of consciousness and urgency / effectiveness do not have a strong, direct effect on the percentage of income contributed independent of participation, resources and demographic characteristics.

Reviewing these findings from a broad theoretical standpoint, it appears that for the population as a whole participation, especially participation that already embodies a

commitment to philanthropy or to a philanthropic organization, is directly related to giving behavior. Within community of participation, religious commitment and participation in religious organizations have a strong influence on general giving behavior. The impact of variables from other theoretical clusters do not have a central and consistent impact on giving behavior.

Confirmatory Research Findings

In this paper, we find confirmation at a broad level for our original findings. That is, for the population as a whole community of participation is strongly related to giving behavior. However, the statistical evidence for all clusters, including community of participation, is weaker than the statistical evidence in the original study. This lesser support is to be expected considering that unlike the 1992 national Survey of Giving and Volunteering (SGV), the two additional data sets on which the current study is based were not designed to examine giving and volunteering and thus did not tap as extensively these behaviors. A new second important finding of the present study is that it appears that the variable clusters are related differently to high givers than they are related to the remainder of the population.

Data and Methodology

For the original analysis we used a subset of data from the national Survey of Giving and Volunteering in the United States collected in 1992 by the Gallup Organization for the Independent Sector. The survey is a representative cross-sectional sample of 2,671 American households whose respondent was 18 years of age or older. In the present analysis we are using a subset of the (1) national General Social Survey (GSS) data collected in 1996 by the National Opinion Research Center for the National Data Program for the Social Sciences and (2) the national Harvard Survey of Health and Life Quality (HSHLQ) data collected in 1994-95 by DataStat for the MacArthur Foundation. The GSS survey is a representative cross-sectional sample of 2,904 American households whose respondent was 18 years of age or older. The HSHLQ is also a representative cross-sectional sample of 4,242 American households whose respondent was 18-74 years of age.

The present analysis is limited by the fact that neither the GSS not the HSHLQ was focused on giving and volunteering. In many occasions, the process of mapping particular survey questions into each of the theoretical clusters resulted in fewer variables per cluster and in the case of the 1996 national General Social Survey, in fewer clusters (three including the demographic cluster). Some of the variables we used in this analysis were the same in all the surveys, some were similar, but others were not comparable. Nevertheless, all variables we selected were within the range of the theoretical meaning of each cluster. Importantly, the dependent variable was defined in the same manner across all analyses as percentage of income contributed by the household.

In the original study, in order to increase the likelihood of accurate responses we restricted our analysis to a subsample of households in which the respondents often jointly with their spouse, were both 'most involved in deciding which charities your household will give to' and 'primarily responsible for giving donations to charity'. In the present study, both new data sets did not include a similar question. However, the GSS did ask the respondent's relationship to head of household, therefore, we limited our analysis of the GSS to a subsample of households in which the respondent was the head of the household or his/her spouse (2,546 households). The HSHLQ did not include even this question, therefore we could not approximate this qualification with this data set.

In the GSS, only approximately half of the sample (1444 respondents) was asked questions about giving and volunteering and the rest of the survey questions, those not related directly to giving and volunteering, were asked only of parts of the full sample. Among the latter set of questions, many could have been mapped into the theoretical clusters, but unfortunately many observations lacked data either on the giving and volunteering or other variables directly included in the analysis. Including these variables would reduce the size of the sample for multivariate analysis to an unacceptable small number of cases. Moreover, this effect was exacerbated by the presence of missing data. In the case of the HSHLQ, all the questions were asked of all the respondents, therefore, this data set provided a stronger basis for the analysis.

In the original analysis using the 1992 Survey of Giving and Volunteering (SGV) we did impute values for the missing data, however, in the present analysis we did not do so. One extreme observation was eliminated from the GSS data (a retired wealthy individual who gave for that year \$399,984, that is, over five times his reported income of \$75,000). Lastly, for the joint regression analysis of all the clusters we reduced further the number of variables by eliminating those whose significance level was greater than 0.1 in the initial analysis of the individual clusters.

At a broad level, our goal in this research is to reassess the degree of support for our original findings and not for obtaining similar values for such measures as beta weights and R-squared. Despite the fact that technical limitations resulted in restricting the size of the samples we could use, the number of GSS respondents included for this analysis was comparable to the original study based on SGV data, and the number of HSHLQ respondents included was almost three times as large as the SGV number (see Table 1). Thus, arriving at a set of variables per cluster was the result of theoretical and methodological considerations.

Findings from Comparison of Separate Variable Clusters

In the present analysis, we want to find out if the broad quantitative support we discovered for the multiple-cluster theory of philanthropy applied at the household level can be replicated with other national data sets. We addressed this research question by considering whether the variables, as measured in the GSS and HSHLQ and as associated with each theoretical cluster were jointly related to giving behavior as measured by percentage of income contributed per household. In particular, we ran multiple regressions

between giving behavior and each of the six theoretical clusters of variables and the cluster of demographic characteristics as part of this assessment. Each of these regression analyses estimates the combined direct and indirect impact of the cluster of variables on percentage of income contributed. Each also estimates the combined direct and indirect impact of each of the specific variables associated with the cluster. Below we describe the effect of each cluster as a whole on giving for each new data set (see Table 1). The effect of each specific variable associated with the cluster (only statistically significant variables) can be seen in Table 2.

In both data sets, communities of participation was confirmed as the theoretical cluster that has by far the strongest statistical relationship to percent of income contributed data sets. However, its relationship estimate, using the GSS, is double the size of its estimated relationship using the HSHLQ, but both estimated relationships are weaker than their counterpart in the original analysis on the basis of SGV.

The clusters youthful experiences and invitation to participate received very weak statistical support using the HSHLQ (there were no such variables for the GSS). The rest of the theoretical clusters received weak statistical support using HSHLQ and we found the same for the two remaining clusters using the GSS. All the theoretical clusters received weaker statistical support from both the new data sets than they received in the original study.

Also, we extended the current investigation beyond the replication of our prior multivariate study to assess the effects of eliminating high givers from the analysis. Below we describe the overall effect that the analysis of the thusly reduced data set produced (see Table 3).

On the basis of both new data sets, we found that when we eliminated from the analysis respondents who gave 10% or more of their annual income the effect of each cluster on giving approximately doubled in size.

This trend reached its highest level after eliminating from the analysis respondents who gave 8% or more of their annual income (see Table 3).

This change in the impact of each theoretical cluster on giving is large and it almost attains the strength of the original findings on the basis of SGV.

Thus, the multiple regression analysis indicates that there is strong statistical evidence for the central tenet of the multiple-cluster theory of philanthropy applied at the household level. That is, for the population as a whole, participation, especially participation that already embodies a commitment to philanthropy or to a philanthropic organization, is directly related to giving behavior. In addition, we find that the clusters of variables are related differently to high givers than to the remainder of the population. When we eliminate the high-givers the statistical relationships increase dramatically, which implies that the relationships between the clusters and giving behavior (as measured by percent of income contributed) is different among the small number of high-givers that among the majority of the population. We are currently looking into the relationships between the clusters and giving behavior among high-givers.

Findings from Comparison of Joint Variable Clusters

When the many factors relevant to the theory are taken simultaneously into account, which factors were most strongly related to giving behavior? We used multiple regression again to investigate this research question. Only variables with the strongest empirical relationship to giving behavior (statistically significant at the 0.1 level or less) were included in the analysis. The resulting reduced set of variables is significantly related to giving behavior at the 0.0001 level of statistical significance (see Table 2).

In the joint analysis on the basis of the HSHLQ, the top two of the seven variables with the strongest relation to giving behavior, as measured by their standardized beta coefficients, were one community of participation and one discretionary resource. The next five variables all have roughly the same strength, and two are community of participation, one is a discretionary resource, one demographic characteristic, and one framework of consciousness. The remaining variable is the weakest among variables significant at the 0.05 level, and is another demographic characteristic.

In the joint analysis on the basis of the GSS, the top three of the six variables with the strongest relation to giving behavior, as measured by their standardized beta coefficients, were community of participation variables. As in the original study, all three were closely related to participation in institutions and organizations that maintain formal channels for receiving charitable contributions. The next three variables were discretionary resources. Of the three remaining variables significant at the 0.05 level, two were community of participation variables and one was a demographic characteristic. Of course, for the GSS, we must remember that we did not include any variables representing the other four clusters, because we found no appropriate questions asked in 1996 or no appropriate questions asked of those respondents who were asked about giving and volunteering.

Considering the HSHLQ study alone, since it is the only one which provided variables for all the clusters, we find that as in the original study there were no variables from the youthful experiences, and effectiveness / urgency clusters. But unlike the original study, there was one variable from the framework of consciousness cluster, and there were no variables from the invitation to participate cluster. In the original study we concluded that these clusters are not strongly and consistently related to the percentage of income contributed once participation, resource and demographic variables are taken into account. We hypothesized that these clusters may still be critical factors in causal sequences involved in giving behavior. That they are either (a) less proximate factors than participation, discretionary resources and demographic factors or (b) proximately related to giving behavior but only for selected segments of the population. After the replication analysis, we still maintain these views with the additional caveat that in the case of the HSHLQ data we found too few variables (seven) to represent these four clusters.

Specific Variables

This section evaluates the impacts of each of the ten variables for the total population in both the GSS and the HSHLQ on percentage of income contributed in terms of the standardised regression and non-standardised coefficients. Standardised coefficients indicate the relative strength of a variable's impact. Non-standardised coefficients estimate the average impact of a variable, adjusting for the effects of all other variables in the analysis, for a given specification of the regression equation.

As in the original study, the two strongest variables associated with the giving behavior behavior (i.e., percentage of income contributed) involved participation to religious institutions. Adjusting for other factors in the HSHLQ, predicted percentage of income contributed increases by a third of one percent for each time the respondent attends religious services per month. In th GSS, the percentage of income contributed increases by one fourth of one percent with each increment of attendance in a 1-8 scale from never to several times a week.

As in the original study, other participation variables had a major impact. For both data sets, two of the four strongest variables associated with giving involved general participation. Adjusting for other factors in the HSHLQ, predicted percentage of income contributed increases approximately by a tenth of one percent for every three hours volunteered or by a third of one percent for the respondents who perform volunteer work for 15 or more hours per week. Adjusting for other factors in the GSS, predicted percentage of income contributed increases approximately by a tenth of one percent for every three hours volunteer do not be percentage of income contributed increases approximately by a tenth of one percent for every two hours per week. Adjusting for other factors in the GSS, predicted percentage of income contributed increases approximately by a tenth of one percent for every two hours volunteered and by half of one percent with each additional different type of organization the respondent contributes money to.

Unlike the original study, besides household income two more resource variables were among the most important variables (significant at the 0.05 level) in the analysis using the GSS and one using the HSHLQ. As in the original study household income has a modest negative impact on percentage of household income contributed, once other variables are taken into account. Adjusting for other factors, in the HSHLQ, the percentage of income increases almost by three quarters of one percent for households whose members feel they have enough money to meet their needs (three category scale). Adjusting for other factors, in the GSS, households whose members feel very satisfied financially tend to give one percent of their income more than those households whose members feel not satisfied financially. In the same vein, households whose members feel their financial situation is above average tend to give three percent of their income more than those households whose members feel their financial situation is not above average.

Religious affiliation (Protestant) in the HSHLQ and the respondent's age in the GSS were the only demographic variables among the most important. Adjusting for other factors, Protestants tend to give eight tenths of one percent of their income more than respondents who report other religious affiliations. A household whose respondent was 60 years old tended to give eight tenths of one percent more than households whose respondent was 30 years old. Retirement status, the only important demographic variable in the original study was also significant at the 0.08 level using the HSHLQ data. After adjusting for other factors, households whose respondent was a retiree contributed 1.28 percent of their income more than households whose respondent was not a retiree.

Unlike the original study, the analysis on the basis of the HSHLQ data includes one framework of consciousness variable. After adjusting for other factors, households whose respondents felt obliged to volunteer time or give money to social causes they support, if the situation arose, tend to give approximately a fifth of one percent of their income more in a 0-10 scale from no obligation to great obligation than households whose members tend not to feel obligated to follow up on their values. Lastly, the analysis on the basis of the GSS data includes one more community of participation variable. Adjusting for other factors, households whose members gave money, food, or clothing to a needy relative tend to give almost one tenth of one percent of their income more than those whose members did not help relatives in this way.

The results of the present analyses seem to confirm the findings of the initial study. That is, from a broad theoretical standpoint, it appears that for the population as a whole participation, especially participation that already embodies a commitment to philanthropy or to a philanthropic organization, is directly related to giving behavior. Within community of participation, participation in religious organizations has a strong influence on general giving behavior. The impact of variables from other theoretical clusters do not have a central a nd consistent impact on giving behavior.

Discussion and Conclusion

The foregoing research both confirms the identification model and breaks some new ground, both empirically and theoretically. Our original research based on the 1992 SGV were theoretically deductive but empirically inductive. That is, the major argument and the choice of variable clusters we examined were derived largely from what we learned through intensive interviews with 130 wealth holders in the Study on Wealth and Philanthropy (see Herman and Schervish 1988 and Schervish 199xmotivation paper). However, the actual empirical analysis was largely inductive in that we discovered the mobilizing factors that lead to charitable giving by searching through long lists of potential variables in a quest for those that were statistically significant. In this paper, we take up where we left off in our previous research .

Although HSHLQ and GSS data do not allow for as complete a replication of our findings with the 1992 SGV data as one might like, they do provide sufficient comparable information to carry out a basic confirmation. This confirmation is made more reliable by the fact that our replication is deductive rather than inductive. The two surveys analyzed here provide new and independent data from which we can test our initial findings. Because

the HSHLQ and GSS data forced us to operationalize the identification model in a somewhat different way from our analysis of the SGV data, we emerge more convinced about the robustness of the identification model. Besides the fact that analysis of the two data sets confirm the primacy of associational variables in increasing the percentage of income contributed, another important finding emerged from the current research. In an effort to explore why the explained variance for the final explanatory models was lower for the HSHLQ and GSS analyses than in the SGV analysis, we revisited a long-standing supposition of ours that the relationships that induce charitable giving for modest and lower givers need to be explored separately from those that induce charitable giving among those who donate greater proportions of their income. When we split the samples between those who give lower and higher percentages of income to charity, we find that the explained variance of the same identification model variables increases substantially for both higher and lower subsamples in both datasets.

We plan to explore more fully just why this occurs, but limitations in available data may make it impossible to do much more than confirm the following reasonable speculation based on what we have discovered in other research. The most concise explanation for the fact that the slopes of the trend lines and the social processes that generate charitable giving are similar for higher and lower contributing households, but the intercepts are different, may be the simple fact that higher givers are more wealthy. In a recent analysis of the joint relationship of income and wealth to charitable giving based on the Federal Reserve's Survey of Consumer Finances, we documented that those households across the entire income spectrum which gave disproportionately higher percentages of their income were those which were the wealthiest (Schervish and Havens 1998--Wealth and Commonwealth). Regardless of their income category, households that possess a deeper pool of wealth give greater percentages of their income to charity. This relatively unremarkable finding is nevertheless important, only if it once again shows that it is not a different set of motivations or social relationships that distinguish givers from different income groups. Although the households in the uppermost strata of income contribute greater proportions of the incomes to charity, belonging to one income group rather than another does not lead to greater giving for the 95% of the population with incomes below \$125,000. And for households above \$125,000 that give a higher average percentage of incomes, and those higher givers in lower income groups, there does not appear to be a radically different social dynamic at work. For those who give a greater proportion of their charitable giving to religion, religious association (such a attendance at religious services) is a key variable. But for those whose giving goes largely to non-religious causes, association remains key. In all cases--for higher and lower givers, for high income and lower income givers, for religious and non-religious givers--the identification model remains central. Association breeds identification; and identification match up with which arenas and amounts of giving, the better we will be able to fortify the identification model and specify its practical implications.

For now, based on our previous analysis and our current analyses of additional surveys, we have found nothing to contradict the identification model and much to confirm it. It remains unproven, as is the natural fate of any theory. At the same time, it remains supported, as is the natural hope for any theory. That engagement induces charitable giving suggests an important commanality among all people across all income groups. That certain types of engagement lead to certain types of chartiable giving suggest the kinds of non-invidious differences that can be drawn upon without having to look for or declare one group of people being better than another.