

Working Paper No.7



The giving of time and money: An analysis of donor behaviour among volunteers

Gianni Zappalà & Tracy Burrell

List and copies of available publicatoins
may be obtained by contacting:

Research and Social Policy Team
The Smith Family
16 Larkin Street
PO Box 10500
Camperdown NSW 1450
Telephone 9550 4422

Further information may also be found at
www.smithfamily.com.au

ISBN: 1 876833 23 8
ISSN: 1446-4748

Copyright © 2002 The Smith Family

July 2002

Research & Social Policy Team

**Working Paper
No.7, 2002**

The giving of time and money: An analysis of donor behaviour among volunteers

By

Gianni Zappalà & Tracy Burrell

Preface

The Research and Social Policy Team provides an internal research capacity to ensure that The Smith Family's programs are evidence-based. A general theme that integrates all of our research activities is *social capability*, the capacities of communities and individuals in them to draw from their own strengths and social capital and to move beyond the limitations of disadvantage. We also investigate a range of issues with national and community relevance, such as trends in financial disadvantage, education and social policy. In addition, we also contribute to policy debates in government and the community sector. This is an integral component of our vision for a more caring and cohesive Australian community.

The Smith Family's strategy for program development is one of collaborating with a range of stakeholders who are interested in working for societal change. As well as conducting our own research, therefore, we also form strategic alliances with other research centres and social sector organisations.

A range of publications makes our research findings and activities accessible to those who have either an interest in or a commitment to The Smith Family's agenda for societal change. **Background Papers** identify areas to be researched as well as provide important pre-evaluation information of Smith Family programs and activities. **Working Papers** present research findings that contribute to the development of evidence based social policy and initiate professional dialogue on critical research questions. **Briefing Papers** provide analysis of Smith Family programs and wider social policy issues in a more concise timely manner. A regular **E – Bulletin** publicises the Team's publications as well as provides current updates on TSF research and policy. These publications, as well as occasional reports, submissions and monographs are either produced in-house, the product of collaborative efforts with other researchers or arise from commissioned research. All publications are subject to a refereeing process.

We trust that you find the following Working Paper a worthwhile contribution to evidence based social research and to the development of social policy that unlocks opportunities and builds capacity for all Australians.

Dr Rob Simons
National Manager Strategic Research & Social Policy

Contents

List of Tables	iv
About the authors	v
Acknowledgments	v
Abstract	vi
Introduction	1
Australian research on charitable giving by individuals	1
The nexus between volunteering and charitable giving	3
Data and Methods	4
The Dependent variable: Charitable giving	4
The Independent variables: Volunteer behaviour	5
The Independent variables: Association membership & religious participation	5
The Independent variables: Sociodemographic & socioeconomic controls	6
Findings	7
Discussion	8
Conclusion	9
Appendix: Summary statistics	10
References	11

List of Tables

Table 1	Donation rate by volunteer status, age and sex
Table 2	Amount donated in past year
Table 3	Determinants of giving (amount donated in the last year)
Table A1	Summary statistics for variables used in OLS model

About the authors

Dr Gianni Zappalà is Research Manager in the Research & Social Policy Team, The Smith Family. He has degrees in Economics, Industrial Relations and Political Science from the Universities of Sydney, London and Cambridge. Prior to joining The Smith Family at the end of 1999, he held various teaching and research positions at the Universities of Sydney, Cambridge (Fellow of Emmanuel College), Wollongong and the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University. In 1996 he was the Australian Parliamentary Fellow at Parliament House, Canberra. He has published widely in the areas of labour markets and industrial relations, immigration and citizenship, and Australian politics and economics. His research at TSF has included: the social impact of the new economy, the relationship between socioeconomic status and educational outcomes, volunteering, assessing the social impact of companies, and school-to-work transitions. His most recent book is *Speaking for the People: Representation in Australian Politics* (Melbourne University Press, 2001) with Marian Sawer.

Tracy Burrell was a Research Assistant in the Research & Social Policy Team, The Smith Family from March 2001 to March 2002. She has an Honours degree in Psychology from the University of New South Wales. Her Honours thesis in Personality and Social Psychology examined the relationship between value priorities and ideologies, and their influence on recycling behaviour.

Acknowledgments

We thank Jennifer McLaren, Dimity Raftos, Rob Simons, and Ciara Smyth from TSF for suggestions and comments. In particular, we thank Ian Watson for his helpful insights regarding the statistical analysis. The usual disclaimers apply.

Abstract

Many nonprofit organisations rely on people who donate their *time* or *money* in order to undertake many, if not most, of their activities. Although evidence suggests that there is a strong relationship between volunteering and giving, these two dimensions of philanthropic behaviour have tended to be examined in isolation from one another in Australia. Having a better understanding of this relationship may be beneficial to nonprofit organisations striving to improve their volunteer management as well as fundraising efforts.

This paper examines the charitable giving behaviour of volunteers at The Smith Family, a large Australian public-serving nonprofit organisation in community services. In particular, it examines the influence of volunteer behaviour and social participation on the propensity to give. While the study is based on a sample of volunteers in one community services organisation, it is able to employ a more complete set of multivariate controls than have been used in previous studies to shed more light on the relationship between volunteer activity and giving in Australia.

The key findings are that age and socioeconomic status (income and education level) are positively related to giving. There is also a significant and positive interaction effect between age and income. In other words, the effect of age was mediated by a volunteer's household income level, so that the magnitude of the positive effect of income on giving increased with age. Another key finding is that those volunteers who were 'infrequent' (gave less time) were more likely to give larger financial donations to charitable causes, while 'frequent volunteers' (highly committed in terms of time) gave less money to charitable causes. In contrast, as the length of time that people had been volunteers at TSF increased (another dimension of commitment), so did the amount of charitable donations. Finally, volunteers who attended church on a regular basis were substantially more likely to give more to charitable organisations than those who were not regular church attendees. The final section discusses the implications of these findings for nonprofit organisations.

Introduction

Many nonprofit organisations rely on people who donate their *time* (by volunteering) or *money* (by making charitable donations) in order to undertake many, if not most, of their activities. These two acts of giving constitute the core of individual philanthropic behaviour in most societies. Our understanding of the factors driving volunteering and volunteer commitment in nonprofit organisations has improved as a result of increased research and data from national surveys (ABS 2001; Zappalà 2000a,b; Zappalà & Burrell 2001, 2002). While the range of data sources on giving have also increased, our knowledge of the factors driving charitable giving among individuals in Australia remains scant. Furthermore, in spite of evidence suggesting a strong relationship between volunteering and giving, these two dimensions of philanthropic behaviour tend to be examined in isolation from one another. Having a better understanding of this relationship may be beneficial to nonprofit organisations striving to improve their volunteer management as well as increase their fundraising efforts.

Research on giving in Australia has focused on why Australians seem to give less than other comparable countries even though we have a strong and vibrant third sector (Lyons 1994, 1995). One estimate suggests that after allowing for differences in population and income, giving by individuals and households in Australia is only 15 per cent of the level in the U.S. (Lyons 1994). Possible reasons for the lower propensity of Australians to give money include differences in tax structures and incentives and the greater religiosity of Americans. Lyons (1994:5) suggests the low giving rates may be a 'product of weaker institutions of philanthropy in Australia.' Although comparative analysis is useful, there are still gaps in our knowledge of the factors associated with individual giving in Australia as well as the relationship between volunteering and giving. While it has been argued that 'volunteering is...a substitute for giving' (Lyons 1994:3), this proposition remains untested.

This paper examines the charitable giving behaviour of volunteers at The Smith Family, a large Australian public-serving nonprofit organisation in community services. In particular, it examines the influence of volunteer behaviour and social participation on the propensity to give money. While the study is based on a sample of volunteers in one community services organisation, it is able to employ a more complete set of multivariate controls than have been used in previous studies to shed more light on the relationship between volunteer activity and giving in Australia. The next two sections briefly summarise some of the key findings from previous Australian research on charitable giving by individuals. In particular, the relationship between volunteering and giving is discussed. The paper then describes the data and methods used to estimate the effects of a range of possible determinants on the amount donated by volunteers. The key findings are then presented, followed by a discussion of their possible implications for nonprofit organisations.

Australian research on charitable giving by individuals

Although Australian research on giving is still in its infancy, the sources of data on giving by Australians have increased over the last few years. Defining the extent of charitable giving is difficult, however, due to the different assumptions and methodologies underpinning the different data sources, hence leading to different estimates. A distinction can be made, however, between philanthropic giving and charitable giving (Jencks 1987:322). The former refers to gifts or donations made to organisations such as schools, hospitals and churches that are often used for operating costs, while the latter, and the focus of this paper, refers to donations specifically aimed at the poor or needy.

The most recent voluntary work survey conducted by the ABS in 2000 suggested that almost three-quarters (74%) of people aged 18 and over made a personal donation of

money to an organisation (ABS 2001). Analysis of the most recently available tax return data suggests that about one in three Australian taxpayers donate monies to charities (McGregor-Lowndes et al 2001). These data are limited because they may include donations that can be legally claimed that are not purely charitable (e.g. donations to school funds may benefit the donor's children). This is because organisations with tax deductibility status are broader than organisations that meet the definition of a Charitable Organisation. These data also exclude religious giving (an important source and motivation for giving), as donations to religious organisations are not tax deductible (Lyons 1994). According to a market research company specialising in the analysis of giving trends, Australian households donated more than \$1.63 billion in cash donations, or \$133 per Australian adult, to the nation's nonprofit organisations in 1999 – an increase of 12.4 per cent over the previous year (O'Keefe & Partners 2000).

To whom do Australians give? In 1997, over one-third (37%) of donations by individual Australians went to religious organisations (e.g. churches, mosques etc.) (Lyons 2000). Less than one-fifth (17%) of donations went to community/welfare organisations, followed closely by organisations in education and research (16%). On average, just over one-quarter (27%) of the income of nonprofit organisations in community services comes from fundraising activities (i.e. donors) (Lyons 2001). This figure hides the fact, however, that for many organisations (e.g. World Vision, The Smith Family) the percentage of income from fundraising is much higher, often close to 80 per cent of all income.

While the precise extent of charitable giving may be difficult to establish, these diverse sources of data also inform, albeit in a limited way, the factors associated with giving by individuals in Australia. In terms of sociodemographic variables, for instance, most surveys indicate that giving increases with age (Lyons 1993; ABS 2001). Table 1, which summarises the available data from the most recent ABS survey, shows that the donation rate increases from a relatively high rate of 62 per cent for people aged 18 to 24 to 80 per cent for people aged 45 to 54. It begins to trend downwards again (72%) for people aged over 75. Similar to other forms of helping behaviour (e.g. volunteering), Table 1 suggests that females have a higher donation rate than males. Other surveys have also found that women give more than men (O'Keefe & Partners 1999). An analysis of giving based on the 1988/89 ABS Household Expenditure Survey (HES) data found that households in rural areas were more generous than households in urban areas and capital cities (Lyons 1993). The same study also found that households where the reference person was born overseas, gave more (measured as a percentage of total expenditure) compared to households where the reference person was Australian-born or born in the UK or NZ. Overseas studies have mixed results with respect to the influence of variables such as household composition, marital status and ethnicity/race on giving (Jencks 1987; Jackson et al 1995).

In terms of socioeconomic status (SES) variables, the relationship between income and giving varies according to whether the variable being examined is expressed as the amount donated or the amount donated as a proportion of the donor's income. The former (and subject of this paper) is generally a positive and linear relationship, with the amount donated increasing as income increases. Analysis of giving based on Australian income tax returns supports the view that the amount donated increases with income. Taxpayers earning less than \$10,000, for instance, made an average tax-deductible donation of \$154, while taxpayers earning over \$1 million made average tax-deductible donations of almost \$27,000 (McGregor-Lowndes et al 2001:22). Furthermore, this analysis showed that as income increases, the more likely it is that taxpayers will make tax-deductible donations. While only 16 per cent of taxpayers with a taxable income less than \$10,000 made tax-deductible donations to charities in 1998/99, this increased to 62 per cent of taxpayers with taxable incomes over \$1 million.

The latter (amount donated as a proportion of income) albeit the subject of debate, is generally in the form of a U-shaped relationship (Jencks 1987; Schervish & Havens 1995).

In other words, donations as a percentage of income are high for people with low incomes, fall as income rises up to a certain point (the bottom of the U) and then rise again as income rises. Lyon's (1993:9) analysis of giving using the ABS HES data found the 'faintest hint of a U-shaped curve', when examining giving as a percentage of total expenditure. When household size was adjusted for, however, the U-shaped distribution disappeared, and giving as a percentage of adjusted household expenditure increased with expenditure (proxy for income). The most recent analysis of taxpayer data, however, does suggest the existence of a U-shaped curve, with taxpayers at both the top and bottom ends of the scale donating more as a percentage of their taxable income compared to middle income taxpayers (McGregor-Lowndes et al 2001:25).

Other dimensions of SES, such as education level or occupational status have also been found to have a positive relationship with giving (amount of money donated) (Jencks 1987; Jackson et al 1995; McGregor-Lowndes et al 2001). Studies of giving also point to the existence of significant interaction effects between income and age. In particular, older people tend to give more than others in the same income band (Jencks 1987).

The nexus between volunteering and charitable giving

While these studies point to the influence of demographic and socioeconomic variables on giving behaviour, as noted earlier, there is little, if any, research in Australia that examines the factors that influence giving behaviour by people who also volunteer. Several studies confirm that individuals who volunteer their time are also more likely to make financial donations to charities (Piliavin & Charng 1990). A recent survey of volunteering and giving in the U.S., for instance, found that households where the respondent volunteered gave substantially more in the way of charitable contributions compared to households where there were no volunteers (Independent Sector 2001). This pattern also seems to be present in Australia. The most recent voluntary work survey conducted by the ABS in 2000 showed that while almost three-quarters (74%) of people aged 18 and over made a personal donation of money to an organisation, volunteers had a higher donation rate (84%) than non-volunteers (70%) (see Table 1). This was the case across all age and sex categories.

Table 1 Donation rate by volunteer status, age and sex^(a)

	Volunteer (%)	Non-volunteer (%)	Total (%)
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	68	60	62
25-34	84	67	71
35-44	86	75	80
45-54	88	75	80
55-64	87	73	77
65-74	86	67	73
75 and over	87	69	72
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	83	67	72
Female	86	73	77
<i>Total persons</i>	84	70	74

Source: ABS (2001:32)

Notes:

- a) The donation rate is the number of people in a particular group who made donations expressed as a percentage of the total population of that group.

Prosocial or helping behaviour therefore appears to be cumulative. This is consistent with the 'General Activity Model' that predicts that 'the more one participates in one kind of socioculturally approved discretionary time activity, the more one will tend to participate in

other kinds of such activity, including volunteer participation...[and] charitable giving' (Smith 1994:255). There is some evidence of this in Australia. One study found that volunteers were significantly more likely than non-volunteers to attend a social club, hobby group or self-help/support group (Baum et al 1999). Civic participation was also significantly higher for volunteers than non-volunteers for both individual civic activities, such as attending a council meeting, and collective civic activities (e.g. involved in a resident or community action group). Greater civic and social participation through clubs and groups may provide more opportunities to volunteer or it may produce greater civic engagement, stimulating people's willingness to act philanthropically (Baum et al 1999).

Religious and association membership is also associated with higher levels of giving (Jackson et al 1995). In particular, as was noted earlier, religious organisations are a key destination source for individual's donations. While the relatively lower levels of religious observance among Australians has been noted as one reason why Australia has comparatively lower levels of giving, the influence of religious observance, such as church attendance, on the giving behaviour of individuals within Australia has not been extensively examined.¹

Existing studies therefore suggest that volunteering and membership of a religious or civic association may be important factors that promote charitable giving over and above sociodemographic and socioeconomic background characteristics. The remainder of this paper examines the nature of the relationship between volunteer behaviour, social participation and giving while controlling for the influence of other factors.

Data and Methods

The data for this study come from a national survey of all known volunteers at The Smith Family (TSF) conducted in May 2000. The Smith Family is an Australian public-serving nonprofit organisation founded by volunteers in 1922 that relies on the time and skills of almost 2000 volunteers for many of its activities. Donors' financial contributions comprise almost 40 per cent of TSF's operating revenue (TSF 2001).² The survey asked questions relating to the reasons people volunteer at TSF, the nature and extent of their volunteering work at TSF (e.g. program areas, tasks performed, hours volunteered), socio-demographic and socioeconomic information as well as aspects of their community and religious involvement. A response rate of 53 per cent was achieved.³ The analysis reported in this paper is based on 645 responses.⁴

The Dependent variable: Charitable giving

The measure of charitable giving used in this analysis was based on volunteers' responses to a question on whether they had donated money to a charity or charities (including The Smith Family) over the previous year. If they had made a donation, they were asked to indicate the total annual amount donated according to the categories in Table 2.

¹ See Evans & Kelley (2000), however, for an examination of the influence of church attendance on volunteering.

² See Zappalà et al 2001 for further details on the survey and the nature of volunteering at TSF.

³ The questionnaire was mailed to 1,513 volunteers whose primary volunteer activity meant they did not regularly visit a TSF location, and distributed personally by local TSF managers to 406 volunteers who volunteer on a regular basis at TSF premises. The response rate for the mail-out survey was 44% and 81% for the handout survey, giving an overall response rate of 53%. Overall, there were 989 usable responses.

⁴ Only cases where data was available on the full set of variables used in the regression were included.

Table 2 Amount donated in past year

Amount donated	N	%
None	56	9
Less than \$10	37	6
\$11 to \$50	163	25
\$51 to \$100	85	13
\$101 to \$500	172	27
More than \$500	132	20
Total	645	100

Consistent with the previous discussion, a very high proportion (91%) of volunteers had also made a charitable donation in the previous year. A significant proportion (47%) had donated more than \$100 to charities in the previous year. Overall then, TSF volunteers are very generous. For the regression analysis, we assigned scores according to the midpoint of the amount donated represented by each category: 0, 5, 30, 75, 300, and (arbitrarily) 600.

The Independent variables: Volunteer behaviour

From a set of questions about respondents' volunteer activities, we used three measures of volunteer behaviour.

- First, we measured whether the respondents also performed volunteer activities for organisations or groups other than TSF. We used a dummy variable (1) to represent the 45 per cent of respondents who said they also volunteered for other organisations.
- Second, we measured the degree of volunteer commitment, ranging from 'infrequent' (those who only volunteer a few times or once a year at TSF), to 'frequent' (those who volunteer at least monthly at TSF). We used a dummy variable (1) to represent the 43 per cent of respondents who volunteered on a frequent basis at TSF.
- Third, we measured the length of time respondents had been associated with TSF as volunteers. This variable was entered as a numerical score, with the mean being 4.4 years ($SD = 4.9$) and a range of 6 months (0.5) to 45 years.

The Independent variables: Association membership & religious participation

From a set of questions on membership of voluntary associations and religious participation we used two measures.

- First, we asked whether respondents belonged to a range of associations; specifically whether they belonged to Veterans/Returned services clubs, service clubs, VIEW Clubs,⁵ youth/school service groups, political or lobby groups, occupational and professional groups, religious associations, and ethnic associations. We used a dummy variable (1) to represent the 56 per cent of respondents who belonged to at least one association.
- Second, we asked respondents how regularly they attended religious services (excluding weddings, funerals and baptisms). We used a dummy variable (1) to represent the 23 per cent of respondents who said they attended church at least once a month.

⁵ VIEW Clubs (Voice, Interest, Education of Women) were founded by TSF in 1960 and provide strong financial and voluntary help to TSF. There are 32,000 women in over 400 VIEW clubs around Australia.

The Independent variables: Sociodemographic & socioeconomic controls

In order to isolate the effects of volunteer behaviour and association and religious participation on charitable giving, we controlled for the influence of some of the other possible determinants of charitable giving discussed earlier. Preliminary analysis of the data indicated that household composition, marital status, labour market status and ethnicity did not affect charitable giving, so these variables were trimmed from the analysis.

Three key demographic variables were included in the analysis: age, sex, and geographic location.

- Age was entered as a linear variable, with each data point representing the midpoint of each age category. 'Centered' values for the age measures were entered in the final model (see Table A1 and discussion on interaction variables below). We used dummy variables to represent the 88 per cent of respondents from 'urban' areas (1) and the 67 per cent of respondents who were female (1).

A critical control in any study of giving behaviour is socioeconomic status. We were able to include three measures of respondents' socioeconomic status: gross annual household income, education level, and occupational status.

- Income was entered as a linear variable, with each data point representing the midpoint of each income category. 'Centred' values for the income measures were entered in the final model (see Table A1 and discussion on interaction variables below).
- We used a dummy variable (1) to represent the 41 per cent of respondents who indicated having a university degree.
- Finally, respondents' current or last regular occupation was coded to four-digit level using ABS ASCO codes. Each occupation was in turn assigned scores from 1 to 100 using the ANU scale of occupational status (McMillan & Jones 2000). Occupational scores closer to 100 have higher status.⁶

Interaction effects

As has been found in previous studies, preliminary bivariate analysis suggested a strong relationship between income and age.⁷ An interaction term between income and age was therefore added to the model. In order to assist interpretation and avoid possible problems of multicollinearity, the age and income variables were 'centred' by subtracting the mean of each variable (in this case the mean of the midpoint values) from each of its values (mean income = \$ 60148; mean age = 51 years) (following procedures suggested by Aiken et al 1991; Jaccard et al 1990).⁸ Multiplying the two centered variables then created the interaction term (income centered * age centered).

⁶ Students (n=8), those who had never worked for pay (n=13), or those who did not complete the question (n=40), were assigned the mean score. The self-employed (n=16) were given a score of 72 (the mean score plus one standard deviation).

⁷ Other interactions were tested but none was significant.

⁸ In previous models where age and income were entered as dummy variables, the interaction term between age and income was positive and significant, however the individual age and income variables lost significance. Diagnostic analysis revealed that increases in the Standard Error of the age and income variables and decreases in the beta coefficients were causing this loss of significance. Analysis of VIF statistics also suggested a multicollinearity problem due to the introduction of the interaction term using dummies. To overcome this problem, 'centred' variables for age, income and the interaction term were used. Diagnostic tests for multicollinearity (VIFs) and omitted variable bias (Ramsey RESET test) on the new model (with centred variables) suggested that the model had an acceptable level of multicollinearity and stability.

Findings

Table 3 presents the findings from an OLS (Ordinary Least Squares) regression of charitable giving on a set of possible determinants. First, it suggests that only one demographic variable, age, had a significant effect on giving. As age increased, so did giving, or older volunteers were more generous in terms of donating money than younger volunteers. Second, two of the three socioeconomic status variables had significant effects on giving. As a volunteer's gross household income increased so did the amount of their donation to charitable causes. Similarly, volunteers who were educated to tertiary level gave more than those without university qualifications. Third, the interaction term between age and income had a significant effect on giving over and above the individual effects of those two variables. In other words, the effect of age was mediated by a volunteer's household income level, so that the magnitude of the positive effect of income on giving increased with age. Expressing it slightly differently, older volunteers with higher incomes gave more than both the effects of their income or age alone would suggest.

In terms of volunteer behaviour and religious participation, Table 3 suggests that three of the five 'social participation' variables were significantly related to giving. While volunteering for several organisations was positively related to giving, it was not significant. Our measure of volunteer commitment at TSF was significantly related to giving in a negative direction. Those volunteers who were 'infrequent' (gave less time) were more likely to give larger financial donations to charitable causes, while 'frequent volunteers' (highly committed in terms of time) gave less money to charitable causes. In contrast, as the length of time that people had been volunteers at TSF increased (another dimension of commitment), so did the amount of charitable donations.

Table 3 Determinants of giving (amount donated in the last year)

<i>Independent Variables</i>	B	t	SE
Female (0-1)	15.127	0.916	16.509
Age (mid-point centred)	3.119***	5.541	0.563
Urban (0-1)	21.492	0.922	23.304
Income (mid-point centred)	0.0022***	10.379	0.000
University qualifications (0-1)	84.872***	4.905	17.304
Occupational status (0 to 100)	0.445	1.049	0.424
Age (C) * Income (C) interaction	0.00005***	3.890	0.000
Volunteer for other organisations (0-1)	12.370	0.835	14.808
Frequent volunteer at TSF (0-1)	-39.437*	-2.241	17.597
Length of volunteer service at TSF (yrs)	5.327**	3.351	1.590
Association membership (0-1)	25.530	1.677	15.224
Church attendance (0-1)	67.097***	3.824	17.548
Constant	99.489	2.827	35.196
R^2	0.373		
Adjusted R^2	0.361		
Number of cases	645		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Finally, while belonging to a range of associations was positively associated with giving, it was not significant. In contrast, religious participation was significantly and positively related to giving. Volunteers who attended church on a regular basis were substantially more likely to give more to charitable organisations than those who were not regular church attendees. Overall, the model accounted for or explained just over one-third (36%) of the variance in the amount donated by volunteers to charitable organisations or causes in the year prior to the survey.

Discussion

An important point to keep in mind is that the overwhelming majority of people who volunteer their time to TSF also donate money to TSF and other charitable organisations. This observation in itself should alert nonprofit organisations to the fact that their volunteers are a significant asset in terms of both human and financial resources. Nevertheless, the amount of money volunteers donate is associated with some key aspects of their volunteer experience and social participation over and above the influence of sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

First, volunteers seem to behave 'rationally' by making a 'trade-off' between their donation of time (volunteer commitment) and their donation of money. Frequent volunteers, those that were highly committed in terms of time, were significantly more likely to *give less* in terms of money to charities. In contrast, infrequent volunteers, those that were less committed in terms of their time donation, were more likely to be more generous in terms of financial donations. From a fund-raising perspective therefore, it implies that the management of infrequent volunteers is particularly important. While their time contribution may be relatively minor, their volunteer experience (however brief) may lead them to make relatively larger financial contributions. This finding may have implications for policies that nonprofit organisations follow with respect to volunteer retention and the management of one-off volunteering events. A person who volunteers their time for a brief or one-off event (e.g. Christmas Hamper packing), for example, is potentially a new and valuable donor.

Second, many people give to a particular charity or cause because they believe in what it does and stands for and also because they have a degree of loyalty to it or familiarity with it. Our findings suggest that those volunteers that have been associated with TSF for longer periods of time were significantly more likely to make larger financial contributions compared to those that were relatively new to the organisation. Having loyal volunteers pays in more ways than one! The loss of long-serving volunteers may therefore have fundraising as well as human resource implications. Once again, this suggests that there are broader gains for nonprofit organisations in adopting a strategic approach to volunteer management. The costs of volunteer turnover, for instance, may be greater than those traditionally associated with employee turnover for organisations that rely on volunteers and for whom fundraising is a significant proportion of their income. At the very least, these findings suggest that fundraising and volunteer management personnel within nonprofit organisations have much to gain by working more closely together.

In terms of the influence of 'social participation' variables on giving, an interesting finding was the significant role that church attendance had on giving. In particular, because TSF is a secular organisation (unlike many other nonprofits in community services), one would expect it attracts volunteers without strong religious beliefs or convictions. Indeed, in previous studies using the same sample, church attendance was not significantly related to volunteer commitment either in terms of hours volunteered or the frequency of volunteering at TSF (Zappalà & Burrell 2001; 2002). This was in contrast to a recent study that found that those who attend church weekly are more likely to be regular volunteers (Evans & Kelley 2000). So although TSF is a secular organisation, being a regular attendee at church influenced a volunteer's tendency to give money to charities but not their donation of time. While this is consistent with broader survey findings on the importance of religion to individual giving in Australia, it remains unclear why it should influence one aspect of philanthropic behaviour and not the other among the same volunteers in a secular organisation. This apparently contradictory finding on the role of religion raises an interesting avenue for further research. In particular, it may suggest that the motivations driving philanthropic behaviour vary according to whether people give time or money.

Conclusion

Although evidence suggests that volunteering (time) and giving (money) are closely related, these two dimensions of philanthropic behaviour have tended to be examined in isolation from one another. A better understanding of this relationship may be beneficial to nonprofit organisations that rely on volunteers as well as income from fundraising to carry out their activities. This paper examined the influence of volunteer behaviour and social participation on the charitable giving behaviour of volunteers at a large Australian public-serving nonprofit community services organisation.

The findings suggest that over and above the influence of sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables, volunteer behaviour, such as the frequency of volunteering and the length of time volunteered, are also important factors driving charitable giving. In particular, people that are highly committed volunteers (i.e. donate a lot of their time) are much less likely to make financial donations or if they do, donations are likely to be smaller. In contrast, those people that are less committed in terms of volunteering (i.e. donate less time) are much more likely to make financial donations and give larger amounts to charities and charitable causes. A limitation of this study is that the findings are based on volunteers in one community service organisation and caution should therefore be exercised in generalising the findings to the wider population of volunteers. Whether this philanthropic trade-off found to exist among this group of volunteers also exists among volunteers more widely requires further research. At the very least, the findings should give those responsible for managing volunteers and fundraising within nonprofit organisations a reason to work more closely together.

Appendix: Summary statistics

Table A1 Summary statistics for variables used in OLS model

Variable	Variable type	N	%
Sex	Nominal		
Male		210	33
Female		435	67
Age	Ratio		
Under 20	Midpoint = 15	6	1
20 to 29	Midpoint = 25	57	9
30 to 39	Midpoint = 35	102	16
40 to 49	Midpoint = 45	129	20
50 to 59	Midpoint = 55	154	24
60 to 75	Midpoint = 68	176	27
Over 75	Midpoint (arbitrary) = 80	21	3
Geographic Location	Nominal		
Rural	(0)	76	12
Urban	(1)	569	88
Gross annual household income	Ordinal (midpoint scores)		
Less than \$10 000	5000	55	9
\$10 001 to \$30 000	15000	131	20
\$30 001 to \$50 000	40000	113	18
\$50 001 to \$70 000	60000	96	15
\$70 001 to \$100 000	85000	105	16
More than \$100 000	120000	145	22
Education	Nominal		
University qualifications	(1)	265	41
No university qualifications	(0)	380	59
Occupational Status	Ratio	Mean	SD
	(3.4 – 99.2)	49.6	22.2
Volunteer for other organisations	Nominal		
Volunteer at other org.s	(1)	290	45
Volunteer at TSF only	(0)	355	55
Volunteer commitment	Nominal		
Frequent (more than monthly)	(1)	278	43
Infrequent (less than monthly)	(0)	367	57
Length of service	Ratio	Mean	SD
Years volunteered at TSF	(0.5 – 45)	4.4	4.9
Association membership	Nominal		
Belong to one or more assoc.	(1)	363	56
Do not belong	(0)	282	44
Church attendance	Nominal		
At least once a month	(1)	150	23
Less than once a month	(0)	495	77

References

- ABS (2001) *Voluntary Work – Australia, June 2000*, Cat. No. 4441.0, Canberra: AGPS.
- Aiken, Leona. S and Stephen G. West (1991) *Multiple regression: testing and interpreting interactions*, Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Baum, Frances, Carolyn Modra, Robert Bush, Eva Cox, Richard Cooke and Robert Potter (1999) 'Volunteering and social capital: An Adelaide study' *Australian Journal on Volunteering*, 4(1), pp.13-22.
- Evans, M.D.R and Jonathan Kelley (2000) 'Charity work: International differences and Australian trends' *Australian Social Monitor* 3(1), pp. 15-23.
- Independent Sector (2001) *Giving & volunteering in the United States: Key Findings*, Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Jaccard, James, Robert Turrisi, and Choi K. Wan (1990) *Interaction effects in multiple regression*, Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Jackson, E.F, M.D. Bachmeier, J.R. Wood and E.A. Craft (1995) 'Volunteering and charitable giving: do religious and associational ties promote helping behaviour?' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24(1), pp.59-78.
- Jencks, Christopher (1987) 'Who gives to what?' in W.W. Powell (ed) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lyons, Mark (1993) 'Private Donations and Australia's Welfare State' Working Paper No.15, CACOM, UTS.
- Lyons, Mark (1994) 'The institutionalisation of philanthropy in Australia and prospects for change' Working Paper No.21, CACOM, UTS.
- Lyons, Mark (1995) 'Fundraising in Australia A Survey of current effort' Sydney: Fundraising Institute Australia.
- Lyons, Mark (2001) *Third Sector*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- McGregor-Lowndes, Myles, Stephen Marsden and Ted Flack (2001) 'An examination of tax deductible donations made by individual taxpayers in Australia for 1998/99' Working Paper 101, Program on Nonprofit Corporations, Brisbane: QUT Faculty of Business.
- McMillan, Julie and F.L. Jones (2000) 'The ANU3_2 scale: a revised occupational status scale for Australia' *Journal of Sociology*, 36(1), pp.64-80.
- O'Keefe & Partners (1999) *11th Annual Giving Trends in Australia Report, 1999: The year that was*, Queensland: O'Keefe & Partners.
- O'Keefe & Partners (2000) *Giving Trends in Australia Report, 2000: 12th Annual O'Keefe & Partners' report into Giving*, Queensland: O'Keefe & Partners.
- Piliavin, Jane Allyn & Hong-Wen Charng (1990) 'Altruism: A review of recent theory and research' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, pp.27-65.
- Schervish, Paul G and John J Havens (1995) 'Do the poor pay more? Is the U-shaped curve correct?' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24(1), pp. 79-90.

Smith, David Horton (1994) 'Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: a literature review', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(3), pp. 243-263.

The Smith Family (2001) *The Smith Family Annual Report 2001*, Camperdown: TSF.

Zappalà, Gianni (2000a) 'How many people volunteer in Australia and why do they do it?', Briefing Paper No.4, Research & Advocacy Team, The Smith Family.

Zappalà, Gianni (2000b) 'Civil society and the nonprofit sector: the role of volunteers', Briefing Paper No.3, Research & Advocacy Team, The Smith Family.

Zappalà, Gianni, and Tracy Burrell (2001) 'Why are some volunteers more committed than others? A socio-psychological approach to volunteer commitment in community services' Working Paper No.5, Research & Social Policy Team, The Smith Family.

Zappalà, Gianni, and Tracy Burrell (2002) 'Understanding the factors associated with volunteer commitment: A case study of volunteers in community services', *Third Sector Review* 8(2) (forthcoming).

Zappalà, Gianni, Ben Parker and Vanessa Green (2001) 'The 'new face' of volunteering in social enterprises: The Smith Family experience', Background Paper No.2, Research & Advocacy Team, The Smith Family.

Research and Social Policy Publications

July 2002

Background Papers

	Quantity
No. 1 Gianni Zappalà & Ben Parker, 'The Smith Family's <i>Learning for Life</i> program a decade on: poverty and educational disadvantage' (March, 2000).	_____
No. 2 Gianni Zappalà, Ben Parker & Vanessa Green, 'The 'new face' of volunteering in social enterprises: The Smith Family experience' (April, 2001).	_____
No. 3 Caitlin Cronin, 'Corporate Social Responsibility in Australia: A Select Review of the Literature' (November, 2001).	_____
No. 4 Ciara Smyth, Gianni Zappalà & Gillian Considine 'School to adult life transitions through work and study: A select review of the literature, (March, 2002)	_____

Working Papers

No. 1 Gianni Zappalà, 'Understanding the new economy: The economic and social dimensions' (October, 2000). Also published as 'The economic and social dimensions of the new economy' <i>Australian Journal of Social Issues</i> , 35 (4), pp.317-331.	_____
No. 2 Gianni Zappalà, Vanessa Green & Ben Parker, 'Social exclusion and disadvantage in the new economy' (December, 2000). Also published as 'The disadvantaged in the new economy' in Ron Callus & Russell Lansbury (eds) <i>Working Futures</i> , Sydney: Federation Press, 2002.	_____
No. 3 Gianni Zappalà & Vanessa Green, 'Addressing disadvantage through place management: Is there a role for nonprofit organisations?' (January, 2001).	_____
No. 4 Gianni Zappalà & Gillian Considine, 'Educational performance among school students from financially disadvantaged backgrounds' (January, 2001). Revised versions also published as 'The influence of social and economic disadvantage in the academic performance of school students in Australia', <i>Journal of Sociology</i> , 38(2), 2002, pp.129-148; and 'Educational performance at school, the gender gap and truancy', <i>AQ - Journal of Contemporary Analysis</i> , 73(5), September-October, 2001, pp. 24-27.	_____
No. 5 Gianni Zappalà & Tracy Burrell, 'Why are some volunteers more committed than others? A socio-psychological approach to volunteer commitment in community services' (November, 2001).	_____
No. 6 Caitlin Cronin & Gianni Zappalà, 'The coming of age of corporate community involvement: An examination of trends in Australia's top companies' (January, 2002)	_____
No. 7 Gianni Zappalà & Tracy Burrell, 'The giving of time and money: An analysis of donor behaviour among volunteers' (July, 2002)	_____

Briefing Papers

No. 1 Rob Simons, 'Developing a social policy framework for The Smith Family' (September, 2000).	_____
No. 2 Vanessa Green & Gianni Zappalà, 'From welfare to place management: Challenges and developments for service delivery in the community sector' (September, 2000).	_____

Publications Order Form

- No .3 Gianni Zappalà, 'Civil society and the nonprofit sector: The role of volunteers' (September, 2000). _____
- No. 4 Gianni Zappalà, 'How many people volunteer in Australia and why do they do it?' (September, 2000). _____
- No. 5 Vanessa Green, Gianni Zappalà & Ben Parker, 'Factors associated with financial disadvantage: a case study of The Smith Family's emergency help program' (October, 2000). _____
- No. 6 Vanessa Green, 'Information technology: Who benefits?' (October, 2000). _____
- No. 7 Rob Simons, 'Social enterprise: An opportunity to harness capacities' (December, 2000). _____
- No. 8 Gianni Zappalà & Vanessa Green, 'The Unlucky Australians? The launch of The Smith Family/NATSEM report on financial disadvantage in Australia' (March, 2001). _____
- No. 9 Caitlin Cronin, Gianni Zappalà & Melissa Clarkson 'Measuring the social impact of companies in Australia: The Smith Family's participation in The Good Reputation Index', (October 2001). _____
- No.10 Peter Saunders 'Getting Poverty Back onto the Policy Agenda' (March 2002) _____
- No. 11 Ciara Smyth, Gianni Zappalà & Gillian Considine 'Promoting participation and inclusion at school: A progress report on TSF's *Learning for Life* program' (June 2002) _____

Other TSF Reports

- Ann Harding & Agnieszka Szukalska, 'Financial disadvantage in Australia 1999: The unlucky Australians?' (November, 2000). _____
- The Smith Family, 'Research & Advocacy annual report - 2000' (February, 2001). _____
- Ann Harding, Rachel Lloyd & Harry Greenwell 'Financial disadvantage in Australia 1990 to 2000: The persistence of poverty in a decade of growth', (November, 2001). _____

Delivery Details

Name: _____

Position: _____

Organisation: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____ Contact number: _____

- To subscribe to our e-bulletin and receive updates about our latest publications email researchsocialpolicy@smithfamily.com.au with the word subscribe as the subject.

Send to:

Administrative Assistant

Research and Social Policy Team

The Smith Family

PO Box 10500

Camperdown NSW 1450

Email: researchsocialpolicy@smithfamily.com.au

Telephone 02 9550 4422

Facsimile 02 9557 5079

www.smithfamily.com.au

Working Paper No. 7

