# NONPROFIT RESEARCH ABRIDGED connecting nonprofit sector research & leadership

Volume 4 Issue 4

Summer 2005

# A Reader's Guide to Research on Charitable Giving

"Arizonans, Take a Bow," was the June 2003 headline in the Arizona Republic, commending the 87 percent of residents who donated an average \$1,572 per household to charity in 2002, according to research published by the ASU Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management. Both the rate of giving and average total annual contribution were on pace with national averages. Yet in November of that same year, a headline read "Arizona is 9<sup>th</sup> Stingiest State," reporting that Arizona came in 39<sup>th</sup> on The Generosity Index, which ranks states by the total amount given to charity relative to income. And in September of 2004, another story ran in the Arizona Republic, quoting a report from the Arizona Community Foundation and Leave a Legacy. This research found an average total contribution of \$2,724 per household for 2004, a number above the national average.

So which study is correct? As such headlines attest, research and public dissemination of charitable giving is becoming more common, yet the findings can be quite dissimilar. What accounts for such differing findings? This issue of Nonprofit Research Abridged will examine some of the recent research on charitable giving and will analyze some of the research methods that affect the findings. Understanding such differences provides individuals with a more informed interpretation of research studies and media reports.

## Population and Sample

Nonprofit Leadership

82 Management

Two important ways that studies on charitable giving and volunteering differ are the population and the sample. In research, the entire group being studied is the population. The sample is the specific group that is drawn from the population. When sound techniques of random sampling are used, the findings from questioning or examining a sample can be generalized to the entire population. Some studies on charitable giving use aggregate data from the charitable donations reported on tax returns. The advantages to using tax return information are that the data are accurate and the sample is very large. However, because the majority of people do not itemize deductions their income taxes, the findings from this type of research can not be applied to all households. In Arizona, approximately 35 percent of taxpayers itemize deductions. The Generosity Index (www.catalogueforphilanthropy.org) is a commonly cited list which ranks states based on charitable giving using tax return data.

Because of the limitations to using tax return data, another common approach is a household survey given to a random sample of households. When the sample is drawn correctly and is a sufficient size, the findings can be generalized to all households within the region, not just those that itemize their tax returns. Both the ASU and the Arizona Community Foundation/Leave a Legacy studies mentioned in the first paragraph used a household survey questionnaire.

### Questionnaire

When charitable giving research is conducted using a questionnaire, the length and type of questionnaire affects the research findings. A study done by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University compared how different questionnaires in giving studies influence the findings. They gave a different set of questions to households within the same region using identical sampling techniques. The longer and more detailed the questionnaire was, the higher the rate of giving and the larger the average total annual contribution. In the survey with the most detailed questions, households reported giving an average of \$1,000 more than those surveyed with the shortest, least detailed questionnaire. This is because more



# NONPROFIT RESEARCH

prompts leads to greater recall; individuals recall the details of their charitable giving better when they are asked about it categorically and specifically.<sup>1</sup>

There is some concern that a longer set of questions can cause respondents to over-report their giving. However, it is thought by researchers that having fewer prompts causes understatement more so than repeated questioning leads to exaggeration. In one diary study with weekly prompting, 100 percent of the sample gave to charitable organizations over the course of a year, which supports the theory that more questioning leads to greater recall. The study lasted 13 months, beginning and ending in January.

The average amount given was not different between the first week and the last week, which supports the hypothesis that extensive and repeated questioning does not significantly inflate the responses of participants.<sup>2</sup>

### Recent Research

The tables on the following page highlight four studies on charitable giving that have

been cited in the local media. Two national studies are often cited: Giving and Volunteering in the United States, published biennially by the Independent Sector, and Giving USA, published annually by the Giving USA Foundation and researched by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. While both are concerned with charitable giving, the methodologies and foci of these two studies are different. Giving and Volunteering in the USA is a random-sample telephone survey of households; it contains information on typical household giving and the factors that influence it. Giving USA estimates total individual giving in the U.S. using tax return data and a mathematical model to estimate giving not reported on tax returns. It reports overall giving in the U.S., including aggregate totals and overall patterns and trends. Both of these research reports are trusted sources for information on charitable giving in the U.S.—they are conducted by well-known nonprofit research institutions and their methodologies have been refined over many years.

Locally, Arizona Giving and Volunteering, published in 2002 by the ASU Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management (ASU CNLM), used a random-sample

household survey similar to that of Giving and Volunteering in the United States. The sample size was 1,004 households. It found that 87.3 percent of households gave to charity in 2002, for an average \$1,572 total annual household contribution.

In 2004, The Arizona Community Foundation (ACF) and Leave a Legacy Arizona published Giving in Arizona. This study also used a random-sample telephone survey; the sample was 500 households, of which 299 reported the amount of their charitable giving. This research found that 81 percent of households gave within the past year, for an average total annual contribution of \$2,724.

Individuals recall the details of their charitable giving better when asked about it categorically and specifically. So why the difference in numbers between Giving in Arizona (the ACF report) and Arizona Giving and Volunteering (the ASU CNLM report)? The difference in the average contribution found by each of the studies (\$1,572 vs. \$2,724) is at least in part due to the smaller sample size for Giving in Arizona and the influence of larger gifts on the

average. Because the sample size for Giving in Arizona was 299 (for average contribution), higher contributions are influencing the mean (average) to a greater degree. This is evidenced by the median (midpoint) total annual contribution figures of the two studies, which are very similar. There is only a six percent difference in the rate of giving (87.3 vs. 81 percent), which is less significant and may be due to differences in the questionnaires. The Arizona Giving and Volunteering survey defined charitable organizations more broadly, and included nonprofit political organizations, which were excluded by Giving in Arizona.

As these examples illustrate, research studies on the same topic, charitable giving, using different methodologies, will often have different results. Therefore, when comparing local and national findings, it is important to examine whether the same methodology was used for the research being compared. Arizona Giving and Volunteering (ASU CNLM) is comparable to Giving in the United States because the methodology, including the survey questionnaire and the sampling techniques, closely mirror each other.

Connecting nonprofit sector research and leadership

# NATIONAL STUDIES

## GIV<mark>ING AND VOLUNTEERING</mark> IN THE UNITED STATES 2001

www.independentsector.org Researched and published by the Independent Sector

#### Type of study:

Telephone survey of 4,216 households Asked about giving by area (arts, education, etc.)

#### Key findings:

Rate of giving: **89%** of households Average annual contribution per household: **\$1,620** 

# **GIVING USA 2005**

www.givingusa.org Published by the Giving USA Foundation Researched and written by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

#### Type of study:

Multifaceted data analysis providing information and trends on charitable giving in the United States

#### Key findings (individual giving):

Charitable giving by individuals an estimated \$187.92 billion in 2004 Gifts from individuals represented 1.9% of personal income

# ARIZONA STUDIES

## ARIZONA GIVI<mark>NG AND</mark> VOLUNTEE<mark>RING (2002)</mark>

http://nonprofit.asu.edu Researched and published by the Arizona State University Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management

#### Type of study:

Telephone survey of 1,004 households Asked about giving by area (arts, education, etc.)

#### Key findings:

Rate of giving: **87%** of households Average annual contribution per household: **\$1,572** 

## **GIVING IN** ARIZONA (2004)

www.azfoundation.org Published by the Arizona Community Foundation and Leave A Legacy Arizona Researched by WestGroup Research

#### Type of study:

Telephone survey of 500 households Asked for one-year total for charitable giving

#### Key findings:

Rate of giving: **81%** of households Average annual contribution per household: **\$2,724** 

NOTES

1. Rooney, P., Steinberg, K., & Schervish, P.G. "Methodology is Destiny: The Effect of Survey Prompts on Reported Levels of Giving and Volunteering." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 33: 628-654 (2004). 2. Havens, J.J., & Schervish, P.G. "The Methods and Metrics of the Boston Area Diary Study." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 30: 527-550 (2001).

Visit the CNLM Web site at http://nonprofit.asu.edu



connecting nonprofit sector research & leadership

# The Center for Nonprofit Leadership & Management

knowledge & tools for nonprofit effectiveness

Nonprofit Leadership EDUCATION

ASSISTANCE to Nonprofits

RESEARCH that matters

CONFERENCES & Convening

#### **CENTER NEWS**

The Nonprofit Management Institute (NMI) offers workshops and courses that provide the knowledge and tools needed to succeed in today's nonprofit environment. Programs include continuing education courses, a professional certificate in nonprofit management, the Nonprofit Excellence Enrichment Series, topical workshops, and conferences.

The 13th Annual Nonprofit Conference, to be held on December 8 & 9, 2005, will focus on the theme of "Building Boards: Strengthening Communities." Designed to address emerging challenges and opportunities in the nonprofit sector, the Annual Nonprofit Conference is developed with nonprofit staff and volunteers in mind.

For more information, please call (480) 965-0607 or visit our website at:

http://nonprofit.asu.edu

Nonprofit Research Abridged is published by the ASU Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management as a service to the nonprofit sector and contains summaries of nonprofit research studies. The full research report, related resources, and past issues are available on our web site. For questions, please contact Stephanie Hiatt, Editor, at <u>nonprofit@asu.edu</u>.

Copyright © 2005 Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of ASU and its Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management. All rights reserved.

connecting nonprofit sector research & leadership

© College of Public Programs



NONDBOELT RESEARCH

Inside this Issue: A Reader's Guide to Research on Charitable Giving



PO Box 874703 Tempe, AZ 85287-4703

Nonprofit Org. US Postage Paid Arizona State University