



NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Exploring the Link Between Individual Volunteering and Giving

DAVID M. VAN SLYKE
Syracuse University
JANET L. JOHNSON
Georgia State University

ABSTRACT: *Empirical research on charitable behaviors of individuals continues to expand and has growing implications for nonprofit leaders, policymakers, and fundraising professionals. In this exploratory analysis, we examine individual charitable giving and volunteering using primary survey data across a range of demographic and socioeconomic factors to analyze the interaction between giving and volunteering. What is different about the giving patterns of volunteers versus nonvolunteers? What is different about the volunteering pattern of givers versus nongivers? Do individuals give to the same causes to which they volunteer? Our findings provide important evidence about the links between giving and volunteering behaviors, and we offer substantive recommendations about resource development strategies that can be used to attract and expand charitable gifts of time and money. Each is an important resource for nonprofit organizations and critical to their effective performance.*

KEYWORDS: *giving patterns, nonprofits, performance, resource development*

A number of scholars have suggested that a significant problem facing nonprofits is financial sustainability (e.g., Morino & Shore, 2004; Ryan, 2001). The financial health and sustainability of nonprofit organizations is critical not only to their effective organizational performance and the quality of programs and services delivered to clients but also, by extension, to government policymakers

and managers, given that nonprofits serve a vital service delivery function and are integral to a healthy and vibrant civil society. Nonprofits are increasingly working harder to develop alternative revenue sources in ever more competitive markets and to build and leverage those resources with greater precision, efficiency, and effectiveness—all important components of organizational management and performance (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Froelich, 1999; Grønbjerg, 2001). Building that capacity, especially for smaller nonprofits, requires nonprofit organizations and their leaders to develop management systems and tools that can be used to attract new sources of financial and human capital (i.e., revenue and volunteer labor) to enhance organizational performance. One important revenue stream for nonprofit organizations is individual philanthropy—the financial and donated gifts and the time and services contributed by volunteers. According to the American Association of Fundraising Council's (AAFC, 2004) *Giving USA*, individuals represent the largest source of contributions for charitable organizations.¹ For nonprofit organizations, individual contributions of time and money are important measures of an organization's resource development and fundraising performance (Frumkin & Kim, 2001; Herman & Renz, 1999). These measures are also vital inputs to the range of programs that nonprofits deliver, often programs with growing client demands and diminishing levels of government financing. As a result, nonprofit managers are paying increasing attention to the charitable contributions of individuals, as they are a large source of "unearned" income in the nonprofit sector. Fogal notes, "The cost of raising money and the effectiveness of fundraising programs are critical issues for nonprofit leaders" (2005, p. 429). Therefore, fundraising effectiveness is also a measure of the degree to which the organization is performing effectively in meeting its organizational mission (Brooks, 2002; Van Slyke & Brooks, 2005).

A philanthropic axiom among fundraisers and development professionals is that individuals who volunteer are more likely to give, and they give more than donors that do not volunteer. The Independent Sector in its analysis of 2001 giving and volunteering data finds that giving and volunteering households give 43% more in total to all organizations than giving-only households (2002b, p. 107). However, very few empirical analyses are available that examine the relation between individual charitable giving and volunteering across different individual socioeconomic characteristics.² Understanding the degree to which giving and volunteering decisions are linked is all the more timely for managers, given

The authors thank Alicia Philipp and the Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta for their financial support of this research. They also thank John O'Kane, Eric Twombly, Sal Alaimo, Shena Ashley, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions on this article. The usual caveat applies.

recent reports that although charitable giving has been on the decline in real dollar terms, voluntarism has been on the rise (Kostigen, 2002). A question of importance for nonprofit managers is how best to maximize the opportunities to attract and leverage donor contributions of time and money.

In this exploratory analysis, we investigate this question by examining a number of questions regarding the links between giving and volunteering. We ask: To what extent is it more likely that people will give, if they volunteer? How much more likely is it that people will volunteer, if they are charitable givers? And do individuals who volunteer time for a charitable cause donate financial resources to that same type of cause or to other types of charitable causes? To this extent, we are interested in how giving to one charitable subsector affects volunteering in another charitable subsector. Finally, we propose strategies derived from our findings that nonprofit managers can use to increase their organizational performance through more effective resource development, volunteer management, and project planning and by developing partnerships with nonprofits from other service areas. To examine these questions, we draw from two rich primary data sources on individual charitable giving and volunteering in the metropolitan Atlanta region. We proceed with an interdisciplinary review of the determinants of charitable giving and volunteering and their interaction, a review of our methods and data, and a presentation of our findings. We conclude with management implications that may assist nonprofit leaders in enhancing their organization's performance through effectively cultivating donors and volunteers, both important contributors of time and money in the nonprofit sector.

Background

Nonprofit organizations differ considerably across the subsectors of the nonprofit economy (e.g., religion, human services, health, education, youth, arts and culture, environment, international, and public benefit) and rely on and solicit different levels of volunteer time and charitable donations from different individuals with varying levels of engagement with nonprofit and charitable causes. The sector is far more heterogeneous and nuanced than is frequently conveyed in the public administration, business, and social work literatures in terms of the organizational missions represented, the clients served, the revenue sources that finance their operations, and the level of philanthropic resources that are needed and relied on as a critical component of organizational capacity and performance. Organizational differences among nonprofits is evident in the manner in which they solicit donations of time and money and the degree to which private contributions represent a significant percentage of an organization's resources and budgeting. Table 1 presents the percentage of all volunteers who contribute time and the percentage of all givers who make a

Table 1. Differences in Giving and Volunteering by Type of Nonprofit Organization

	<i>Adult Volunteers Donating Time (%)^a</i>	<i>Households Making a Financial Donation (%)^b</i>	<i>Organizations' Revenues from Private Contributions (%)^c</i>
Type of nonprofit organization			
Arts	8.6	9.4	
Education	17.3	20.3	
Environment	9.2	11.5	
Health	11.4	27.3	
Human services	15.9	25.1	
International	2.5	6.1	
Public benefit	7.9	10.3	
Religion	22.8	48.0	
Youth related	17.5	20.9	
Nonprofit subsector			
Health services			4.0
Education and research			13.4
Religious organizations			95.4
Social and legal services			19.6
Civic, social, and fraternal			35.2
Arts and culture			43.5

^aSee Weitzman et al. (2002), table 3.15.

^bSee Weitzman et al. (2002), table 3.11.

^cSee Weitzman et al. (2002), table 4.3.

Notes: Because of how the data are reported, nonprofit type and nonprofit sector are separated. Although health services is generally consistent with the work performed by nonprofit health organizations, to avoid confusion and misrepresentation of the data, subsectors such as *civic, social, and fraternal* are not easily correlated with a single type of nonprofit organization such as *public benefit* nonprofits. Therefore, we do not combine *percentage of organization's revenue from private philanthropic sources* with nonprofit type because the data reported in Weitzman et al. (2002) are for nonprofit subsector. The table thus illustrates the heterogeneity of the nonprofit sector.

financial donation across the diverse nonprofit landscape. These percentages can then be contrasted with the percentage of private contributions that serve as a revenue source for different organizations.

Despite the diversity and complexity of the many different types of organizations represented by the nonprofit sector, generally speaking, contributions of time and money are important components to a nonprofit organization's performance and operational effectiveness.

Extensive research has taken place over the last two decades on the topic of philanthropy with a focus on examining determinants of charitable giving and

the implications for fundraising practice (Independent Sector, 2002a; AAFC, 2004; Kelly, 1998; O'Neill, 2001). Many economic studies of philanthropy have focused on the tax policy implications for charitable giving and the effect of government funding on private giving levels and theorized about motives for giving, such as reputation, prestige, commitment, and social effects (Andreoni, Brown, & Rischall, 2003; Brooks, 2000; Brown, 1999b; Clotfelter, 1985, 1997; Greene & McClelland, 2001; Harbaugh, 1998; Schervish & Havens, 1995; Steinberg, 1990a, 1990b; Tichen, 2001; Wolff, 1999). Studies conducted for the Independent Sector and the AAFC have provided valuable information in developing profiles of individual donor behavior (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). The study of voluntarism and the resulting individual contributions of time to charitable causes (another component of philanthropy) has also developed as a scholarly field (Allison, Okun, & Dutridge, 2002; Bowen, Andersen, & Urban, 2000; Brudney, 1990; Clary & Snyder, 1999; Cnaan, Handy, & Wadsworth, 1996; Freeman, 1997). Depth is developing in the scholarly literature on effects of corporate volunteer programs, government-funded volunteer programs, and the roles that volunteers have in organizations and their economic impact in the nonprofit sector (Brown 1999a; Brudney, 1990; Brudney & Kellough, 2000; Duncan, 1999; Farmer & Fedor, 1999; Tschirhart, 1998). However, very little empirical analysis has been conducted that segments individual philanthropic participation according to giving and volunteering profiles and then translates those findings into actionable management implications for nonprofit leaders.

Theories of charitable giving are largely categorized along psychological, sociological, and economic dimensions, reflecting both the academic disciplines and the interdisciplinarity that characterize most of the research on charitable giving and voluntarism. As such, the findings from studies of individual philanthropy may conflict based on the methodology, unit of analysis, sample selection, variables, and type of analysis used in the studies. Differences among economists, psychologists, sociologists, and others also are fundamentally framed by their assumptions about human behavior and, therefore, the reasons that individuals act charitably. Psychological theories focus on predictors of individual motivation to give, such as altruism, giving because of a sense of community, and having been helped by charitable organizations in the past (Clary & Snyder, 1999). Sociological theories focus on the giver's context and institutionalized affiliations, such as organized religion, political institutions, and organizational participation (Schervish, 1997; Wolpert, 1995). Economic theories examine relations between giving and variables such as education, employment and marital status, household income and wealth, and the impact of tax policy, and the net of tax price of giving (Brown, 1999b; Clotfelter, 1997). These theories have stimulated empirical tests of various hypotheses about charitable behavior, and a number of

demographic, socioeconomic, attitudinal, and behavioral variables have been found to affect giving and volunteering.

In 2003, private American households contributed about \$180 billion to charities and causes (AAFC, 2004).³ According to the Independent Sector's (2002b) *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001* study, approximately 89% of households made charitable contributions and 44% of adults over age 21 volunteered with a formal charitable organization in 2000. The total number of adult volunteers donating time was approximately 83.9 million, with an average weekly volunteer contribution of 3.6 hours at an estimated hourly value of \$15.40.⁴ More than 15.5 billion hours were recorded as volunteered with a total dollar value of \$239.2 billion (Independent Sector, 2002b). For nonprofit organizations, understanding the determinants and motives of individual giving and volunteering and the interaction between the two represents a potential resource of financial and human capital to be leveraged for enhancing their organizational performance.⁵

INDIVIDUAL DETERMINANTS OF GIVING AND VOLUNTEERING

In the population of givers and nongivers and volunteers and nonvolunteers, researchers across the social sciences and philanthropy and fundraising professionals tend to focus on a set of demographic characteristics that include age, gender, and race/ethnicity as well as a set of socioeconomic characteristics that include education, income, marital status, religious participation, and political party affiliation. Each variable is thought to influence and thus predict the degree to which individuals may or may not give a financial donation to a charitable cause and the degree to which an individual will or will not contribute time to a charity. The unit of analysis, therefore, in many studies of charitable giving is the individual or household. However, much of the research to date tends to treat giving and volunteering as discrete functions rather than investigating the extent to which each activity (giving or volunteering) has an effect on the other (volunteering or giving).

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Clotfelter notes that "age has shown itself to be the variable most consistently related to volunteering" with middle-aged individuals volunteering more than older or younger persons, resulting in a curvilinear effect of age on the incidence and amount of time volunteered (1997, p. 17; Gallagher, 1994; Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995; Omoto, Snyder, & Martino, 2000). Wolff (1999) finds that women tend to be more altruistic in their volunteer activities than men. National survey data such as the Independent Sector's (2002b) *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001* and Hodgkinson & Weitzman (1996) find that women volunteer more than men, which is consistent with other studies on the topic (Gallagher, 1994; Ozorak, 2003). Race and ethnicity have been measured as sta-

tistically significant in a number of studies of giving (e.g., Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996), with racial minorities less likely to donate money compared to whites; however, the empirical results are less clear in the area of volunteering. Musick, Wilson, and Bynum (2000) find that whites volunteer 50% more hours than African Americans and that African Americans are less likely to volunteer regardless of their personal or social resources.

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Education and income are the variables most frequently identified as being positive and significant predictors of engagement as measured by the incidence of contributing and the amount of money and time that are given (Bowen et al., 2000; Feldstein & Clotfelter, 1976; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996; Jencks, 1987; Smith, 1994). Studies have found that as education increases, so does volunteering (Wilson & Musick, 1997, 1998). With respect to the effect of income on philanthropic behavior, the predominant model of economists (i.e., charitable giving/volunteering as a consumption good) predicts that as income increases, consumption increases for “normal” goods. With respect to volunteering, however, the individual’s wage rate (which may be highly correlated with income) is considered as the opportunity cost of time, and a higher wage rate would then lead to less volunteer time, assuming all other factors are held constant. When wages are held constant, researchers have generally found the expected positive impact of income on volunteering (Freeman, 1997; Iannacone, 1998; Menchik & Steinberg, 1990a; Weisbrod, 1987). The work of other social scientists also supports a positive effect between income and volunteering, with theories focusing on motives for helping behaviors, social capital, and social resources (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1992; Smith, 1994). Rooney, Mesch, Chin, and Steinberg (2002) find that (after controlling for education, income, and occupational status) racial differences in giving and volunteering are insignificant.

A growing body of work conducted by researchers has identified a causal link between religious practice (typically measured as the frequency of worship attendance) and charitable behavior (Clain & Zech, 1999; Clotfelter, 1997; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996; Independent Sector 2002b; Lam, 2002; Schervish, 1997; Wolpert, 1995). Jackson et al. find that “participation in church groups . . . increases [different] forms of secular helping . . . [and that] it is the religious community that is vital in encouraging helping” (1995, pp. 59–60). Clotfelter (1985) finds that religious volunteer work is more common than any other form of volunteer work, and Jackson et al. and Brooks (2003) find a strong positive relation between church group participation and involvement in secular charitable causes.

Consistent with previous research, the effect of church attendance on volunteering is stronger for African Americans than whites. Hodgkinson and Weitzman

(1992) also find that adults who attend religious services weekly reported more than twice as many volunteer hours as those not attending church. Wuthnow (1994) asserts that membership and activity in a congregation are far better predictors of charitable involvement than the strength of faith alone. Brooks (2003) finds that a secular person is 23 percentage points less likely to give and 26 percentage points less likely to volunteer than a religious person.⁶ He also finds that religious individuals are more generous than secular individuals to nonreligious causes and concludes that "religion engenders charity in general including nonreligious charity" (p. 43). Park and Smith assert, "Church activity participation is both the most consistent and the strongest religious predictor of the increased likelihood of non-church related volunteering" (2002, pp. 281–282).

Jencks (1987) and Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall (2003) find that marriage positively relates to giving, although the evidence in this area is mixed, with Randolph (1995) finding that marital status is not a significant predictor. On the issue of political ideology and party affiliation, Wolpert (1995) contends that giving participation rates are higher in regions of the country and among individuals where the political and cultural ideology is liberal rather than conservative. Twombly, Lampkin, and Cordes (2003) provide evidence of this relation in the South and Southwest, and Brooks (2003) shows similar results among more conservative religious groups. Brooks and Lewis (2001), however, find a correlation between individual trust in government and charitable participation. Their results show that individuals with lower trust in government and generally more conservative in their political and ideological orientation are more likely to support charitable organizations financially than individuals who identified their political orientation as more liberal and who possess greater levels of trust in government. Further research is needed to understand the relation between marital status and philanthropic participation. Similarly, better understanding of how political party affiliation and political ideology affect individual giving and volunteer participation rates and amounts is also needed.⁷

INTERACTION BETWEEN GIVING AND VOLUNTEERING

A public goods model of utility maximization predicts that contributions of time and money might function as substitutes, whereas a private goods model suggests that giving and volunteering would complement one another. The research to date has tested charitable giving and volunteering hypotheses by contrasting the public goods model and the private consumption model.⁸ This work by economists has focused on the cross price elasticities for charitable time and money, but little attention has been paid to the sociodemographic determinants that may affect the relation between giving and volunteering. Although policymakers may be able to influence the prices of giving and volunteering, nonprofit managers and their fundraisers operate in environments in which these prices are not under

their control. Therefore, nonprofit organizations and their managers could benefit by understanding the giving and volunteering interactions for various donor profiles. Doing so may reduce the uncertainty associated with the cross price elasticities and enhance organizational performance through more effective utilization of their fundraising, donor, and volunteer resources.

To date only a few studies have examined the interaction between gifts of time and money for individuals by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., see Clain & Zech, 1999). Work on the interaction relation we describe has, to a small degree, begun to be addressed such as in the Independent Sector's (2002b) *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001*, which is one of the most accessible sources for much of the conventional knowledge used by nonprofit managers and their development staffs in developing profiles for new sources of donated financial and human capital. However, the range of variables, univariate level of analysis, and lack of interpretation and explication in terms of management implications limit its utility and wider integration with other research on nonprofit organizations and charitable giving. Our exploratory study expands on this work by introducing new socioeconomic variables (such as religiosity and political affiliation). We utilize a combined gender-marital status variable to reflect more appropriately households as the giving unit; provide socioeconomic profiles of giver-volunteers versus givers-only, volunteers-only, and noncontributors; introduce a subsector analysis that compares giving and volunteering behavior across a range of nonprofit service sectors (such as arts and social services organizations); and test important differentials for statistical significance. We also explicate the types of management strategies that nonprofits may decide to employ based on the findings presented to increase their resource development effectiveness and organizational performance.

Methods and Data

Two different survey data sets are used in our exploratory analysis. The data collected are from the metropolitan Atlanta region. We use Atlanta because it is the largest metropolitan area in the South, the area scores very high among the 10 largest metropolitan areas in the United States on relative giving effort,⁹ and the Independent Sector reports that the relation between weekly attendance at religious services and household giving and volunteering is particularly significant in the South (Independent Sector, 2004). These characteristics give our Atlanta data unique strengths. First, given the importance of religion in American life and the strong relation between charitable giving and volunteering and the frequency of worship attendance, the Atlanta data allow us to examine a set of relations that are not as easily discerned from the Independent Sector data. Second, given the long history of involvement by religiously affiliated organizations in

the delivery of goods and services for the public benefit and the increasing role of faith-based organizations participating in the provision of publicly financed and privately delivered services under the Charitable Choice provisions,¹⁰ we believe it is important to focus on individuals in regions of the country where the relation among religious participation, giving, and volunteering may have implications for secular and sectarian nonprofits and their own resource development needs and the manner in which they are managed. In these ways, the Atlanta study site both presents opportunities for generalizability as well as areas in which the data are less generalizable to the nation as a whole but relevant to those geographic areas that share similar characteristics, as in the case of religious participation such as Jacksonville, Florida, and Dallas, Texas (Independent Sector 2002a; Twombly et al., 2003).

The first data set is from the Individual Philanthropy Patterns Survey (IPPS) in which individuals were interviewed about their charitable giving and volunteering patterns, behaviors, and attitudes regarding the role of nonprofit organizations. A 53-question telephone survey instrument¹¹ was administered to 2,545 Georgia residents in a 22-county Atlanta metropolitan statistical area. The survey was conducted from May through September 2000.¹² The sampling frame was randomly selected using random digit dialing and a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system. The response rate was 35%, and the percentages reported have a margin of error of approximately +3.5% at the 95% confidence level.¹³ The second data set comes from the Community Foundation Trends Study (CFTS), a five-quarter study of individual charitable giving and volunteering. The data for the CFTS were collected from the first quarter of 2002 through the first quarter of 2003 using a telephone survey consisting of 26 questions about individual charitable giving and volunteering, with additional questions on demographic characteristics.¹⁴ Again, the survey was administered and respondents were selected using random digit dialing and a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system. The result was 2,404 completed interviews randomly sampled from a 22-county metro Atlanta area. The response rate for this survey was also 35%, and the percentages reported have a margin of error of approximately +3.5% at the 95% confidence level.

The analysis of both data sets consists of simple cross tabulations, *t*-tests, and chi-squared tests and was used to examine the bivariate relations between the dependent variable (giving or volunteering measures) and frequency of church attendance (used as a proxy variable for religiosity), political party affiliation, race, sex, marital status, age, income, and education. Our exploratory study uses bivariate analysis because the direction of the effects of volunteering and giving on each other is difficult to determine, and we want to show relations in which causal direction does not have to be assumed.¹⁵ The IPPS data set is used to investigate our research questions that involve analyses of annual giving and volunteering. The results are presented in Tables 2 through 5. The CFTS data set is

Table 2. The Giving Behavior of Volunteers and the Volunteering Behavior of Givers

	<i>Volunteered During the Year</i>	<i>Did Not Volunteer During the Year</i>
Probability of giving (%)	89	71**
Overall respondents (\$)	2,391	909**
For those who gave of annual income (\$)	2,751	1,406**
Overall respondents (%)	5.54	1.75*
	<i>Gave During the Year</i>	<i>Did Not Give During the Year</i>
Probability of volunteering (%)	55	27
Overall respondents (%)	3.7	1.7**
For those who volunteered (%)	7.6	7.6

* difference is statistically significant at the .05 to .10 level.
 ** difference is statistically significant at the .05 level or greater.

used to examine giving and volunteering by service sector, with results presented in Table 6.¹⁶

Findings

THE GIVING BEHAVIOR OF VOLUNTEERS AND THE VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR OF GIVERS

In Table 2 we examine overall differences in the probability and amount of giving based on volunteer status and the overall differences in the probability and amount of volunteering based on giving status. Our analysis of all respondents reveals that those individuals reporting they had volunteered during the previous year were significantly more likely to have also given financially during the previous year. The probability of giving was 18 percentage points higher (89% vs. 71%), or 25% greater, for those who also volunteered during the year than for those who were not engaged in volunteer activities. The average annual charitable donations to all organizations by giver-volunteers were almost double that of those who gave but did not volunteer during the year (\$2,751 vs. \$1,406). Similarly, our analysis of all respondents reveals that those individuals reporting they had given financially during the previous year were significantly more likely to have also volunteered during the previous year. The likelihood of volunteering during the year was 28 percentage points higher (or roughly twice as great) for those who also gave during the year than for those who did not give.¹⁷ Interestingly, givers who volunteered reported the same number of volunteer hours as

Table 3. Percentage of Giving During the Year by Volunteer Status and Sociodemographic Characteristics of Donors

	<i>All Respondents</i>	<i>Non-volunteers</i>	<i>Volunteers</i>	<i>Added Percentage Points If a Volunteer</i>
All respondents	80	71	89	18**
Marriage status				
Single men	66	58	80	22**
Single women	72	62	83	21**
Married	86	79	92	13**
Ethnicity				
Whites	84	76	91	15**
African Americans	69	55	83	28**
Education				
High school or less	67	57	80	23**
Some college	81	74	87	13**
Bachelor's or more	91	86	95	9**
Age				
18–29	70	62	81	19**
30–44	83	74	90	16**
45–64	86	78	93	15**
65 or older	72	65	83	18**
Church attendance				
Weekly or more	84	70	91	21**
Less than weekly	76	72	85	13**
Political affiliation				
Democrat	77	68	87	19**
Republican	87	80	92	12**
Independent/"don't think in those terms"	77	68	89	21**
Income				
Under \$30,000	61	48	76	28**
\$30,000–\$74,999	84	75	93	18**
\$75,000 and over	90	87	93	6

** Difference between volunteers and nonvolunteers is statistically significant at the .05 level.

volunteers that did not give. This result is not necessarily surprising given the strong positive correlation between income and giving and that those with higher incomes are also more likely to have a higher opportunity cost of their time.

THE INCIDENCE OF GIVING BY VOLUNTEER STATUS AND SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF DONORS

In Table 3 we examine whether the impact of volunteering on giving varies among different socioeconomic groups.¹⁸ Our results signal a very strong conclusion.

For every sociodemographic characteristic considered (gender by marital status, race, educational attainment, age, religiosity, political affiliation, and income), the results are the same: The likelihood of giving is significantly higher for volunteers than for those who do not volunteer. The added impact of volunteering on the likelihood of giving is greatest for those individuals with relatively few financial resources and with lower overall rates of giving. The differences in probabilities of giving between volunteers and nonvolunteers are 28% for African Americans, 23% for those with a high school education or less, and 28% for those in the lowest income category. The least impact of volunteering on the likelihood of giving was for groups who were more likely to give overall. The difference in the probability of giving between volunteers and nonvolunteers provides an important value-added dimension for nonprofit managers to consider when evaluating the potential contributions volunteers also make to the financial solvency of the charities in the subsectors with which they feel strong alignment. For example, specifically developing African Americans and lower-income volunteers would be expected to enhance even more dramatically the breadth and diversity of the donor base for nonprofits.

THE INCIDENCE OF VOLUNTEERING BY GIVING STATUS AND SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF DONORS

Table 4 shows whether the impact of giving on volunteering varies among different socioeconomic groups. Again, our results signal a very strong conclusion. For every sociodemographic characteristic considered (gender by marital status, race, educational attainment, age, religiosity, political affiliation, and income), the results are the same: the likelihood of volunteering is significantly higher for financial givers than for those who did not give financially during the year. With a few exceptions (most notably for income categories), the added impact of giving on the likelihood of volunteering is greatest for those groups with a higher overall likelihood of volunteering. The impact is greater for married persons than for single men or single women, for the most educated relative to the least educated, for those in the 30–44 and 45–64 age groups, and for weekly church attendees compared with less frequent church attendees. Again, nonprofit managers can benefit their organizations by looking to current donors that fit these characteristics, appealing to their interest in the organization, and working with the donor to identify appropriate volunteer opportunities. This use of information is not without costs, as volunteer managers would be needed to identify relevant opportunities in which meaningful contributions of time and expertise could be offered. However, such strategies provide nonprofit managers with options for expanding their resource development base.

Table 4. Percentage of Volunteering During the Year by Giving Status and Sociodemographic Characteristics of Donors

	<i>All Respondents</i>	<i>Non-volunteers</i>	<i>Volunteers</i>	<i>Added Percentage Points If a Volunteer</i>
All respondents	49	27	55	28**
Marriage status				
Single men	38	23	46	23**
Single women	45	27	53	26**
Married	54	30	58	28**
Ethnicity				
Whites	48	26	53	27**
African Americans	54	31	64	33**
Education				
High school or less	40	23	48	25**
Some college	51	34	55	21**
Bachelor's or more	57	32	60	28**
Age				
18–29	43	28	50	22**
30–44	51	28	56	28**
45–64	54	27	58	31**
65 or older	40	24	45	21**
Church attendance				
Weekly or more	68	38	73	35**
Less than weekly	32	20	36	16**
Political affiliation				
Democrat	49	29	55	26**
Republican	57	33	61	28**
Independent/"don't think in those terms"	45	22	52	30**
Income				
Under \$30,000	45	27	57	30**
\$30,000–\$74,999	53	25	58	33**
\$75,000 and over	59	44	61	17

** Difference between volunteers and nonvolunteers is statistically significant at the .05 level.

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF GIVER-VOLUNTEERS, GIVERS-ONLY, VOLUNTEERS-ONLY, AND NONCONTRIBUTORS

Some people are engaged in giving of both their time and money to charitable organizations. Others demonstrate no formal philanthropic behavior. Still others give but do not volunteer, or volunteer but do not give. Does any pattern exist as to what types of people fit into each of these categories? In Table 5 we examine the sociodemographic profile of each of these groups.

Compared with all other groups (i.e., givers-only, volunteers-only, or those

Table 5. Sociodemographic Profiles of Givers-Volunteers, Givers-Only, Volunteers-Only, and Noncontributors, in Percentages

	<i>Givers- Volunteers</i>	<i>Givers- Only</i>	<i>Volunteers- Only</i>	<i>Noncontributors</i>
Marriage status				
Single men	10	15**	21**	26**
Single women	21	24	34**	35**
Married	68	62**	45**	40**
Ethnicity				
Whites	74	80**	57**	62**
African Americans	24	16**	40**	34**
Other	2	3	3	4
Education				
High school or less	25	33**	50**	62**
Some college	26	26	30	22
Bachelor's or more	49	41**	20**	16**
Age				
18–29	16	19**	31**	30**
30–44	40	37	34	32**
45–64	37	33**	23**	23**
65 or older	7	11**	13**	15**
Church attendance				
Weekly or more	69	31**	55**	33**
Less than weekly	31	69**	45**	67**
Political affiliation				
Democrat	31	32	41**	37
Republican	34	28**	24**	17**
Other	35	41**	36	46**
Income				
Under \$30,000	19	20	47**	51**
\$30,000–\$74,999	50	52	33**	39**
\$75,000 and over	31	28	20**	10**

** Difference between volunteers and nonvolunteers is statistically significant at the .05 level.

that neither give nor volunteer), giver-volunteers are more likely to be married, white, college educated, frequent church attendees, Republican, and middle aged. Although giver-volunteers are more likely than volunteers-only or noncontributors to occupy a higher income bracket, no statistically significant difference is found in income classes for giver-volunteers compared with those who were givers-only. Givers-only are also more likely to be white than are giver-volunteers. Blacks have relatively greater representation in the volunteer-only group than in any of the other charitable engagement categories. Interestingly, volunteers only are more likely to attend church on a weekly basis compared with givers only, more likely to be Democrats, and more heavily represented in the under \$30,000 income

group. Differences in religiosity (here measured as frequency of church attendance) are particularly interesting across the four groups. Givers-only are no more religious than noncontributors and are significantly less religious than either volunteers-only or giver-volunteers.

DO VOLUNTEERS TEND TO GIVE TO THE SAME CAUSES THEY VOLUNTEER FOR?

In Table 6 we compare the nonprofit service sectors in which an individual volunteers within the sector to which he or she gives.¹⁹ The highest correlations between giving and volunteering occur between the same charitable subsectors (represented by the numbers on the diagonal). No correlation coefficient off the diagonal is found that is as large as any of the correlation coefficients on the diagonal.

Giving to religion is strongly correlated with volunteering to religious causes but is not correlated with volunteering to any other cause. Similarly, volunteering to religious causes is strongly correlated with religious giving but is not correlated with giving to any other cause (with the exception of a very small negative correlation within giving to health). Contrast this with giving and volunteering to health causes or to the arts: Giving to either of these subsectors is significantly and positively correlated with volunteering in every service subsector except religion. Similarly, volunteering to either of these sectors is significantly and positively related with giving in every service sector except religion. One explanation for this contrast may be that religion ranks high for a majority of givers and a cause such as the arts ranks lower in many individuals' hierarchy of giving. Religious giving is a priority for many givers; it is the first sector one sets aside time and money for and is the last charitable cause from which a donor will reduce giving when individual resources become constrained.²⁰ Although involvement with religion may mean a higher level of giving or volunteering to secular causes in general, giving to religion is not a good predictor of volunteering to any particular subsector, nor is volunteering to religion a good predictor of giving to any particular subsector. Knowing that someone donates to religion, then, may say little about his or her philanthropic motivations and the other types of causes that are or would be supported. However, someone who is giving to the arts may have already made commitments to religion, social services, education, and so on. Thus, knowing that an individual is a donor to the arts suggests a higher probability that the donor also gives to a range of other charitable causes.

Although giving to social or human services is correlated with volunteering in only three service sectors (i.e., social/human services, health, and the arts), volunteering to social/human service causes is significantly correlated with giving to all causes except religion. The complementarities of youth and education causes can be seen by the relatively large correlations between giving and volunteering

Table 6. Do Volunteers Tend to Give to the Same Causes for Which They Volunteer? Correlations of Giving and Volunteering by Subsector

	<i>Giving by Subsector</i>						
	<i>Religious Organizations</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Health</i>	<i>Social/Human Services</i>	<i>Arts/Culture/Humanities</i>	<i>Environment/Wildlife</i>	<i>Youth Programs</i>
<i>Religious organizations</i>	.41**	-.03	-.07**	-.05	.02	-.02	.01
<i>Education</i>	.01	.38**	.10**	-.02	.15**	.03	.22**
<i>Health</i>	.00	.16**	.36**	.08**	.13**	.16**	.08**
<i>Social/human services</i>	.03	.11**	.14**	.29**	.16**	.09**	.08**
<i>Arts/culture/humanities</i>	-.02	.17**	.19**	.12**	.55**	.10**	.11**
<i>Environment/wildlife</i>	.02	.19**	.13**	.01	.14**	.49**	.04
<i>Youth programs</i>	.00	.23	.11**	.00	.11**	-.06	.47**

*** The correlation between giving and volunteering is statistically significant at the .05 level or greater.

across these subsectors. The correlation between giving to youth causes and volunteering to education is .22, and the correlation between giving to education and volunteering to youth programs is .23. These are the largest off-diagonal numbers on the table. To exploit this finding, nonprofit managers and development directors may wish to consider parents volunteering at their children's schools or their participation in after-school programs and other youth-related activities. Such findings on complementarities across sectors may be used by nonprofit managers to target donors who are not yet involved with an organization but who may be sympathetic to it, based on the donors' support for organizations that have complementary missions and client focus. The data on complementarities also point to potential collaborative partners in other subsectors of the nonprofit economy based on perceived similarities in mission and client focus. Such opportunities certainly represent viable options for partnerships based on common synergies, complementary goals, and jointly produced and integrated client services.

Discussion and Management Implications

Giving and volunteering to charitable causes go hand in hand. In our study of metro Atlantans, more people were involved during the year with both giving and volunteering than those who gave only, volunteered only, or did not give or volunteer. The probability of giving during the year was found to be 25% higher for volunteers than for nonvolunteers. The annual financial donation for volunteers was almost double that of nonvolunteers. Conversely, the proportion of givers who volunteer was more than double the proportion of nongivers who volunteer. What do these findings mean for nonprofit managers interested in increasing both the effectiveness and performance of their organizations? As previously stated, individual contributions of time and money are important measures of an organization's resource development and fundraising performance. These measures are also vital inputs to the range of programs that nonprofits deliver. Fundraising effectiveness is itself an important measure of the degree to which the organization is performing effectively in meeting its organizational mission.

For example, competent and talented volunteers can supplement program staff or can lend expertise on an as-needed basis. This arrangement not only creates resources for a nonprofit organization but, equally important, creates organizational capacity. This new capacity, in terms of financial and human resources, can be used to make improvements to existing programs, to invest in developing new programs and partnerships, and to create more efficient mechanisms for matching client needs with program offerings. In addition, increased organizational capacity can afford managers and leaders the opportunity to invest in operational capacity in the form of physical plant investments, technology upgrades, and enhanced benefits and salaries for employees. The newly developed resources

and strengthened organizational capacity can also be used to invest in the type of strategic donor cultivation and development of philanthropic resources that we discuss in this article as well as more effective and targeted outreach and advocacy efforts in the community. These latter efforts—especially if unrestricted resources are developed—can potentially attract more attention to a nonprofit organization's cause and serve to educate community and political leaders about program success and unmet need. In each way, increasing donated resources in the form of volunteer time and money can improve the organizational performance of nonprofit organizations.

Although the literature examining the determinants of charitable giving and of volunteering is fairly extensive, little attention has been paid to the connections between these two behaviors. Yet, a better understanding of the characteristics of giver-volunteers compared with others could be a key in expanding time and money contributions to the nonprofit sector. The sociodemographic profiles of giver-volunteers, givers-only, volunteers-only, and noncontributors can also serve to target those most likely to give or volunteer. We find a higher propensity of givers to volunteer and of volunteers to give for each sociodemographic group studied. The impact of being a volunteer on the probability of giving was especially high for African Americans, the least educated, and those in the lowest income category. The impact of being a giver on the probability of volunteering was highest for African Americans, the middle and lowest income categories, and regular church attendees. The typical sociodemographic profile of the giver-volunteer is someone who is married, white, college educated, a regular church attendee, middle-aged, and middle income. Givers-only are more likely to be white than any other group and are also less likely to attend church. Volunteers-only are more likely to be African American, Democrats, and younger than the other groups. Noncontributors are distinguished from the other groups in being less educated and having lower income.

What, then, are the implications of these results for nonprofit organizations? Three management findings and applications are immediately identifiable. First, the role of faith, worship attendance, and their relation to philanthropic engagement is assessed. This assessment should yield considerable insight into whether an opportunity for partnering with houses of worship is a strategy that an organization should pursue. Second, volunteers are an organization's best donors, so nonprofits should not be inhibited from asking. Third, the degree to which complementarities to a donor's giving and volunteering motivations and involvement that can be jointly leveraged through the development of partnerships for collective purpose and shared goals should be explored. Our findings and proposed management implications are largely interdependent and build on one another.

First, we find that nonprofit organizations have a viable resource base in en-

Table 7. Targets of Opportunity: Value-Added Resource Development Strategies for Nonprofit Organizations

<i>Challenge/Need</i>	<i>Opportunity</i>
Expanding financial resources Converting volunteers to givers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target your volunteers for giving. Finding new volunteers will also increase the number of new donors, as those who volunteer are more likely to give to the same cause. The increased likelihood of giving is the greatest for those donors with the following characteristics:^a <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African-American volunteers, • Volunteers who are least educated, and • Volunteers in the lowest income category. <p>Converting givers to volunteers</p> <p>Finding new donors will also increase the number of new volunteers, as those who give are more likely to volunteer to the same cause. The increased likelihood of volunteering is greatest for those donors with the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married individuals, • College educated (bachelor's degree or higher), • 30–64 years old, and • Weekly church attenders.
Using data for development, cultivation, and solicitation of donors and volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giver-volunteer group is the highest payoff strategy for organizations with very limited resources. • Volunteer-only group represents a real opportunity, especially among African Americans.
Partnering/collaboration with other nonprofit organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payoff is in the cooperation that arises from mission alignment, organizational complementarities, and interdependences. For example, education and youth-related causes are complementary. • Religion is very important to giving and volunteering, but in itself does not predict to which other causes an individual will give and volunteer. • Target of opportunity is with those that give and volunteer to arts organizations. These individuals are also among the most likely to give and volunteer to a range of other causes. However, they are also the individuals most likely to suffer from donor solicitation fatigue.

^aThis category considers the incidence of giving, not the amount given. A number of foundation chief executive officers and fundraisers have suggested that incidence of giving is a more important measure because over time as an individual's income and wealth increases, so will their level and amount of charitable participation to causes with which they have been involved in the past.

gaging individuals of faith into their organizations. For example, volunteers-only are relatively high on the survey's measure of religiosity, suggesting churches and faith-based organizations as prime sources of volunteers. We find that African Americans are actively engaged with houses of worship as measured by frequency of attendance, and that they are quite active in serving as volunteers with a variety of secular and sectarian causes. However, our findings, as well as other studies (Byrd, 1990; Carson, 1990; Pressley, 1995) reveal that more can be done to engage African Americans in opportunities not only to volunteer but also to give financially to the charitable organizations that best represent their interests and values. More than any other characteristic, giver-volunteers are distinguished by their regular church attendance. One potential management strategy for secular charities to consider is to pursue partnerships with religious organizations, especially African-American congregations, for which strong correlations are found between faith-based and philanthropic engagement. Consideration needs to be given to the number of volunteers, the frequency of their use (episodic or continuous), and the degree to which the organizations partnering are in alignment with one another on how the volunteers are to be used. In essence, does a nonprofit's cause appeal to regular worshipers? A common example of this partnering arrangement is the collaborative relationships that exist between houses of worship and soup kitchens. Often, a soup kitchen or food pantry will partner with a large number of religious groups for donations of food and volunteers to prepare, serve, and distribute the food to those in need. These types of relationships have been described as effective by leaders of both organizations because the burden of providing (funding) the service is shared across a number of organizations, and the episodic volunteer leaves with a sense of having performed a service.

Second, we find that if giving and volunteering go hand in hand and individuals tend to give (volunteer) to the same causes for which they volunteer (give), then charitable organizations would be wise to target their own donors for volunteer recruitment and their own volunteers for financial donations. Axiomatically, fundraisers and the professional practice literature have often subscribed to the point of view that volunteers should not be asked to give financially to avoid the creation of an environment of donor fatigue. Yet, this belief is not supported by the data, and, in fact, the opposite conclusion has more merit. The opportunity for nonprofits, according to our analysis, is that organizations should target their volunteers for financial contributions and their financial donors for contributions of time. In addition, it would be advisable to utilize what is known about the propensities of givers (volunteers) in one sector toward volunteering (giving) in another to target those new contributors who might also be open to an appeal. Consistent with the work of Hager and Brudney, "investment in volunteer management yields higher net benefits" for nonprofit organizations (2004b, p. 1). Therefore, invest-

ing in the personnel such as a volunteer manager and a system that focuses on recruitment, training, skill development, and the evaluation of volunteers can create positive returns for nonprofit organizations. Although this type of organizational capacity development is not free, the long-term returns can offset the short-term investment costs. As our findings demonstrate, the investment in volunteers can also have returns in terms of additional financial contributions. Developing volunteers into donors and donors into volunteers fundamentally represents new resources in the form of donated time and money for charitable organizations.

Third, directly linked to the preceding findings, we identify opportunities for partnering with other charitable nonprofit organizations. By segmenting donors along socioeconomic and demographic characteristics and analyzing donor and volunteer engagement patterns, managers can develop solicitation strategies that are more effectively targeted to particular donor groups. This segmentation and engagement strategy can lead to the development of partnerships with organizations that have complementary missions and can result in new resources, more volunteers, and additional opportunities and synergies that can be jointly leveraged in a targeted manner toward collective goals.²¹ For example, those who give or volunteer to education-related causes have a significantly higher probability of also giving or volunteering to youth programs—a mission focus and clientele that is obviously complementary to education.

Looking further, nonprofit managers can use the granularity contained in these data to identify other potential partners, programmatic initiatives, and donor segments for cultivation. For example, volunteering to environment/wildlife causes is also significantly correlated with giving to education. This finding has obvious implications for environmental conservation, advocacy, and education organizations with each taking a particular approach to environmental stewardship. A result may be that interdependent synergies exist that can be leveraged in the form of partnerships. The issue of complementarities has direct implications for the development of partnerships with organizations that have similar missions and values, given the strong levels of cross-sectoral support among donors and volunteers.

Nonprofit managers can use the concept of complementarities to plan joint programs and resource development strategies more effectively through fundraising that focuses on particular donor segments with shared goals and common clients. We do recognize, however, that a great many nonprofit organizations, particularly the smallest of charities, struggle to obtain even the most basic of information on whom they serve. We also understand that many of these organizations are several steps away from developing the institutional capacity and infrastructure necessary to engage in the type of donor segmentation, solicitation, and partnering we are suggesting. These limitations certainly do present barriers to raising money from certain groups. However, planning strategically

for the development of that capacity, infrastructure, and potential partnerships are goals that can enhance organizational performance and effectiveness. These findings and the questions they raise provide important information and incentives for organizations to work collaboratively to explore how the contributions of each might be pooled toward a larger collective public benefit.

In this exploratory analysis we link the concept of giving and volunteering and present a set of findings that has management implications for more effectively linking volunteers with opportunities to give and volunteering opportunities for those that give. In the accompanying text box we have also suggested management implications based on organizational need and value added resource development strategies that present real opportunities for nonprofit managers focused on enhancing organizational performance.

Individual philanthropy is an important revenue stream for nonprofit organizations and essential to their organizational performance. However, donors and volunteers are not monolithic. In fact, understanding an organization's philanthropic constituencies is a critical strategy that can assist nonprofit leaders in attracting resources to their organizations and cause. Fundraising and resource development cannot exist in an organizational vacuum and must, therefore, be integrated with other key organizational management systems. Such information sharing, coordination, and integration of management systems represent a move away from individual silos of marketing, fundraising human resources, and volunteer management and toward a more disciplined management focus centered on performance and effectiveness. The link between organizational performance and effective development and utilization of donors and volunteers is clear and represents a significant opportunity for nonprofit organizations to strengthen their resource development strategies. Raising money and doing it efficiently and effectively is an important measure of nonprofit performance. For nonprofit leaders, this type of data provides actionable recommendations that can be implemented with respect to their fundraising and volunteer management activities. Both volunteering and fundraising are important activities and resources in nonprofit organizations, and strengthening each has direct implications for the performance and effectiveness of their organizations. Our exploratory analysis and findings demonstrate the management utility of charitable giving data for nonprofit organizations.

A number of next steps can be taken to further our knowledge in this area, including multivariate analysis, using national data sets, and interviewing nonprofit managers about the effectiveness of their resource development systems and strategies on overall organizational performance. In the end, the cost of raising money, recruiting volunteers, and fundraising are critical issues for nonprofit leaders concerned with performance, mission alignment, and effectiveness. We provide a modest contribution in providing this type of information and analysis for nonprofit leaders.

Notes

1. According to *Giving USA* (AAFC, 2004), individuals contributed \$179.36 billion in 2003 to charitable organizations. Individuals account for 74.5% of all contributions made to nonprofits.

2. In Greenfield's (2001) comprehensive guide to fundraising, only two separate acknowledgments are found in a text of more than 1,100 pages that address the role of volunteers as donors. In Kelly's (1998) scholarly review of effective fundraising management, only passing reference is made to cultivating volunteers and the importance of volunteer management in developing an expanded donor base (see p. 444). Kelly describes the fundamental role of volunteers in fundraising events and campaigns but does not expand on this topic in terms of explicating the interconnected role of donations of time and money.

3. Arguably, nonprofit organizations incur financial costs to attract donations. Therefore, the term *unearned income* suggests financial resources secured by the organization through means other than selling a product or providing a service. Attracting such resources, however, often does require certain institutional and personnel investments, as in the case of hiring a professional fundraiser.

4. See Brown (1999a) for a more accurate assessment of the value of volunteer activity and a critique of the Independent Sector's method of calculating an hourly wage value for volunteer time.

5. A rich literature is developing on the motives for giving. Although the *why* dimension of the decision to give and volunteer is briefly addressed here in terms of different demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, a fuller treatment of individual motives and variation in giving and volunteering is accessible by drawing on Brown (1999b), Allison et al. (2002), and Kelly (1998).

6. Brooks (2000) defines secular persons as those individuals reporting that they attend a worship services less than a few times a year or stating they have no explicit religion.

7. Limited empirical research has been conducted to date on this issue; however, the Philanthropy Roundtable has begun to feature symposiums that address some of these issues. See, for example, www.philanthropyroundtable.org/magazines/2005/janfeb/piereson.htm.

8. Govekar and Govekar (2002) provide a good overview of the work done by economists on issues of voluntarism.

9. See Twombly et al. (2003), table 4. The authors look at the population, average contribution as a percentage of income, the average contribution, and the overall metro rank across all metropolitan statistical areas and then compute a relative giving effort score for the 10 largest metropolitan areas in the United States.

10. The Charitable Choice provisions are executive orders, which are being implemented in 10 different federal agencies.

11. A number of previous research surveys and questions guided the development of the survey instrument in which respondents were asked about their giving and volunteering patterns, behaviors, attitudes, solicitation preferences, and the sources of information they use in making their charitable giving decisions. These include the Independent Sector's (2002b) *Giving and Volunteering* national survey, AAFC's (2004) *Giving USA*, the Hudson Institute's (1997) Report of the National Commission on Philanthropy, the Federal Reserve Board's (2006) *2004 Survey of Consumer Finances*, and numerous regional surveys such as those administered on behalf of the Dallas Community Foundation and the Silicon Valley Community Foundation. A copy of the survey instrument is available from the authors.

12. Survey participants were not asked to provide the name of the organizations to which they made financial donations and contributions of time. Rather they were asked to identify the subsector to which they contributed. These subsectors are the common organizational types identified in the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities, including religious, educational, health, social services, environment/conservation, arts/culture, and youth-related organizations. In addition, charitable-giving methodology shows that asking individuals for specific names con-

tributes to several challenges, including (a) the extended length of time required to complete the survey and, by extension, the cost of the survey; (b) the difficulty of recording and then coding each type of organization under the NTEE categories; and (c) the generalizability issue. A significant number of national and regional charitable giving surveys ask for category of giving, such as giving money or time to educational organizations. We sought to minimize social desirability biases by asking for giving and volunteering information by subsector rather than by organization (see Hall, 2001). To truly understand giving and volunteering at the organizational level, interviews would be the most appropriate. That method was beyond the scope and funding of this study.

13. A 35% response rate is considered to be quite acceptable for a telephone survey. An issue often raised with public opinion data is the response rate. Asher suggests that contacting the public has become more difficult because of technology, with the use of answering machines, caller ID, and voice mail, making direct contact with the public more challenging (2001, pp. 76–78). However, he suggests that repeat calls at different times of the day, leaving messages with explanations as to the nature of the call, trying to arrange more convenient times, and using highly trained interviewers to convert respondents that refuse to agree to participate all contribute to augmenting the quality and representativeness of the sample. Interviewers for the this survey are all trained in these techniques. Also, a report conducted by the Pew Research Center for the People and Press (cited by Asher) reveals that in a study with two surveys administered—the first with a 42% response rate and the second with a 71% response rate—revealed “very similar results across a wide variety of questions” (p. 78). Finally, Asher notes, “Declining response rates are less of a problem for those reputable survey organizations that work harder to secure completed interviews through multiple callbacks and other tactics. . . [and that] lower rates do not automatically indicate that a poll is inaccurate” (p. 28). On the issue of weighting, the actual results were weighted using the 2000 U.S. Census data for the state of Georgia. Asher notes, “Weights are used to correct for biases—that is, to ensure that the sample’s demographic characteristics more accurately reflect the population’s overall properties” (p. 79).

14. The survey questions are available on request.

15. A generally accepted conclusion exists that the events of 9/11 shifted (possibly very short term) individual charitable giving and volunteering across subsectors of the nonprofit economy toward human services and away from arts and environmental causes. A myriad of news stories can be found on the Independent Sector’s and AAFC’s Web sites that focus on changes in giving post-9/11. As for empirical pieces, a dearth of research exists that actually tests pre- and post-9/11 giving and volunteering. The National Opinion Research Center researchers report on giving and volunteering in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 but have no comparisons pre-9/11. We do not have comparable pre- and post-9/11 data. In this paper we are not looking at the level of giving and volunteering by sector, just the correlations between giving and volunteering.

16. The two data sets are not linked in any explicit way given their different purposes. We are unable to compare subsector results between the IPPS and CFTS because one asked about annual incidence and the other asked about quarterly incidence of giving. The IPPS did not ask about volunteering by subsector.

17. On the effects of 9/11, we found no statistical difference in the two surveys with regard to the average volunteer hours per week across all respondents, nor did we find any statistical difference in the two surveys in the average annual amount of total contributions in 1999 versus 2001, after adjusting for inflation.

18. As noted above (see note 15), an examination across broad socioeconomic groups is desirable but often not feasible when trying to survey a large population for the purposes of generalizability. This examination is an excellent area for future research and one that should be explored further because of the micro-level implications of donor behavior and motives and the potential cultivation and solicitation strategies that could be developed by nonprofit organizations to enhance their organizational performance.

19. The data limit us to examining differences by subsector, not by specific charitable organizations.

20. The correlations between giving (volunteering) to religious organizations and volunteering (giving) to other subsectors is, in essence, how giving in one sector affects volunteering in another sector.

21. This finding is in some ways consistent with the work of Hager and Brudney (2004a), who find that variation in the needs of charitable organizations, such as episodic versus continuous use of volunteers, is an important management dimension to be considered for an organization's volunteer management system. This finding would also suggest that an important opportunity exists for thinking about how complementary charitable causes could partner with one another depending on their resource needs.

References

- Allison, L.D., Okun, M.A., & Dutridge, K.S. (2002). Assessing volunteer motives: A comparison and open-ended probe and Likert rating scales. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 12*(4), 243–255.
- American Association of Fundraising Council. *Giving USA 2004*. New York: American Association of Fundraising Council Trust for Philanthropy.
- Andreoni, J., Brown, E., & Rischall, I. (2003). Charitable giving by married couples: Who decides and why does it matter? *Journal of Human Resources, 38*(1), 111–133.
- Asher, H. (2001). *Polling and the public: What every citizen should know* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Bowen, D.J., Andersen, M.R., & Urban, N. (2000). Volunteerism in a community-based sample of women aged 50 to 80 years. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(9), 1829–1842.
- Brooks, A.C. (2000). Is there a dark side to government support for nonprofits? *Public Administration Review, 60*(3), 211–218.
- Brooks, A.C. (2002). Can nonprofit management help answer public management's "big questions"? *Public Administration Review, 62*(3), 259–266.
- Brooks, A.C. (2003). Religious faith and charitable giving. *Policy Review, 121*(October/November), 39–50.
- Brooks, A.C., & Lewis, G.B. (2001). Giving, volunteering, and mistrusting government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 20*(4), 765–769.
- Brown, E. (1999a). Assessing the value of volunteer activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 28*(1), 3–17.
- Brown, E. (1999b). Patterns and purposes of philanthropic giving. In C.T. Clotfelter & T. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in a changing America* (pp. 212–230). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Brudney, J.L. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector: Planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brudney, J.L., & Kellough, J.E. (2000). Volunteers in state government: Involvement, management, and benefits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(1), 111–130.
- Byrd, A. (1990). *Philanthropy and the black church*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.
- Carson, E.D. (1990). Patterns of giving in black churches. In R. Wuthnow, V. Hodgkinson, & Associates (Eds.), *Faith and philanthropy in America* (pp. 232–252). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clain, S.H., & Zech, C.E. (1999). A household production analysis of religious and charitable activity. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 58*(4), 923–947.

- Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5), 156–159.
- Clotfelter, C.T. (1985). *Federal tax policy and charitable giving*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clotfelter, C.T. (1997). The economics of giving. In J.W. Barry & B.V. Manno (Eds.), *Giving better, giving smarter: Working papers of the national commission on philanthropy and civic renewal* (pp. 31–55). Washington, DC: National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal.
- Cnaan, R.A., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364–383.
- Duncan, B. (1999). Modeling charitable contributions of time and money. *Journal of Public Economics*, 72(2), 213–242.
- Eikenberry, A.M., & Kluver, D.P. (2004). The marketization of the nonprofit sector: Civil society at risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 132–140.
- Farmer, S.M., & Fedor, D.B. (1999). Volunteer participation and withdrawal: A psychological contract perspective on the role of expectations and organizational support. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9(4), 349–367.
- Federal Reserve Board. (2006). *2004 survey of consumer finances*. Washington, DC. Available at www.federalreserve.gov/PUBS/oss/oss2/2004/scf2004home.html, accessed April 4, 2006.
- Feldstein, M., & Clotfelter, C. (1976). Tax incentives and charitable contributions in the United States: A microeconomic analysis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 5(1), 1–26.
- Fogal, R.E. (2005). Designing and managing the fundraising program. In R.D. Herman & Associates (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Freeman, R. (1997). Working for nothing: The supply of volunteer labor. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15(1, pt. 2), S140–166.
- Froelich, K.A. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3), 246–268.
- Frumkin, P., & Kim, M.T. (2001). Strategic positioning and the financing of nonprofit organizations: Is efficiency rewarded in the contributions marketplace? *Public Administration Review*, 61(3), 266–275.
- Gallagher, S.K. (1994). Doing their share: Comparing patterns of help given by older and younger adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 56(August), 567–578.
- Govekar, P.L., & Govekar, M.A. (2002). Using economic theory and research to better understand volunteer behavior. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13(1), 33–48.
- Greene, P., & McClelland, R. (2001). Taxes and charitable giving. *National Tax Journal*, 54(3), 433–453.
- Greenfield, J.M. (2001). *The nonprofit handbook: Fundraising* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Grønberg, K.A. (2001). The U.S. nonprofit human service sector: A creeping revolution. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(2), 276–297.
- Hager, M.A., & Brudney, J.L. (2004a). *Balancing act: The challenges and benefits of volunteers*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Available at www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411125, accessed March 25, 2006.
- Hager, M.A., & Brudney, J.L. (2004b). *Volunteer management: Practices and retention of volunteers*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Available at www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411005, accessed March 25, 2006.
- Hall, M.H. (2001). Measurement issues in surveys of giving and volunteering and strategies applied in the design of Canada's national survey of giving, volunteering, and participating. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 515–526.

- Harbaugh, W.T. (1998). What do donations buy? A model of philanthropy based on prestige and warm glow. *Journal of Public Economics*, 67(2), 269–284.
- Heidrich, K.W. (1990). Volunteers' life-styles: Market segmentation based on volunteers' role choices. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 19(1), 21–31.
- Herman, R.D., & Renz, D.O. (1999). Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(2), 107–126.
- Hodgkinson, V.A., & Weitzman, M.S. (1992). *Giving and volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Hodgkinson, V.A., & Weitzman, M.S. (1995). Key factors influencing caring, involvement, and community. In P. Schervish, V. Hodgkinson, M. Gates, & Associates (Eds.), *Care and community in modern society* (pp. 21–50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hodgkinson, V.A., & Weitzman, M.S. (1996). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Hudson Institute. (1997). *Giving better, giving smarter: Renewing philanthropy in America*. Report of the National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal. Washington, DC.
- Iannacone, L.R. (1998). Introduction to the economics of religion. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36(3), 1465–1496.
- Independent Sector. (2002a). *Faith and philanthropy: The connection between charitable behavior and giving to religion*. Washington, DC.
- Independent Sector. (2002b). *Giving and volunteering in the United States 2001*. Washington, DC.
- Independent Sector. (2004). *Independent Sector report examines regional differences in American philanthropy*. Washington, DC. Available from www.independentsector.org/media/nationPR.html, accessed April 4, 2006.
- Jackson, F.J., Bachmeier, M.D., Wood, J.R., & Craft, E.A. (1995). Volunteering and charitable giving: Do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24(1), 59–78.
- Jencks, C. (1987). Who gives to what? In W.W. Powell (Ed.), *The nonprofit sector* (pp. 321–339). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kelly, K.S. (1998). *Effective fund-raising management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kostigen, Thomas (2002). More to give than money: Volunteerism keeps rising as financial charity slips. *CBS Marketwatch.com*, October 15.
- Lam, P.Y. (2002). As the flocks gather: How religion affects voluntary participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(3), 405–422.
- Menchik, P.L., & Weisbrod, B.A. (1987). Volunteer labor supply. *Journal of Public Economics*, 32(2), 159–183.
- Morino, M., & Shore, B. 2004. High-engagement philanthropy: A bridge to a more effective social sector. In Venture Philanthropy Partners (Ed.), *High-engagement philanthropy: A bridge to a more effective social sector* (pp. 7–22). Washington, DC.
- Musick, M.A., Wilson, J., & Bynum, W.B. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces*, 78(4), 1539–1571.
- Omoto, A.M., Snyder, M., & Martino, S.C. (2000). Volunteerism and the life course: Investigating age-related agendas for actions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 22(3), 181–197.
- O'Neill, M. (2001). Research on giving and volunteering: Methodological considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 505–514.
- Ozorak, E.W. (2003). Love of God and neighbor: Religion and volunteer service among college students. *Review of Religious Research*, 44(3), 285–299.
- Park, J.Z., & Smith, C. (2000). To whom much has been given . . . Religious capital and

- community voluntarism among churchgoing protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 39(3), 272–286.
- Pressley, C. (1995). Financial contributions for the kingdom for the elect: Giving patterns in the black church. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, Spring, 91–100.
- Randolph, W.C. (1995). Dynamic income, progressive taxes, and the timing of charitable contributions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103, 709–38.
- Rooney, P.M., Mesch, D.J., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K.S. (2002, November). *The effects of race, gender, and measurement on giving and volunteering: Indiana as a test case*. Paper presented at the Association for Research on Nonprofits and Voluntary Action Annual Conference, Montreal.
- Ryan, W.P. (2001). *Nonprofit capital: A review of problems and strategies*. New York: Rockefeller Foundation/Fannie Mae Foundation.
- Schervish, P.G. (1997). Inclination, obligation, and association: What we know and what we need to learn about donor motivation. In D.F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fundraising* (pp. 110–138). New York: Wiley.
- Schervish, P.G., & Havens, J.J. (1995). Do the poor pay more: Is the U-shaped curve correct? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24(1), 79–90.
- Smith, D.H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(3), 243–263.
- Steinberg, R. (1990a). Labor economics and the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 19(Summer), 151–167.
- Steinberg, R. (1990b). Taxes and giving: New findings. *Voluntas*, 1(2), 61–79.
- Tiehen, L. (2001). Tax policy and charitable contributions of money. *National Tax Journal*, 54(4), 707–723.
- Tschirhart, M. (1998). Understanding the older hybrid volunteer: Age-related differences among AmeriCorps members. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 22(1), 35–48.
- Twombly, E.C., Lampkin, L., & Cordes, J. (2003, November). *Comparing generosity in metropolitan areas*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action, Denver.
- Van Slyke, D.M., & Brooks, A.C. (2005). Why do people give? New evidence and strategies for nonprofit managers. *American Review of Public Administration*, 35(3), 199–222.
- Weitzman, M., Jalandoni, N.T., Lampkin, L.M., & Pollak, T.H. (2002). *The new nonprofit almanac and desk reference: The essential facts and figures for managers and volunteers*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 694–713.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1998). The contribution of social resources to volunteering. *Social Science Quarterly*, 79(4), 799–814.
- Wolff, E. (1999). The economy and philanthropy. In C.T. Clotfelter & T. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in a changing America* (pp. 212–230). Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Wolpert, J. (1995). Giving and region: Generous and stingy communities. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 7(Spring), 11–30.
- Wuthnow, R. (1994). *God and mammon in America*. New York: Free Press.

David M. Van Slyke is an assistant professor of public administration at Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. His research and teaching focus on public and nonprofit management, privatization and contracting, strategic management, and philanthropy.

Janet L. Johnson is an adjunct professor of economics at the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University and a senior research associate in the school's Nonprofit Studies Program. Her research and teaching focus on human resource economics, quantitative analysis, and philanthropy.