



Australian Government
Department of Families,
Community Services
and Indigenous Affairs



THE PRIME MINISTER'S
COMMUNITY
BUSINESS
PARTNERSHIP

Giving Australia: Research on Philanthropy in Australia

Australians Giving and Volunteering 2004

December 2005

The 'Giving Australia' project, an initiative of the Prime Minister's Community Business Partnership, was coordinated by the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS) in collaboration with the Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management (CACOM) at the University of Technology, Sydney, the Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies (CPNS) at the Queensland University of Technology, Roy Morgan Research (RMR), McNair Ingenuity Research and the Fundraising Institute of Australia (FIA). This report was authored by Mark Lyons and Andrew Passey from the Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management (CACOM) University of Technology, Sydney



Centre for Australian Community
Organisations and Management
CACOM

© Commonwealth of Australia 2005

ISBN:

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth available from the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney-General's Department.

Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney-General's, Robert Garran Offices, National Circuit, Canberra ACT 2600 or posted at <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>

For more information contact:

Australian Government Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
PO Box 7788
Canberra Mail Centre ACT 2610

Telephone: 1800 260 402

www.facs.gov.au

Contents

List of figures and tables	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Overview	vii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Project details	1
1.2 Previous research	1
2 Methodology	3
2.1 Overview	3
2.2 The questionnaire	3
2.3 Survey administration and data cleansing	4
2.4 The tsunami problem	4
3 An overview of giving	6
3.1 Numbers, rates and amounts	6
3.2 Trends	6
3.2.1 Giving	6
3.2.2 Volunteering	8
3.3 Some international comparisons	8
3.4 Other financial support from individuals	10
3.4.1 Support in return for a material benefit	10
3.4.2 Bequests	10
4. Givers	12
4.1 Who gives?	12
4.1.1 Gender	12
4.1.2 Age	13
4.1.3 Income	14
4.1.4 High income earners	15
4.1.5 Education	16
4.1.6 Employment status	16
4.1.7 Occupation	17
4.1.8 Household type	18
4.1.9 Location	19
4.1.10 Place of birth	20
4.1.11 Do givers give equally?	21
4.1.12 The giving of money and time	22
4.1.13 Religion and the giving of money and time	22
4.2 Ways people are approached to give and attitudes to these	25
4.2.1 Common fundraising methods	25
4.2.2 Other methods of approach	26
4.2.3 Ways approached for specific single donation	26

4.2.4	The value of tokens and events for fundraising	27
4.2.5	Payroll deductions	27
4.3	Reasons for giving	28
4.3.1	Stated reasons	28
4.3.2	Affiliated giving	29
4.3.3	Is giving planned?	30
4.3.4	Tax concessions and giving	31
4.3.5	Awareness of tax changes to encourage giving	33
4.3.6	Reasons for not giving	34
5.	The recipients of individual philanthropy	36
5.1	Who gets the money?	36
5.2	Who gets the hours?	36
5.3	Giving to nonprofits and giving to governments	38
5.4	Tsunami giving	38
5.5	Are some fields growing or declining in popularity?	38
5.6	Where is affiliation giving strongest?	40
6.	Conclusion	41
	References	42

List of tables

Table 1: Methods of fundraising and their popularity	10
Table 2: Bequests to nonprofit organisations	11
Table 3: Givers by gender	12
Table 4: Volunteers by gender	13
Table 5: Givers by age	13
Table 6: Volunteers by age	13
Table 7: Givers by personal income	14
Table 8: Givers by household income	14
Table 9: Volunteers by personal income	15
Table 10: Volunteers by household income	15
Table 11: High income givers	15
Table 12: High income volunteers	15
Table 13: Givers by education	16
Table 14: Volunteers by education	16
Table 15: Givers by employment status	17
Table 16: Volunteers by employment status	17
Table 17: Givers by occupation	18
Table 18: Volunteers by occupation	18
Table 19: Givers by household type	18
Table 20: Volunteers by household type	19
Table 21: Giving by location	19
Table 22: Volunteers by location	20
Table 23: Giving by place of birth	20
Table 24: Volunteers by place of birth	21
Table 25: Amounts given by giving quintiles	21
Table 26: Hours volunteered by volunteer quintiles	21
Table 27: Number of fields supported	22
Table 28: Giving of money and time	22
Table 29: Impact of religion on giving, including giving to religion	23
Table 30: Impact of religion on giving with giving to religion excluded	23
Table 31: Impact of religion on volunteering, including volunteering for religion	24
Table 32: Impact of religion on volunteering with volunteering for religion excluded	24
Table 33: Percentage of sample approached by different methods (ranked by number approached)	25

Table 34: Frequency of giving reported for each method	25
Table 35: Attitudes towards methods	26
Table 36: Other fundraising approaches	26
Table 37: Approaches for specific single donations	27
Table 38: Value of tokens and events for fundraising	27
Table 39: Reasons for giving	29
Table 40: Planned and spontaneous giving	31
Table 41: Tax concessions and giving	32
Table 42: Tax concessions and high income earners	33
Table 43: Awareness of tax deductibility for giving	33
Table 44: Impact of tax changes on giving	34
Table 45: Reasons for not giving	35
Table 46: Encouragements to give for non-givers	35
Table 47: Recipients of giving	36
Table 48: Recipients of volunteering	37
Table 49: Recipients in health and education of giving	37
Table 50: Recipients of giving in the health sector	37
Table 51: Recipients growing and declining in popularity	39
Table 52: Giving and affiliation	40

Acknowledgements

While we are the authors of this report, the huge and hugely difficult task of data collection was performed by Roy Morgan Research. We would like to acknowledge great amount of assistance provided by Andrea Douglas, Chris Lonergan and Clare McAdam from Roy Morgan Research. They gave us great help in the design of the questionnaire, and were responsible for sample selection and for administering the survey.

We would also like to acknowledge the ideas contributed by Philip O'Donoghue of ACOSS and members of the secretariat to the Prime Minister's Community Business Partnership in the Commonwealth Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs to the design of the questionnaire.

Overview

- In 2004, Australians gave \$5.7 billion in donations. 87% of adult Australians made at least one donation.
- The median total donation was \$100; this means that half of the donors donated more than \$100.
- The average sum donated by donors was \$424.
- Around 50% of people provided another \$2 billion by way of participating in charitable gambling, charity auctions, dinners and other events where they received a benefit in return for their support.
- This represented a total of \$7.7 billion paid out to support a great variety of causes.
- Around 92% of this went to nonprofit organisations; government entities received the rest.
- Religious organisations, such as churches, mosques, temples and the like received over one-third of the \$5.7 billion donated. Organisations providing community and welfare services, international aid and development and collecting for medical research received a little over 10% each.
- The \$5.7 billion was a big increase over 1997, when 69% of adults gave \$3 billion. Expressed as a percentage of GDP, Australians give more than Canadians, but considerably less than Americans.
- In 2004, 41% of adult Australians volunteered for a total of 836 million hours. This represents an increase in the percentage of people volunteering compared to 2000 which was in turn higher than 1995. It also represents a 19% increase in hours volunteered.
- On average, volunteers gave 132 hours over the year; the median hours volunteered was 44.
- A higher percentage of adult Australians volunteer than Americans or Canadians.

1. Introduction

1.1 Project details

Between early February and mid-March 2005 just over 6,200 adult Australians agreed to participate in a telephone survey designed to collect data on the giving of money and the giving of time or volunteering to organisations working in different fields of activity. Data was also collected on their reasons for giving (or for not giving) and their experience of, and attitudes toward, different fundraising methods. It was the first time in Australia that data on the two major forms of philanthropic behaviour, the giving of money and the giving of time, have been collected from the same population. One of the reasons for undertaking the study was to determine if there had been any noticeable change in these behaviours over the past decade.

The survey reported here was conducted by Roy Morgan Research and undertaken as part of a wider study of Australian philanthropy, the *Giving Australia* project, which is an initiative of the Prime Minister's Community Business Partnership. That larger project was coordinated by the Australian Council of Social Service and funded by the Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

The following report outlines the major findings from this survey.

1.2 Previous research

International research on giving is quite extensive.¹ While some studies are based on large sample surveys conducted by central statistical agencies and derive reliable estimates of the rate, amount and destination of giving,² other studies are smaller in scope and focus on the determinants of giving. Statistics Canada has established the benchmark for best practice and collects data on giving and volunteering in the same survey. It collects data on social participation as well.³ Most surveys also collect data on people's motives for giving (and/or volunteering), along with a range of other variables.⁴ As a result, we can identify a range of variables that increase the likelihood that a person will give: having a university degree, being a volunteer (far fewer people volunteer than give), frequent religious observance.⁵ The relationship between income levels and levels of giving is more complex; but the likelihood that a person will give increases with income.⁶ Some surveys sought to collect data on people's reasons for giving and the way they came to give, including the different methodologies of fundraising.⁷ Some studies also collected data to estimate the effect of tax deductions on giving.⁸ The growing international experience with collecting data on giving has led to a growing agreement about best practice for collecting data on giving and volunteering.⁹

¹ eg, Magat, R 1989; Hodgkinson, V and Weitzman, M 1996; Reed, P and Selby, K 2000; Hall, M, McKeown, L and Roberts, K 2001; Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (APPC) 2002.

² eg, Hall et al. 2001.

³ Hall et al. 2001.

⁴ Hodgkinson, V and Weitzman, M 1996; Hall et al. 2001.

⁵ Reed, P and Selby, K 2000.

⁶ Schervish, P and Havens, J 1995.

⁷ Hall et al. 2001; APPC 2002.

⁸ eg, Hall et al. 2001.

⁹ eg, Lyons, M Wijkstrom, P and Clary, G 1998; Browne, E and Burlingame, D 2001.

Little of this research has been mirrored in Australia. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) conducted the only large sample (12,000 respondents) survey of giving in Australia in 1997. It was commissioned by the Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management (CACOM) at the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) as part of the Australian Nonprofit Data Project, in which the ABS was a partner. The primary object of the survey was to estimate the rate and amount of giving to nonprofit organisations by field of activity. Only limited results from that survey have been published.¹⁰ Apart from data on membership of associations and the usual demographic profile, little else was collected to enable the various theories of the determinants of giving to be explored in an Australian setting.

Volunteering has been better served, with the ABS surveying volunteering by adult Australians in 1995 and again in 2000.¹¹ The 2000 survey asked respondents if they had also made financial gifts in the previous year, but no information was collected on the amount or destination of that giving.

¹⁰ Lyons, M and Hocking, S 2000.

¹¹ ABS 1996, 2001.

2 Methodology

2.1 Overview

This survey, the results of which are reported here, was designed primarily to collect data on the giving of money and of time (volunteering) by adult Australians, especially the levels of giving and the destinations of those gifts. It was also designed to collect data on people's reasons for giving money or for not giving, and on people's experience of different forms of fundraising and their attitudes towards these. Data was collected on the demographic characteristics of respondents and on their religious behaviour, as this has been demonstrated elsewhere to have a strong relationship with philanthropy. Data was also collected to try to determine the impact of government policy designed to encourage monetary giving, such as tax deductions for gifts to certain organisations. Respondents were also asked about their preparedness to leave bequests and the extent to which they supported organisations and causes by participating in fundraising methods that involved some significant return (or possibility of such a return) to the supporter.

2.2 The questionnaire

The survey was designed with a view to ensuring comparability with earlier research. However, the method of administration (by telephone) and the period of recall (one year) differs from the 1997 ABS survey of giving¹² and the 2000 ABS voluntary work survey, both of which used face to face interviews and the former a three month period of recall for most data. As a consequence, direct comparisons of results are not possible. However, we can obtain rough indications of the dimensions of changes that have occurred between 2004 and the two earlier surveys.

The introduction specifically asked people to report only gifts that they had made personally and to exclude any gift made by other members of the household or from a family business.

The survey used the field or type of cause that people might support as a memory prompt. After an introduction, people who agreed to participate were asked if they had made a monetary donation over the previous twelve months to any of a list of fields of activity (such as medical research, community or welfare services and arts or cultural organisations). Each field contained examples of typical and well-known organisations or types of organisations in each field (eg Cancer Council, Salvation Army, scouts, art galleries and political parties). People were given the opportunity to identify any further organisations or fields, which were later integrated with existing sets of fields. In some cases, such as education and health, respondents were then asked for a more detailed breakdown (for example, distinguishing between private and public schools and universities). When a respondent affirmed a gift to one or more fields, they were then asked for the amount they had given to organisations in each field over the previous year.

One field was randomly selected for each respondent, and the names of all organisations in that field to which they had made donations were collected. From within this list, one specific organisation was randomly selected and a more detailed

¹² Lyons, M and Hocking, S 2000

set of questions asked about donations to that organisation. It was assumed that a person's reasons for giving and the circumstances of that gift would vary with the type of recipient of the gift, but it would have been too time-consuming to collect detail on all gifts. The random selection of an organisation to be explored in detail meant that certain generalisations could be made about all giving (this detailed questioning applied only to gifts of money, not time).

All respondents, including those who had not reported making any gifts, were then asked about their experience of fundraising and their awareness of government policies to encourage giving.

Those who had not given to any organisation in the past twelve months were asked their reasons for not doing so and whether any changes in circumstances or the behaviour of fundraising organisations might change this.

All respondents were read a list of types of voluntary work and asked whether over the previous twelve months they had performed such work as a volunteer. They were then given the same list of organisational fields used in the monetary donations section of the questionnaire. These two questions acted as memory prompts for both types of volunteering as well as the organisations through which the volunteering was undertaken. Data was collected on where they had worked as a volunteer and for how many hours over the previous year. Finally, demographic data and data on religious behaviour were collected.

2.3 Survey administration and data cleansing

The survey was administered by computer aided telephone interviews during February 2005. A total of 6,209 interviews were completed. This represented a useable response rate of 40%, which is considered satisfactory for such surveys. Interviews took an average of just under 20 minutes to complete.

There was a deliberate over sampling of households from high income census collection districts (CCDs) to ensure high income-earning households were well represented in the sample. In total 30% of interviews were conducted within the 20% of CCDs with the highest mean household income. Useable responses were weighted by age, gender and educational attainment to represent the Australian population aged 18 and over, giving a weighted sample of 15,398. This was just under 0.1% of the adult population.

After running some preliminary tests on the sample, extreme outliers were identified in responses both on giving and on volunteering. These were examined individually and where responses appeared to be a consequence of erroneous recollection or recording, they were rebased to the mean for all other responses. This applied to 1% of responses for giving and a little over 2.5% of volunteering responses (the method used to collect hours volunteered over a year was complex and could have been misunderstood).

2.4 The tsunami problem

The survey had been designed and pilot tested before the end of 2004, but data collection was held over till early 2005 to avoid the pre- and post-Christmas period. On Boxing Day reports reached Australia of extraordinary devastation all around the shores of the northern Indian Ocean caused by a tsunami triggered by an earthquake off the north-west coast of Sumatra. Subsequent weeks of extensive media coverage

engendered unprecedented levels of giving to overseas aid and development nonprofits. It also gave extraordinary prominence to, and positive endorsement for charitable giving. This created two problems for the survey. It meant that the huge one-off outpouring of giving (estimated in March 2005 by the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) as \$300 million) would lift the level of giving for the preceding twelve months above the underlying or structural level. As well, the positive endorsement of giving might encourage a more accurate recall, but it might also lead some respondents to invent or to exaggerate their level of giving. We were aware of unpublished American research which had found that an effect of the September 11 2001 disaster had been to increase the reported rate of giving among certain population groups.¹³

In an attempt to guard against the first problem the questionnaire was altered slightly. The tsunami appeal was mentioned in the introductory remarks and respondents were told that they would be later asked about their response to that disaster but initially to think only about their non-tsunami giving over the previous twelve months. As will be indicated below, we do not believe this effort was entirely successful and there is a tsunami bias in the data.

As to the second problem, that of exaggerated reporting of giving, we believed we could guard against the most obvious examples of exaggeration by running a series of tests on the raw unit data so as to identify obvious outliers. As well, to the extent that it prompted recollection of acts of giving by legitimating them, which was a positive benefit. One of us (Lyons) had earlier estimated that the Olympic Games and the positive endorsement it had given to volunteering had encouraged the reporting of volunteering that had gone unreported in the earlier ABS's 1995 survey.

Even after these adjustments, we believe that our data may still suffer from a tsunami effect. This belief is based on three tests where we had independent statistics or reliable methods for estimating data using other sources. Two of these tests involve comparing estimates derived from the survey of amounts given to overseas aid and development organisations and to the tsunami appeals. In both cases our data was around 60% higher than other sources would suggest. However, we believe that the exaggeration is largely confined to that field, that is, to donations to organisations engaged in international aid and development. Our third test involved identifying amounts respondents reported to have claimed as a tax deduction in the previous financial year and comparing this with forward projections from tax claim data reported by the Australian Taxation Office. The survey figure was somewhat higher than the estimate. However, given that the estimate involves projecting forward a trend over two years and that some other independent survey evidence suggests that giving was rising more quickly over those two years than previously, we concluded that the results reported from this survey are not significantly exaggerated.

¹³ Subsequently published, Steinberg, K and Rooney, P 2005.

3 An overview of giving

3.1 Numbers, rates and amounts

During the twelve months to the end of January 2005, and excluding the extraordinary outpouring of donations in response to the tsunami, 13.4 million Australians aged 18 years or older, 86.9% of the adult population, gave a total of \$5.7 billion. This meant that those giving gave an average of \$424 each. The median amount given was \$100. This means that exactly half of the sample gave less than \$100 and half gave more. Some gave much more, which is why the average amount given is markedly higher.

Over the same period a smaller 6.3 million, or 41% of the adult population, gave 836 million hours of their time as volunteers, an average of 132 hours each. The median hours volunteered was 44 hours per year. Again, this means that half of those volunteering did so for less than 44 hours and half for more.

Percentage of adult Australians giving during 2004	87%
Average amount given (by givers)	\$424
Median amount given	\$100
Total amount given	\$5.7 billion
Percentage of adult Australians volunteering	41%
Average hours volunteered by volunteers	132 hours
Median hours volunteered	44 hours
Total hours	836 million

3.2 Trends

There are no exactly comparable surveys that would enable precise comparisons to be drawn; however, there are several data sets that enable reasonably reliable estimates to be made of whether these figures represent an increase in giving and volunteering.

3.2.1 Giving

In 1997 the ABS collected data on giving from a random sample of 12,000 adult Australians.¹⁴ The survey was conducted on four occasions during the year, each occasion three months apart. Data was collected from around 3,000 respondents at a time. Mostly they were asked about their giving over the previous quarter, but for some basic data they were asked to look back over a year. This survey showed that in 1997, 9.1 million adult Australians, 69% of the adult population, gave a total of \$3.02 billion, an average of \$331 each. Because of the methodology used by that survey, it is not possible to estimate the median amount given over the year. The 2004 data suggests a significant increase in giving, both in numbers giving and in the average sum given over the intervening seven years. It suggests that over the seven years since 1997, there has been an increase of 18% in the percentage of the adult population who give and an 88% increase in the amount given. This amounts to an average increase of 12.5% each year. When we take account of inflation over the seven-year period, we find a real increase in giving of 58%.

¹⁴ Lyons, M and Hocking, S 2000

These increases have several possible sources. The increasing size of the adult population would have led to an increase in the amount given even if nothing else changed. But a significantly larger proportion of the population now gives and gives more: the average amount donated by those givers has increased by almost \$100. In large part these increases reflect greater and more positive publicity for giving. They are also a product of a large increase in the number of organisations seeking donations and the growing sophistication of the appeals run by the major organisations seeking the public's donations. But on top of that, seven years of economic prosperity, with increasing numbers in employment and, for most, rising wages and rising wealth, have provided the wherewithal for a large increase in the numbers giving and the amounts given.

The possibility that this 2004 data might be exaggerated by a halo effect caused by the positive endorsement of giving surrounding the tsunami has been noted. However, there are four other data sets that also suggest that the giving of money has increased in real terms over the past decade.

In its 2000 Voluntary Work survey, the ABS asked respondents if they had made a donation over the last twelve months. This was affirmed by 74.2% of the population. Coming at the end of a long questionnaire, with few prompts, this is likely to be an underestimate. Nonetheless it is an increase on the 1997 estimate.

The market research firm McNair Ingenuity conducts a survey that has been tracking charitable giving over the past eight years. Every second year, it asks a sample of the population in the capital cities about their giving to well-known charities over the past two years and then asks about their charitable giving generally. Its survey in early 2005 showed a remarkable 250% increase in the total given between 2003 and 2005. Over 20% of the 2005 sum was tsunami-related. When we exclude that, we still find a 104% increase in giving compared with 2003. Earlier increases had been nowhere as dramatic.

Another market research firm, Roy Morgan Research, includes questions about charitable giving over the previous twelve months as part of their Single Source survey. This is a continuous face-to-face tracking study. It shows a small increase in the giving rate over the past two years to around 80%. It also shows a small but steady increase in the average amount given by individuals. Neither this survey nor the McNair survey is comparable with the survey whose results are reported here, but they provide further evidence that numbers giving and the average amount they give have both increased.

A final data set is an official one. Statistics on numbers of taxpayers claiming a deduction for a donation to a Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) and amounts claimed are published each year (though with a three-year lag). These also show a significant increase in the amount claimed for tax deduction over the past decade: from \$430 million in 1992-93 to \$913 million in 2002-03, an increase of 112% or an average increase of 11% per year. Interestingly, the percentage of taxpayers making claims has not increased, unlike the increase in reported giving behaviour in the whole population. These taxation data are not directly comparable with survey data. Because of the limited and confusing scope of tax deductibility and because the advantage of a deduction is heavily biased to high income taxpayers, donations for which a deduction is claimed account for only around one-fifth of all giving; as well, many 'taxpayers' are family trusts, not individuals, so the tax data are drawn from a somewhat different base to the survey data. Nonetheless, the significant increase in the total claimed supports the view that giving has increased over the past decade.

3.2.2 Volunteering

When we turn to the giving of time, a similar story confronts us, though it is one that is slightly better documented. In 1995 and again in 2000 the ABS conducted a voluntary work survey. Several questions about volunteering were also asked in the 2002 General Social Survey.¹⁵ These indicate a gradual increase in both the volunteering rate and the number of hours volunteered. Along with its estimates for volunteering in 2000, the ABS also released revised figures for volunteering in 1995.¹⁶ This showed a volunteering rate of 24% and total hours volunteered of 512 million. The average hours volunteered by each volunteer was 160 hours. In 2000 the figures were a volunteering rate of 32%, a total of 704 million hours and an average number of hours per volunteer of 160 hours. By 2002 the rate had increased to 34% (no estimates of hours were provided). Our data of volunteering in 2004 maintains this increase both in the percentage of the population who claim to volunteer and in the total number of hours volunteered.

Interestingly, the average number of hours volunteered by each volunteer over the twelve-month period has declined (from 160 to 132 hours). Median hours volunteered has also declined (from 73 to 44 hours per year). This decline in average and median hours is not particularly surprising. The big increase in the numbers of people volunteering is likely to be heavily weighted toward those who volunteer only a few hours. This would be true both of those who have only just begun to volunteer and also of those who have volunteered for many years but have only recently come to think of themselves as volunteers.

Over the past decade there has been much greater publicity given to volunteering, and a huge endorsement of it. The lead-up to the 2000 Olympics and the Games themselves were pivotal in this. Based on data on length of time volunteered in the 2000 Voluntary Work Survey, we estimated that half the increase in the volunteer rate over the preceding five years from 24% to 31% was due to new volunteers and half due to long-term volunteers coming to recognise that what they had been doing was volunteering. Since then the publicity surrounding the 2001 International Year of Volunteering added further endorsement of volunteering as a “good thing”. A recent survey by Newspoll for Volunteering Australia reports that 77% of respondents said they were more aware of volunteering now than they were five years ago. Almost 80% said they believed volunteering was now more important for the community than it was five years previously. That survey (by telephone of a random sample of 1,200 adults) reported a volunteering rate of 46%.

3.3 Some international comparisons

It is not possible to make accurate comparisons of behaviours such as giving or volunteering between countries. There are no standard methods for collecting and reporting data.¹⁷ As well, there are no agreed ways for drawing comparisons. This is particularly important for comparing amounts donated by people in different countries, with different standards of living and different currencies. The comparisons that follow should be understood as being at best broadly indicative.

¹⁵ ABS 2003

¹⁶ ABS 2001.

¹⁷ Lyons, M Wijkstrom, P and Clary, G 1998.

The United States is generally seen as the home of philanthropy. There is a certain amount of myth making in that assessment, but the giving of money in the US is certainly exceptional. The most usually cited source of data on giving is the annual publication *Giving USA*. Published by the American Association of Fundraising Counsel (AAFRC), for the last few years the data has been generated by the Centre on Philanthropy at the University of Indianapolis/ Purdue University at Indianapolis (UIPUI). The data is not survey-based but relies fundamentally on US taxation data, which, because it is available with a three-year lag, is updated by a complicated algorithm. As well, because it does not include claims by half of US taxpayers who are not required to file a return that itemises their claims, further adjustments, based on data from a small sample survey, are made to take account for giving not captured in taxation statistics. It is likely that the *Giving USA* estimates will omit giving to some of the nonprofits that are included in the Australian survey.

In 2004, individual Americans made donations that totalled \$188 billion.¹⁸ The data sources do not allow for an estimate of the percentage of the adult population who give. One method of comparison is to divide the total given by the GDP of the two countries. For the USA giving/GDP is 1.6%; for Australia it is 0.68%. This indicates that the USA generates more than twice the level of giving than Australia, even when the huge difference in the size of the economy is taken into account. Note that this is **not** a measure of the contribution of giving to GDP. Given that the US data probably omits some donations counted here, the difference is likely to be even greater.

The picture changes when we look at volunteering. According to a large sample survey conducted in 2003 by the United States Department of Labor, a mere 27.6% of Americans aged 16 and over volunteered during the twelve months to September 2002.¹⁹ The median hours volunteered was 52 hours. A significantly higher proportion of Australians volunteered but with slightly lower median hours than Americans.

Canada is a country that is closer to Australia in size, history and culture than the United States. Statistics Canada has conducted several state-of-the-art surveys of giving and volunteering by Canadians, in 1997, 2000 and again in 2004. At the time of writing, data from the 2004 survey was not available. In 2000, 78% of Canadians aged 15 and above gave a total of \$4.94 billion.²⁰ On average they gave \$259. This was 0.46% of the value of the Canadian GDP for 2000. The rate was the same as in 1997; the size of the average donation had increased by 8% over those three years. Although the Canadian data is for four years earlier than the Australian data, and the gross amount and probably the average would have increased over that time, it is still clear that more Australians give more than Canadians and that the total given is equivalent to a higher proportion of GDP.

Volunteering presents a rather different picture. In 2000, 27% of Canadians over 15 volunteered for a total of 1,050 million hours, or an average of 163 hours per volunteer.²¹ The rate had decreased since 1997, though the average hours volunteered had increased. It can be seen that a significantly higher percentage of adult Australians volunteered, but for fewer hours on average than Canadian volunteers.

¹⁸ AAFRC 2005.

¹⁹ United States Department of Labor 2002.

²⁰ Hall et al. 2001.

²¹ Hall et al. 2001.

3.4 Other financial support from individuals

3.4.1 Support in return for a material benefit

The survey asked respondents to report donations of money they had made over the past twelve months. They were told they could include donations where they received a minor gift or token of recognition, such as a chocolate bar or pin in return. They were explicitly told to exclude ‘membership fees, expenditure on raffle tickets and the purchase of goods of significant value such as at a charity auction’. After a series of questions on donations they were asked about whether they had supported ‘a charity, school, political party or other nonprofit by purchasing a raffle ticket, or a ticket to a fundraising dinner or an item of significant value at a charity auction or art show or fete’, and how much overall they had outlaid.

These methods of fundraising are used by many nonprofits of varying sizes, from high profile charities, to schools and local charities. They clearly attract a great deal of support. We estimate that 10.5 million or 68.6% of adult Australians provided support of this kind, contributing an average of \$127 annually for just under \$2 billion in total. Most providing support in this way also made donations, but just under one million who participated in these fundraising activities did not make donations during 2004.

Table 1 sets out the main methods used and the relative popularity of each method. It shows that the purchase of raffle tickets and similar acts of ‘charity gambling’ are by far the most common methods of providing support.

Table 1: Methods of fundraising and their popularity

	% SAMPLE PARTICIPATING	% PARTICIPANTS ALSO MAKING DONATIONS
Raffle ticket	66.2	69.2
Fundraising dinner	13.0	13.9
Charity event	6.5	7.0
Any of these methods	68.6	71.6

3.4.2 Bequests

Bequests are sums of money or of shares, goods or property bequeathed to a living individual or organisation by a will. There are no reliable estimates of the value of bequests received by nonprofit and government organisations annually. The charity research group Givewell, on the basis of analysis of the financial statements of 220 nonprofit and government organisations, reported that those organisations received \$140 million in bequests in 2003-04. This included one organisation that reported bequests of \$4.1 million.²²

It is not possible to estimate the value of a bequest in advance, as the value of an estate can never be known until the death of the person leaving the bequest.

Nonetheless, we believed it would be useful to know how many Australians have wills and how many of them were intending to leave funds to nonprofit (or government) organisations. Respondents were asked whether they had made a will and whether they had included a bequest to any charity or other nonprofit organisation in that will.

²² Givewell 2005.

Table 2 shows that some 58% of the adult population have made a will but that fewer than 7.5% of those have included in their will a bequest to a charity or other nonprofit organisation. Not surprisingly, the likelihood of having a will increases with age. However, the likelihood of a person who has drawn up a will leaving money to charity increases only marginally with age. The high percentage among those 18-24 years of age is of a very small percentage with wills. It has a high standard error and should be discounted.

Table 2: Bequests to nonprofit organisations

		% OF GIVERS HAVING A WILL	% OF THOSE WITH A WILL THAT INCLUDES A BEQUEST TO A CHARITY OR NONPROFIT
Gender	Male	56.5	7.4
	Female	59.5	7.5
Age cohorts	18-24	8.8	25.1
	25-34	32.2	7.1
	35-44	53.6	6.0
	45-54	73.0	7.0
	55-64	83.0	7.4
	65+	90.9	7.9
Personal income	Nil to \$15,599	52.5	7.4
	\$15,600 to \$31,199	55.6	7.4
	\$31,200 to \$51,999	50.9	8.9
	\$52,000 to higher	65.3	8.4
	Can't say/refused	67.4	5.7
Household income	Nil to \$25,999	64.3	8.5
	\$26,000 to \$51,999	53.9	8.4
	\$52,000 to \$103,999	55.6	6.7
	\$104,000 and over	61.5	9.6
	Can't say/refused	58.2	5.7
Education	School level only	57.0	6.1
	Trade qualification/apprenticeship/ certificate/diploma	55.3	6.7
	Bachelor degree/postgraduate qualification	56.7	11.1
	Can't say/refused	74.9	4.9
Employment status	F/T paid employment	52.5	7.9
	P/T paid employment	50.1	5.7
	Unemployed looking for work	24.8	5.9
	Not retired and not in workforce	45.8	5.5
	F/T student	16.3	6.4
	Retired	88.5	8.1
Occupation	Managers and professionals	64.7	9.1
	Other white-collar	57.0	7.0
	Trades	51.0	6.1
	Other blue-collar	46.4	4.8

4. Givers

4.1 Who gives?

The data presented here is drawn from the weighted sample. It has four dimensions, for both data on giving (of money) and on volunteering:

- ▶ The *percentage donated (or volunteered) in the past 12 months* is that percentage of the relevant population who give (or who volunteer). This is sometimes called the giving (or volunteering) rate.
- ▶ The *mean donation (or hours volunteered)* is the average over the past year for all of those in the relevant population group who gave (or who volunteered). It is **not** the average for all in that population, givers and non-givers alike.
- ▶ The *total donations (or hours volunteered)* is the total dollars donated (or hours volunteered) of all those in that population group.
- ▶ The *percentage of total donations (or hours)* is the percentage of the total amount given (or hours volunteered) by all givers (volunteers) in that population group.

For most population groups a fifth dimension is provided: the *% of total cases* (in the sample) constituted by that particular population group. This enables an easy comparison of the differences in contribution to giving and volunteering of different population groups. The proportion is of the sample rather than the whole adult population, though there will be little or no difference between the two figures. To calculate the percentage of givers (or volunteers) constituted by that group, simply multiply the *% total cases* by the *% donated* (or volunteered). This will be illustrated below. A population total for a particular group can be obtained by multiplying total donations (or hours volunteered) by 1,001.62.

4.1.1 Gender

Givers

As Table 3 below shows, women are more likely to give than are men, but on average, men give more. Men comprise 49% of our weighted sample but contribute a little over 53% of the donations.

Table 3: Givers by gender

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Male	84.1	477	3,029,321	53.4	49.1
Female	89.5	377	2,648,502	46.6	50.9
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Volunteers

Women are not only more likely than men to volunteer, but also on average volunteer more hours over a year. As a result they contribute 60% of hours volunteered.

Table 4: Volunteers by gender

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Male	35.8	123	333,976	40.0	49.1
Female	45.9	139	500,607	60.0	50.9
Total	41.0	132	834,583	100	100

4.1.2 Age

Givers

The likelihood that people will give increases slightly with age until middle age and then declines slightly. All but the two youngest age groups are slightly more likely to give than the overall average for the adult population. Although a slightly smaller percentage of those aged 65 years and over donate, those that do on average make the largest donation and contribute, proportional to their numbers, the largest amount overall.

Table 5: Givers by age

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
18-24	82.2	230	373,611	6.6	12.8
25-34	86.5	343	858,064	15.1	18.8
35-44	88.3	448	1,161,386	20.5	19.1
45-54	88.4	500	1,270,453	22.4	18.7
55-64	87.0	461	938,434	16.5	15.2
65+	87.3	517	1,075,875	18.9	15.5
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Volunteers

The volunteer rate shows a typical inverted ‘U’ shape, peaking for the 35-44 age groups. However, the distribution of mean hours takes the opposite shape, with the largest number of hours on average being contributed by older and younger volunteers. This is possibly because those aged between 23 and 54 are the most likely to have dependent children, and thus have the greater demands made on them to volunteer in various activities that their children enjoy. But they are also least likely to have many hours to devote to volunteering.

Table 6: Volunteers by age

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
18-24	36.4	132	95,014	11.4	12.8
25-34	35.1	112	113,641	13.6	18.8
35-44	46.6	116	158,531	19.0	19.1
45-54	46.4	105	140,538	16.8	18.7
55-64	39.8	178	165,941	19.9	15.2
65+	39.5	171	160,917	19.3	15.5
Total	41.0	132	834,582	100	100

4.1.3 Income

Givers

Data is presented for the personal income and also the income of the household that the donor came from. Although there is only a modest increase in proportions who give according to their personal or household income, the average amount given rises considerably and as a result, so too does percentage contributed compared to numbers in the income band. In short, those that have more are more likely to give and to give more. Declaring income is a sensitive issue for some people and many respondents who were happy to answer other questions demurred on this one. A few more were happy to report their personal income but did not know their household income. Because it is so large, we include this ‘can’t say/refused’ group in these tables (Tables 7 to 10).

Table 7: Givers by personal income

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Nil to \$15,599	82.6	264	783,861	13.8	23.3
\$15,600 to \$31,199	87.7	337	871,846	15.4	19.2
\$31,200 to \$51,999	89.7	446	1,197,688	21.1	19.5
\$52,000 and higher	90.5	769	1,878,906	33.1	17.5
Can’t say/refused	85.1	352	945,522	16.7	20.5
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Table 8: Givers by household income

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Nil to \$25,999	80.0	267	566,662	10.0	17.2
\$26,000 to \$51,999	88.4	379	954,990	16.8	18.5
\$52,000 to \$103,999	90.6	448	1,557,880	27.4	24.9
\$104,000 and over	91.9	835	1,437,111	25.3	12.2
Can’t say/refused	84.5	329	1,161,180	20.5	27.2
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Volunteers

The relationship between volunteering and income is very different to the relationship between donating and income. Among volunteers, while there is not much change in the proportion of people in different income bands who volunteer, there is a marked decline in the average hours volunteered as the income level increases. A similar pattern is revealed for increases in household income.

Table 9: Volunteers by personal income

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Nil to \$15,599	41.0	159	234,452	28.1	23.3
\$15,600 to \$31,199	44.1	132	172,036	20.6	19.2
\$31,200 to \$51,999	39.9	118	140,391	16.8	19.5
\$52,000 and higher	44.1	91	108,143	13.0	17.5
Can't say / refused	36.3	157	179,559	21.5	20.5
Total	41.0	132	834,582	100	100

Table 10: Volunteers by household income

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Nil to \$25,999	39.8	164	173,529	20.8	17.2
\$26,000 to \$51,999	39.6	139	157,317	18.8	18.5
\$52,000 to \$103,999	44.7	109	187,655	22.5	24.9
\$104,000 and over	45.3	97	82,022	9.8	12.2
Can't say/refused	37.2	150	234,060	28.0	27.2
Total	41.0	132	834,582	100	100

4.1.4 High income earners

We deliberately over-sampled among census districts containing a high proportion of high income households. This enables us to provide a finer picture of the giving and volunteering practices of those 17.5% of adults who earn more than \$52,000 per year. The data shows a slight decline in the percentage making donations and an increase in the mean size of donations only for those earning over \$104,000. Since this group (3% of our weighted sample) includes many with incomes well above \$104,000, this is not surprising. With volunteering, it appears that those in the middle of our three high income bands are more likely to volunteer but for fewer hours on average, but these differences are not statistically significant.

Table 11: High income givers

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
\$52,000 to \$77,999	91.6	623	930,497	16.4	10.6
\$78,000 to \$103,999	89.2	623	333,595	5.9	3.9
\$104,000 and over	88.3	1,483	614,814	10.8	3.0

Table 12: High income volunteers

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
\$52,000 to \$77,999	43.4	93	65,575	7.9	10.6
\$78,000 to \$103,999	46.3	83	23,044	2.8	3.9
\$104,000 and over	43.6	95	19,524	2.3	3.0

4.1.5 Education

Givers

There is a slight increase in the likelihood that a person will donate as their level of education increases. More importantly, on average they give a lot more. But then, in general, as education level increases, so too does income.

Table 13: Givers by education

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
School level only	84.5	313	2,353,446	41.4	57.8
Trade qualification/ apprenticeship/ certificate/diploma	89.6	509	1,384,293	24.4	19.7
Bachelor degree/ postgraduate qualification	91.0	628	1,929,105	34.0	21.9
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Note: As 0.6% of respondents did not provide their education level, the last three columns will not add to the total.

Volunteers

The volunteer rate increases with the level of education attained. However, unlike donating, the average hours given decrease with increasing educational attainment. This is likely to be a product of the more demanding employment (in terms of time) of people with university degrees.

Table 14: Volunteers by education

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
School level only	36.9	142	467,019	56.2	57.8
Trade qualification/ apprenticeship/ certificate/diploma	43.6	131	173,273	20.8	19.7
Bachelor degree/ postgraduate qualification	49.6	114	191,189	23.0	21.9
Total	41.0	132	834,582	100	100

Note: As 0.6% of respondents did not provide their education level, the last three columns will not add to the total.

4.1.6 Employment status

Givers

When we look at the relation of givers to the labour market, we find that those in employment and those who have retired are more likely to give than those who are unemployed, students or otherwise not in the workforce. Mean donations show a more interesting pattern. Those in full-time employment give more than those in part-time employment, reflecting differences in income. But retired people on average give almost as much, suggesting that they are also giving from savings as well as income. Those not otherwise in the workforce are mostly partners of those who are (and mostly those who are on high incomes). Their relatively high average gift reflects the level of their family income.

Table 15: Givers by employment status

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
F/T paid employment	88.8	484	2,867,714	50.5	44.3
P/T paid employment	89.6	355	943,913	16.6	19.9
Unemployed looking for work	70.6	172	57,741	1.0	2.5
Not retired and not in workforce	81.7	333	496,945	8.8	11.2
F/T student	79.0	176	50,902	0.9	2.2
Retired	86.4	472	1,256,859	22.2	19.9
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Note: Due to rounding the rows in the final three columns may not add to the figures in the total row.

Volunteers

The relationship between volunteering and employment status is not straightforward. The unemployed are far less likely to volunteer than any other group; reflecting the pressures of looking for work or a general feeling of despondency. We explicitly excluded hours spent on work for the dole programs, so many may be engaged in this form of activity. Those in full-time employment also have a slightly lower volunteer rate than other groups (except the unemployed). However, because they constitute over 40% of the sample, collectively, they contribute the highest proportion of hours volunteered. Retired people are only marginally more likely to volunteer, but this reflects the relatively high proportion of the over 75s who are frail or have limited mobility. Those not retired but not in the workforce (mostly wives of high income husbands, many with dependent children) have only slightly above average propensity to volunteer but when they do they give the longest hours.

Table 16: Volunteers by employment status

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
F/T paid employment	38.7	100	256,592	30.8	44.3
P/T paid employment	48.7	126	181,500	21.8	19.9
Unemployed looking for work	23.8	115	12,982	1.6	2.5
Not retired and not in workforce	42.2	165	127,216	15.3	11.2
F/T student	45.9	102	17,153	2.1	2.2
Retired	39.8	195	238,537	28.6	19.9
Total	41.0	132	834,582	100	100

Note: Due to rounding the rows in the final three columns may not add to the figures in the total row.

4.1.7 Occupation

Givers

When we look more closely at those in employment, we find that while there is very little difference in the propensity to donate between occupation groups, there is a big difference in the average amount donated; once again, this is likely to be a reflection of income levels. The difference between the number of white-collar donors and those in trades and other blue-collar occupations reflects the character of the Australian work force.

Table 17: Givers by occupation

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Managers and professionals	91.4	613	1,937,763	34.1	22.5
Other white-collar	89.6	377	1,142,790	20.1	22.0
Trades	83.2	345	354,928	6.3	8.1
Other blue-collar	84.9	253	376,146	6.6	10.1
Total (for whole sample)	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Note: Data in all but the last row is drawn from those who are in employment. As a result the last three columns do not add to the total, which is for the whole sample.

Volunteers

The percentage of an occupational group that volunteered appears positively related to the status of the occupation; though the average hours contributed do not display a pattern. It is worth noting that other blue-collar workers are least likely to volunteer and to do so for the shortest average number of hours.

Table 18: Volunteers by occupation

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Managers and professionals	48.4	127	294,020	35.2	31.2
Other white-collar	42.1	141	351,946	42.2	38.5
Trades	33.5	135	82,807	9.9	11.9
Other blue-collar	30.8	121	105,809	12.7	18.5
Total (for whole sample)	41.0	132	834,583	100	100

Note: Data in all but the last row is drawn from those who are in employment. As a result the last three columns do not add to the total, which is for the whole sample.

4.1.8 Household type

Givers

The type of household in which a person lives seems to have little effect on giving, with the exception that of sole parents and those living in group households (invariably students or those who have recently joined the workforce), each groups with low incomes, who give somewhat less than the average.

Table 19: Givers by household type

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Person living alone	84.1	431	1,066,097	20.7	18.5
Couple with no children living at home	88.9	456	1,633,214	31.7	26.8
Couple with children living at home	88.2	466	2,168,115	42.1	34.8
Single parent with children living at home	85.3	290	279,442	5.4	7.2
Group household of related or unrelated adults	84.7	313	514,493	10.0	12.3

Volunteering

Broadly, these data appear to reflect the effect on volunteering of age, presence of children and time free of employment obligations. The most interesting finding is that single parents volunteer, and for more hours on average than people from two-parent families.

Table 20: Volunteers by household type

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Person living alone	36.0	158	166,966	20.1	18.5
Couple with no children living at home	39.4	142	224,391	27.0	26.8
Couple with children living at home	46.1	122	297,263	35.8	34.8
Single parent with children living at home	49.2	129	71,480	8.6	7.2
Group household of related or unrelated adults	33.7	108	70,715	8.5	12.3

4.1.9 Location

Giving

There are slight variations between states and between capital cities in the rate of giving. Adelaide stands out, closely followed by Perth and non-metro Queensland. But the highest average gifts are made by Sydneysiders. This probably reflects that city's higher income profile though it also has the highest living costs. Canberra is disadvantaged in this data by being grouped with Tasmania and the Northern Territory: numbers in the sample did not allow a finer disaggregation. The most interesting comparisons are between columns 4 and 5. Those rows with a higher number in column 4 than column 5 are contributing more than their numbers warrant; those with lower numbers in 4 than 5 are contributing less. This shows the importance of Sydney and Melbourne, whose residents comprise 40% of our sample and contribute almost half the funds donated.

Table 21: Giving by location

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Brisbane	85.8	377	437,010	7.7	8.7
Qld country	88.5	378	534,512	9.4	10.6
Sydney	87.6	524	1,501,546	26.4	21.4
NSW country	84.5	428	700,197	12.3	12.2
Melbourne	88.0	485	1,199,459	21.1	18.5
Vic country	86.0	397	353,733	6.2	6.7
Tasmania/ACT/NT	82.4	350	205,797	3.6	4.4
Adelaide	90.5	344	275,429	4.9	6.0
SA country	78.7	370	85,637	1.5	1.7
Perth	89.0	303	301,985	5.3	7.5
WA country	82.4	256	82,520	1.5	2.4
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Volunteers

These data reflect patterns revealed in earlier surveys of volunteering. People living in capital cities are less likely to volunteer than those in regional areas, but with one exception, for longer hours; people in Sydney are less likely than those in any other city to volunteer (though not by much); people in rural South Australia are the most likely to volunteer, though the prize for the longest hours on average goes to Adelaide.

Table 22: Volunteers by location

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Brisbane	37.7	134	68,242	8.2	8.7
Qld country	41.4	131	86,897	10.4	10.6
Sydney	36.7	125	150,180	18.0	21.4
NSW country	44.0	137	116,139	13.9	12.2
Melbourne	40.2	135	152,638	18.3	18.5
Vic country	46.1	124	59,343	7.1	6.7
Tasmania/ACT/NT	51.5	126	46,400	5.6	4.4
Adelaide	39.5	164	57,475	6.9	6.0
SA country	52.0	125	19,154	2.3	1.7
Perth	37.3	132	55,265	6.6	7.5
WA country	49.4	118	22,850	2.7	2.4
Total	41.0	132	834,583	100	100

4.1.10 Place of birth

Giving

Again, there is only a slight difference between groups in terms of their propensity to give, with those born in non-English speaking countries being slightly less likely and those born overseas in English speaking countries marginally more likely to give. On average, those born in Australia or in other English speaking nations give a little more.

Table 23: Giving by place of birth

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Australia	87.1	426	4,515,810	79.5	79.2
Overseas English-speaking	89.1	438	610,951	10.8	10.4
Overseas non-English-speaking	83.0	398	549,861	9.7	10.3
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100	100

Volunteers

These figures reflect opportunities for, and demands on people to volunteer. Those who are Australian-born or if overseas-born with English as their native tongue are more easily caught up by networks that provide opportunities for, or subtly require volunteering, than are people for whom English is not a first language. Once again, this phenomenon has been observed in previous surveys, though the difference noted here is less than in 1995, where it was less than half that of those for whom English was their first language.

Table 24: Volunteers by place of birth

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Australia	42.2	130	667,804	80.0	79.2
Overseas English-speaking	40.2	157	99,071	11.9	10.4
Overseas non-English-speaking	32.7	124	67,586	8.1	10.3
Total	41.0	132	834 582	100	100

4.1.11 Do givers give equally?

The answer to this question is a resounding no. Some people give a great deal more money or time than others. This has already been indicated by the data above that shows, for example, university graduates although only 22% of the adult population give 34% of dollars (though only 23% of the hours) while the one fifth of the adult population who are retired give 22% of the donations, but contribute 29% of the hours.

Tables 25 and 26 further explore this differential commitment to giving of money and time. For each table the population of donors and then of volunteers is divided into fifths or quintiles, according to the number of dollars they donate or hours of volunteering they each do. For each quintile, the table shows the average number of dollars donated and hours volunteered, along with the total dollars donated and hours volunteered, and the percentage of the overall total that this represents. It shows that the 20% of donors who gave the largest amounts on average in total gave almost three-quarters of all the money donated.

Table 25: Amounts given by giving quintiles

	MEAN (\$)	SUM (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS
Bottom quintile	17	46,505	0.8
Second-bottom quintile	61	156,382	2.8
Middle quintile	140	385,366	6.8
Second-highest quintile	338	887,379	15.6
Highest quintile	1,587	4,202,190	74.0

Volunteering shows a similar pattern. The 20% of people who volunteer for the greatest number of hours contribute 70% of hours volunteered. Or to put it another way, a mere 8% of adult Australians contribute 70% of all hours volunteered.

Table 26: Hours volunteered by volunteer quintiles

	MEAN (HOURS)	SUM (HOURS)	% TOTAL HOURS
Bottom quintile	4	4,089	0.5
Second-bottom quintile	18	20,613	2.5
Middle quintile	56	66,379	8.0
Second-highest quintile	138	161,115	19.3
Highest quintile	506	582,387	69.8

Another way of looking at the differences in people's commitment to giving or volunteering is to recognise that many people give or volunteer to only one cause or field, while others support organisations in many fields. Table 27 sets out the percentage of the population that support different numbers of fields, through giving

or volunteering. It will be seen that more than half of the people who make donations support organisations in three or more fields, while over three-quarters of volunteers volunteer in only one field.

Table 27: Number of fields supported

	NUMBER OF FIELDS SUPPORTED				
	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE OR MORE
% of total givers	18.4	22.0	22.3	17.2	20.1
% of total volunteers	79.2	15.5	4.1	0.9	0.3

4.1.12 The giving of money and time

Overseas research indicates that people who volunteer are more likely to be givers than those who do not. Our data indicates that is true for Australia as well. Table 28 looks at the different predisposition toward giving by the 41% of people who are volunteers compared with the 59% of non-volunteers.

Table 28: Giving of money and time

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Volunteer	91.2	538	3,392,912	59.8	41.0
Non-volunteer	83.8	251	2,284,912	40.2	59.0
Total	86.9	424	5,677,823	100.0	100.0

A similar pattern can be seen by looking at the predisposition to volunteer among givers compared to non-givers, but the effect is not as marked, as many more of the population are givers.

4.1.13 Religion and the giving of money and time

International research indicates that people who are religious are more likely to give and to give more than those who are not. However, this effect does not necessarily hold when giving to religion is excluded. In Tables 29 and 30 we explore the impact of religion on the giving of time and money by Australians. We have two measures of religiosity. We asked our respondents if they had a religion. But in addition we asked those that said they did how frequently they attended religious services.

Table 29 shows that having a religion and attending religious services affects the likelihood that a person will give and dramatically affects the amounts given. Those who indicate that they cannot say if they have religion are too few to affect this result.

Table 29: Impact of religion on giving, including giving to religion

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Have a religion	88.9	460	4,342,589	76.5	61.3
Don't have a religion	83.5	223	1,308,911	23.1	38.2
Can't say	90.4	301	26,324	0.5	0.5
Attend a religious service					
At least once a week	93.0	1,020	2,513,159	44.3	16.0
Between once a week and once a month	92.5	446	530,844	9.3	7.7
Between once a month and once a year	91.0	247	572,477	10.1	15.1
Less frequently	86.4	242	361,349	6.4	9.7
Never	81.2	188	360,279	6.4	12.5

However, it is possible that a good deal of the impressive giving displayed by those who profess a religious belief is impacted by their giving to the religion that they embrace. To see if religious practice impacts on giving for non-religious causes, we excluded sums given to religion (and also any who gave only to religion). When we look at the results we can only conclude that having a religion does not affect the likelihood that a person will support non-religious causes or the amounts that they donate. However, when we look at the level of commitment to their religion, as demonstrated by frequency of attendance at religious services, the data suggests that the likelihood of a person supporting non-religious causes is inversely related to the frequency of their worship.

Table 30: Impact of religion on giving with giving to religion excluded

	% DONATED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATIONS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS	% TOTAL CASES
Have a religion	81.6	279	2,300,488	64.0	61.3
Don't have a religion	82.6	260	1,272,615	35.4	38.2
Can't say	88.3	307	23,993	0.7	0.5
Attend a religious service					
At least once a week	61.7	351	776,566	21.6	16.0
Between once a week and once a month	75.6	291	315,847	8.8	7.7
Between once a month and once a year	87.4	249	520,850	14.5	15.1
Less frequently	84.9	259	329,610	9.2	9.7
Never	80.5	228	353,755	9.8	12.5

Note: Column 1 treats those who gave only to religion as if they had not donated. Column 2 is the mean donation excluding donations to religion, and any cases who only gave to religion. Columns 3 and 4 are based on those who donated, again excluding those who only gave to religion. There are small differences between the totals of the last five rows, which report the frequency of worship of those claiming to have a religion, and the numbers in the top row because a few claiming a religion could not say how often they attended a service; as well, a very small number of those without a religion nonetheless donated/volunteered for a religious organisation.

The impact of religion on volunteering plays out somewhat differently to its impact on the giving of money. It is not so pronounced, as volunteering for religion is not as large a proportion of total hours volunteered as is religious giving of all giving. What we find

is that people who say they have a religion are more likely to volunteer and for more hours than those who say they have no religion. This effect is even more pronounced for people who frequently attend religious services.

Table 31: Impact of religion on volunteering, including volunteering for religion

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Have a religion	43.8	146	601,587	72.1	61.3
Don't have a religion	36.3	106	225,765	27.1	38.2
Can't say	49.9	166	7,231	0.9	0.5
Attend a religious service					
At least once a week	56.1	168	232,445	27.9	16.0
Between once a week and once a month	51.3	136	83,059	10.0	7.7
Between once a month and once a year	42.8	121	120,743	14.5	15.1
Less frequently	37.2	132	73,495	8.8	9.7
Never	29.7	158	90,391	10.8	12.5

However, when volunteering for religious organisations is excluded, then the volunteer rate falls, but the average hours volunteered increases slightly as those who only volunteer for religion tend to volunteer for below average hours. The same effect can be seen for those who are frequent worshippers. Frequent worshippers who volunteer for non-religious causes do so for more hours on average (even when any religious volunteering they do is excluded) than the same group did when all forms of volunteering were counted. Of greater importance (and in contrast to the picture for giving), while those who are frequent worshippers are no more likely to volunteer for non-religious causes than those who have no religion, on average, they still volunteer for more hours.

Table 32: Impact of religion on volunteering with volunteering for religion excluded

	% VOLUNTEERED IN PAST 12 MONTHS	MEAN HOURS VOLUNTEERED	TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED	% TOTAL HOURS	% TOTAL CASES
Have a religion	33.8	151	520,501	69.2	61.3
Don't have a religion	32.4	109	224,276	29.8	38.2
Can't say	37.9	204	7,158	1.0	0.5
Attend a religious service					
At least once a week	33.1	177	159,023	21.1	16.0
Between once a week and once a month	40.0	156	79,529	10.6	7.7
Between once a month and once a year	38.5	126	119,225	15.9	15.1
Less frequently	33.5	139	73,348	9.8	9.7
Never	25.4	164	87,925	11.7	12.5

4.2 Ways people are approached to give and attitudes to these

Except in the case of major disasters such as the Asian tsunami, people rarely give unless they are asked. Organisations seeking donations have a variety of ways of asking people for gifts. Some are direct, such as telephone appeals to strangers; others are less direct, such as using known donors or people who volunteer for the organisation to ask friends or work colleagues to donate. Some ways are more successful than others at eliciting a donation. Some are not universally liked; their overuse may damage the reputation of a fundraising organisation or all fundraising charities. We have two sets of data that can inform us about these matters. One is taken from the whole sample; the other is drawn for the more detailed questioning of donors about one donation. The first records their recollection of all approaches for donations they remember over the past year. The second can be tied to a particular donation, and so as an approach it was clearly successful.

4.2.1 Common fundraising methods

Starting with the whole sample, Table 33 sets out six of the most common fundraising methods, and for each method records the number of people who recalled being approached. Subsequent tables, 34 and 35, indicate the frequency of giving in response to this approach and respondents' attitude.

Table 33: Percentage of sample approached by different methods (ranked by number approached)

	% OF SAMPLE APPROACHED	NUMBER OF PEOPLE APPROACHED
Telephoned at home	77.3	11,907
Television advertisement or program	69.3	10,670
Request through mail/letterbox	65.9	10,147
Approaches doorknock appeal	61.1	9,408
Street or public place	59.8	9,204
Advertisements or fliers in magazine/newspaper	51.9	7,985

Table 34: Frequency of giving reported for each method

	EVERY TIME %	MOST OF THE TIME %	SOME OF THE TIME %	NOT AT ALL %	TOTAL SAMPLE %
Telephoned at home	2.2	7.4	31.9	58.3	77.3
Television advertisement or program	0.5	1.3	13.9	84.0	69.3
Request through mail/letterbox	1.6	3.9	28.7	65.4	65.9
Doorknock appeal	22.9	24.5	35.2	17.0	61.1
Street or public place	5.1	16.1	44.2	34.3	59.8
Advertisements or fliers in magazine/newspaper	0.1	0.4	8.0	91.3	51.9

Table 35: Attitudes towards methods

	DISLIKE THIS METHOD %	NO FEELING %	HAPPY TO BE APPROACHED THIS WAY %	TOTAL SAMPLE %
Telephoned at home	77.8	10.4	10.6	77.3
Television advertisement or program	16.4	42.7	38.6	69.3
Request through mail/letterbox	32.7	34.3	31.8	65.9
Doorknock appeal	21.6	21.9	55.3	61.1
Street or public place	41.8	20.8	36.2	59.8
Advertisements or fliers in magazine/newspaper	15.4	51.9	31.6	51.9

The tables show that the most frequently reported approach, being telephoned at home, is also the most disliked. However, although it is not the most successful at eliciting a donation, it is far from the least successful. Interestingly, doorknock appeals are not as frequent, but are less likely to be disliked and far more likely to elicit a donation.

4.2.2 Other methods of approach

Respondents were also asked to nominate any other fundraising approaches they recalled. These, together with the percentage of respondents who recalled them, are provided in Table 36 (data on the success of these additional methods at eliciting donations was not collected). None of these other methods was widely cited.

Table 36: Other fundraising approaches

	% OF SAMPLE APPROACHED	NUMBER OF PEOPLE APPROACHED
Family member, friend or neighbour	2.9	451
Email or internet advertisement	2.9	441
Other	2.6	401
Colleague at work	2.2	345
Place of worship	2.1	327
Work fundraiser	1.1	168
Radio advertisement	1.0	161
Telephoned at work	0.5	82

4.2.3 Ways approached for specific single donation

A slightly different perspective is provided from the additional information given by each giver about one of the organisations they supported. If a respondent reported making several donations to a particular cause or field, they were asked about the last donation they had made. They were asked how they were approached to make this donation. Answers to this question were not prompted and so they are not mutually exclusive. For example, the approach by a friend could have been in the street. However, most approaches appear to have been made by strangers. The two methods of approach that were most disliked (telephone and street appeals) nonetheless accounted for almost one-third of donations.

Table 37: Approaches for specific single donations

	% APPROACHED
On the street or another public place	19.4
Doorknock appeal	15.0
Request through the mail, or by letterbox drop	14.2
Telephoned at home	13.3
Not approached - I approached them	9.6
Place of religious worship	6.9
Family member/friend/neighbour/someone I know	5.0
Unmanned collection box in a public place or store/agency	3.7
At the organisation	2.8
Other	1.9
Can't say	1.8
Fundraising at club	1.6
Television advertisement, telethon, television program	1.4
There was a work-organised fundraiser	1.4
A colleague at work	1.2
Advertisements in a magazine or newspaper	0.8
Telephoned at work	0.7
Fete/exhibition	0.7
Radio advertisements	0.2
Email or advertisement over the internet	0.2

4.2.4 The value of tokens and events for fundraising

Many fundraising appeals offer a minor token (such as a pin or lapel flag) or gift (such as a chocolate bar) in response to a donation. Others are associated with events. In the closer questioning about a single donation, donors were asked if the donation was associated with a gift or an event. They were also asked if they would have made the donation and given the same amount in the absence of the stimulus of the event or gift. The results show that events are more effective than tokens/gifts at attracting donations, though not at increasing the amount donated.

Table 38: Value of tokens and events for fundraising

	DONATION ASSOCIATED WITH EVENT OR GIFT		% WOULD HAVE GIVEN ANYWAY	% WOULD HAVE GIVEN SAME AMOUNT
	%	NUMBER		
Purchase of fundraising Item	12.5	1,666	77	81.4
Sponsored event	3.9	515	51.5	78.4
Workplace event	0.4	59	55.9	78.1
Other	0.7	98	62.2	68.9

4.2.5 Payroll deductions

One way in which a few people give is via a regular deduction from their pay. Their employer deducts the donation and passes it on to the nominated charity. Because it requires a commitment to nominate a certain charity, it is an example of planned giving. A few charities have used such a method for some time, but it required the cooperation of employers and was limited in its scope. Over the past decade several nonprofit organisations have been established to facilitate such arrangements. To encourage

such methods of giving, two years ago the government allowed employers to adjust an employee's PAYE tax to recognise the value of the donation. In that way the donor gained the tax benefit they were entitled to at the time of making the donation, rather than months later, as is the case for conventional donations.

Although advice from one of the three organisations that facilitate this method of giving was that numbers participating in such schemes were low (around 20 – 30,000), some indication of the size of the commitment can be found in the responses to one of the questions asked about the single donation, namely how the donor had made the donation. Of our sample (of donors), 0.7% said their donation was made as a deduction from their pay. This suggests around 94,000 people who participate in such schemes. Because there are such small numbers, the 95% confidence range is from 85,000 to 102,000. A small majority are men (52%); most are in full-time employment (64%). Surprisingly only 17% said they earned over \$52,000 annually, but a quarter of the small number who gave in this way did not supply their income. If we assume most of these were high income earners, this would suggest that around 40% of payroll givers earned over \$52,000. Most (70%) live in capital cities, but a few (30%) are based in rural areas reflecting the use of such schemes by some of the big mining companies.

4.3 Reasons for giving

People have many reasons or motives for giving. There is a huge literature on why people give, a literature contributed to by psychologists, economists and sociologists, each with their own disciplinary approaches; approaches that differ in their assumptions. By contrast with the complexity of the academic literature, the popular media assume that people who give (whether money or time) are simply motivated by selflessness, by a desire to help others, to help people who are not known by them, by a motive commonly called altruism. Data reported in this section explores the reason people state as the basis for their gift, but also points to the importance of prior connection or affiliation with the organisation to which the gift is made.

4.3.1 Stated reasons

For the particular donation selected for closer examination, respondents were asked to nominate the main reasons they had for making that donation. These were coded into a manageable list of reasons and are listed in Table 39 in the order of their frequency of being mentioned. The percentage who stated that reason is given, together with the average amount given by people who gave that as their reason, the total they donated and the proportion that was of the total sum given by this subset of donations recorded by the survey.

Table 39: Reasons for giving

	% STATING	MEAN DONATION (\$)	TOTAL DONATED (\$)	% TOTAL GIVING
1. It's a good cause/charity	31.5	127	518,060	18.1
2. I respect the work it does	22.9	137	402,119	14.1
3. Sympathy for those it helps	14.3	137	253,836	8.9
4. I/someone I know has /had an illness or condition it tries to cure	13.1	93	157,037	5.5
5. I/someone I know has directly benefited from its services	13.0	106	180,342	6.3
6. To help strengthen the community	7.8	168	170,138	6.0
7. I/someone I know might need its help in the future	6.0	95	73,606	2.6
8. I trust it to use the money correctly	5.0	232	147,068	5.2
9. A sense of religious obligation	4.8	603	362,038	12.7
10. I/someone I know is/used to be a member	4.3	204	113,357	4.0
11. I felt obliged to the person who asked	3.8	76	37,674	1.3
12. To help make the world a better place	3.8	313	155,820	5.5
13. Gives me a feeling of goodwill/makes me feel good about myself	2.7	161	56,487	2.0
14. I volunteer my time for the organisation	1.4	277	47,801	1.7
15. My employer encourages staff to give	0.3	70	2,942	0.1
16. Other	6.9	165	147,944	5.2
17. Can't say	2.5	94	28,423	1.0

The strongest set of reasons, in terms of frequency with which they were invoked, was an affirmation of identity with the cause and the people whose assistance is the object of the cause (1st and 3rd). These are the reasons given by almost half the donors. Close to another one-third say they give because of a sense of reciprocation for services already provided, or anticipation that help might be needed in future (4th, 5th and 7th). Just under one-quarter nominate respect for or trust in the organisation (2nd and 8th). For just under one-eighth, the main reason is a desire to strengthen the community or, more generally, to make the world a better place.

But different reasons appear to have a stronger pull than others. The 32% who affirm that they gave because they thought it a good cause gave 18% of the total given. Only 4.8% said they gave because of a sense of religious obligation, but they gave almost 13% of the total.

4.3.2 Affiliated giving

It is often assumed that all giving is motivated by altruism. In fact, as suggested by the range of responses to the question about reasons for giving, different people have different reasons for giving, perhaps even to a similar cause and, by extension, the same person may have different reasons for giving to different causes. Some of the reasons for giving suggest that the donor has a prior connection or affiliation with the recipient of her/his donation. They gave because they were a member or volunteered for the organisation, or they have directly benefited from it. We know, too, that a lot of giving is to the church, temple, mosque or synagogue where a person worships.

For these reasons, we thought we should explore the possibility that some giving is to organisations with which the giver has a prior affiliation. As part of the exploration of a donation to a single organisation, respondents were asked if they belonged to the organisation they were assisting, or if they volunteered for it or if they or a member of their family had benefited from it. Overall 34 % of givers claimed some sort of direct affiliation with the organisation to which they were donating. For 25%, this affiliation was that they (or members of their family) used the service it provided (some of these were also members of the organisation or volunteered for it). Fourteen percent were volunteers and 12% were members; again in both cases many were users or volunteers as well as members and so on.

In addition, when we look at the level of giving, affiliation encouraged a higher level of giving. Across our sample of single donations, affiliated givers on average gave \$214 over the preceding 12 months compared to givers without an affiliation, who gave on average \$114. Overall, the 34% of affiliated givers gave 49% of all money donated. This finding has significant implications for fundraising, though many organisations that engage in fundraising already understand the point implicitly. It does mean that the simple belief that giving is a response to altruistic feelings is true for only around two-thirds of cases and for barely half of the money donated.

4.3.3 Is giving planned?

A popular view of giving is that it is spontaneous; a response to some tragedy, or a recognition that some person or group has a pressing need. Yet, fundraising and most fundraising organisations try to build a commitment to giving. The newly emerging discourse of social investment tries to persuade people that their giving requires as much attention, as much planning, as their other investing, for their retirement, for example.

When the survey asked people who had made at least one donation additional questions about a particular donation, one of the questions asked was how long they had been donating to that particular organisation. A surprising majority (52%) had been providing support for five or more years. They were also asked if they had made one or more donations to that organisation over the past year. In 51% of cases organisations had received a one-off donation while 48% of cases the donor had made several donations to the organisation (1% could not say).

Respondents were asked if their donation was planned or spontaneous (or, in the case of those making several donations, if some had been planned and some spontaneous). Just over 50% were described as spontaneous, while just fewer than 16% were described as planned. Almost 31% were a mixture of both. Not surprisingly, those who gave for the first time were more likely to describe their support as spontaneous. But at the same time, many people who had been supporting an organisation for several years nonetheless did not plan to provide support in this year, but simply responded to a particular appeal. Table 40 sets out the duration of the donation along with the percentage of donations which were spontaneous.

Table 40: Planned and spontaneous giving

	NUMBER OF GIVERS	% TOTAL	% OF GIFTS THAT WERE SPONTANEOUS
First time this year	2,140	16.3	74.1
More than 1 year but less than 2 years	956	7.3	56.8
2 years but less than 3 years	1,389	10.6	55.8
3 years but less than 4 years	970	7.4	46.5
4 years but less than 5 years	784	6.0	47.4
5 years or more	6,857	52.4	47.7

When we look at the amounts given, we find that the average amount donated to the chosen organisation when the gift was described as planned was \$238 and the average gift described as spontaneous was \$59. We also looked at the demographics of planned giving, and found a small increase in likelihood that the donation was planned among those aged over 65 years, those with a university degree and those in managerial and professional employment, but the differences were barely significant.

4.3.4 Tax concessions and giving

There is a great deal of mainly US literature on the effect of tax concessions on giving. Being able to deduct a donation from estimates of taxable income effectively lowers the cost of giving and adds an incentive. Those who pay a higher marginal rate of tax receive a greater incentive.

A recent review of literature summarises the findings of previous research as indicating that a 1% increase in income leads to an increase in giving of between 0.6% and 1.2%, while a decrease in the tax deduction of 1% leads to a 1.2% decline in giving.²³ Australian data does not allow such sophisticated modelling, but the survey asked respondents whether they had claimed any deductions for donations in their last tax return (for 2003-04). Thirty-six percent replied in the affirmative, and recalled claiming a total of \$1.64 billion. This is higher than would be expected by projecting the Australian Taxation Office's record of sums claimed over the past decade. As reported in 4.2 above, this has increased by an average of 11% per year over the past decade. That would lead to an expectation that around \$1.2 or \$1.3 billion would be claimed in 2003-04. We will not have the definitive ATO data for several years.

²³ Brooks 2005.

Table 41: Tax concessions and giving

		% CLAIMING TAX	MEAN DONATIONS TAX CLAIMERS (\$)	MEAN DONATIONS NON TAX CLAIMERS (\$)
All givers		35.8	646	297
Gender	Male	38.3	743	315
	Female	33.7	546	282
Age cohorts	18-24	13.6	320	219
	25-34	32.7	521	259
	35-44	41.9	655	290
	45-54	47.4	699	311
	55-64	43.5	652	319
	65+	27.9	808	392
Personal income	Nil to \$15,599	18.1	523	200
	\$15,600 to \$31,199	33.4	455	275
	\$31,200 to \$51,999	42.0	664	427
	\$52,000 and higher	56.3	1,334	574
Household income	Nil to \$25,999	17.0	442	216
	\$26,000 to \$51,999	36.3	593	314
	\$52,000 to \$104,00	45.1	718	398
	Over \$104,000	52.4	1,117	596
Education	School level only	27.6	463	249
	Trade qualification	39.4	695	401
	Bachelor/PG degree	53.2	847	369
Employment status	F/T paid employment	46.8	681	321
	P/T paid employment	38.0	452	304
	Unemployed looking for work	15.7	326	141
	Not retired and not in workforce	21.3	642	248
	F/T student	9.6	668	126
	Retired	28.5	796	329
Occupation	Managers and professionals	50.9	845	412
	Other white-collar	33.8	517	278
	Trades	29.5	509	234
	Other blue-collar	23.1	380	235

Table 41 sets out our main demographic and employment variables by the percentage of respondents who report they claimed a tax deduction. It also sets out the size of the average donation they made in the survey period (not the same as the 2003-04 tax year) and, for comparison, the average donation made by those not claiming a deduction. It must be noted that the average donation made by tax claimers is not the amount for which they claimed a deduction: the amount reported as claimed for deduction was for the 2003-04 tax year, while the amounts reported here are for 2004; as well, many donations, eg to religion, are not tax deductible. Rather, the last two columns indicate that those who claim tax deductions give more. The table also makes it clear that the likelihood that a taxpayer will claim tax increases with income.

We thought that the income effect was so significant that we explored it with the higher incomes. It did not show any more dramatic effects as income increased. Those whose income was above \$104,000 were even more likely to claim a tax deduction than lower income groups, but those who did not nonetheless had higher mean donations than those on lower incomes who claimed a tax deduction.

Table 42: Tax concessions and high income earners

PERSONAL INCOME	% CLAIMING TAX	MEAN DONATIONS TAX CLAIMERS (\$)	MEAN DONATIONS NON TAX CLAIMERS (\$)
\$52,000 - \$77,999 per year	55.8	766	423
\$78,000 - \$103,999 per year	52.9	871	356
\$104,000 or more per year	62.3	1,841	917

4.3.5 Awareness of tax changes to encourage giving

Since 1999, the Australian Government has made a number of changes to taxation law to encourage giving, especially by high income/high wealth individuals. These include the ability for people who give through workplace giving programs to receive tax deductions immediately, the availability of deductions for donations of property and for some of the costs associated with attending fundraising dinners and similar events, the right to spread deductions over five years and the right to claim deductions for donations to private charitable funds. The survey sought to discover the level of awareness of these changes, and whether they have an impact. Nineteen percent of the sample was aware of changes, although some changes were better known than others. Table 43 indicates the level of awareness of different changes (note that the percentages are of those 19% of respondents who said they were aware that there had been some changes).

Table 43: Awareness of tax deductibility for giving

	% AWARE (N=2,904)
Deductions are now available for donations to private charitable funds	63.3
Giving which allows regular donations through pay to receive tax benefits immediately	46.5
Deductions are now available for attending fundraising dinners or similar events	34.9
Gains tax exemptions are now available	29.6
Deductions are now available for some property donations	23.7
Can be spread over 5 years	21.4

This awareness was spread fairly evenly across demographic and occupational groups. It was noticeably higher among university graduates (27% of graduates claimed awareness of changes), and among higher income earners. More importantly, the average size of donations made by those aware of tax changes was significantly higher than donations made by those who were not aware.

However, far fewer claimed that the changes had any impact on their giving. Only 1% of total respondents, or 7% of those who were aware of changes, indicated that it had an impact on their giving. Table 44 indicates the different impacts reported by those claiming that the changes had an impact.

Table 44: Impact of tax changes on giving

	% (N=158)
I donated because of the tax changes when I otherwise wouldn't have	30.7
I donated to more charities as a result of the tax changes	27.2
I donated more often as a result of the changes	22.3
I donated a greater amount as a result of the changes	32.0
Something else	4.6
Can't say	2.0

Note: Total percentages add to more than 100% because several respondents reported more than one effect.

One of the tax changes designed to encourage giving was to allow employees of firms that enabled payroll giving to gain a tax deduction at the same time as their donation was deducted from their pay. This is sometimes known as pre-tax giving. It was hoped that such a change would also encourage employers to introduce payroll giving schemes. But only 9% of givers claimed to be aware of this change.

4.3.6 Reasons for not giving

Only a small percentage (13%) of respondents said they had made no donations in the previous twelve months. Around half of these (7% of adults) said they had provided support in other ways, mainly by purchasing raffle tickets. A picture of non-givers can be constructed from the tables in Section 4.1, by identifying the groups with lower than average giving rates. For example, non-givers are slightly more likely to be found among men than women. Non-givers are marginally more common among people in their first decade of adulthood or who failed to complete high school education and among those with less than \$16,000 annual income. People in the Northern Territory are marginally less likely to give, as are people born in non-English-speaking countries and people who are not religious. But in all cases the differences are marginal. There is no easy way of predicting whether a person will give based on the demographic and behavioural variables we are using here.

People who said they had not given in the previous year were asked their reasons for not giving. The most common single reason was that they could not afford to give. Interestingly, the next most important bundle of reasons related to the efficiency and transparency (and by extension confidence) in the organisation asking for funds. Table 45 sets out the reasons given by respondents; most respondents affirmed several reasons.

Table 45: Reasons for not giving

	%
I can't afford to give	58.2
Too much in every dollar is used in administration	47.0
I don't know where the money would be used	44.3
I don't believe that the money would reach those in need	39.8
I feel as though the government should be providing the support that is needed through our taxes	35.9
I get annoyed at the number of times I am approached to donate	31.2
I don't like the way I am approached to give money	30.8
I am usually asked when I don't have spare change on me	30.5
I prefer to volunteer my time instead of giving money	29.3
I think that the people they say they help should be able to help themselves	12.2
I haven't been approached to give	10.6
Other	2.3
My partner makes the donations	1.7
I donate through my business	1.0
Can't say	1.8

Respondents were asked about possible factors that might influence them to give on a future occasion. Table 46 sets out these responses.

Table 46: Encouragements to give for non-givers

	LIKELY %	UNLIKELY %	CAN'T SAY %
Being provided with better information	64.9	30.6	4.4
Approached by local not national organisations	40.6	50.7	8.7
If others around me are giving	34.8	54.9	10.3

5. The recipients of individual philanthropy

The previous section described the characteristics of those who give and who volunteer; it is now time to look at who are the beneficiaries of giving and volunteering. The conventional way of doing this is to look at levels of giving and volunteering received by organisations in different fields of activity. There are far too many organisations that are the beneficiaries of people's generosity to list them individually. These fields of activity approximate to industries and have been used with some variations in previous surveys of giving and volunteering, both in Australia and internationally.

5.1 Who gets the money?

Table 47 sets out for organisations in each field of activity the levels of financial support received from individuals. It shows that while organisations in some fields are more favoured or popular than others, they do not therefore receive the largest quantum of support. For example, 60% of adults donate to organisations providing community services, more than to any other field, but the average size of each donation is relatively small, and so these organisations, the traditional 'charities', receive only one dollar of every eight donated. By contrast, international aid and development organisations receive slightly more even though they are supported by less than one-quarter of the population.

Table 47: Recipients of giving

	% DONATING	AVERAGE DONATION PER GIVER (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS
Arts or cultural associations	4.2	220	2.3
Australian emergency relief services	31.8	52	4.2
Community or welfare services	60.4	81	12.8
Education	16.2	156	6.6
Environmental or animal welfare groups	21.5	87	4.8
International aid and development organisations	22.3	234	13.3
Medical research	50.3	77	10.2
Health services	17.8	88	4.0
Interest groups (professional and business assns, unions, political parties, other advocacy groups)	5.3	125	1.6
Recreational or hobby groups	3.4	75	0.7
Religious or spiritual organisations	26.2	529	36.1
Sporting clubs	13.2	86	3.0
Other	0.5	355	0.4

5.2 Who gets the hours?

The picture for volunteering (Table 48) has some interesting differences. Organisations providing community and welfare services, the organisations commonly called charities, receive voluntary assistance from a bit over 10% of the adult population. They receive almost one-third of the hours volunteered. Educational organisations (mainly schools and parent groups) are supported by 8% of the adult population and receive 12% of the hours volunteered. Sporting clubs are supported by 7% and receive around the same percentage of hours. Religious organisations receive less volunteer assistance

than donations. Volunteers for arts and hobby groups seem to put in the most time volunteering – an expression of their commitment and enthusiasm (and their affiliation).

Table 48: Recipients of volunteering

	% VOLUNTEERING	AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	% TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED
Arts or cultural associations	1.2	159	3.4
Australian emergency relief services	1.8	119	4.0
Community or welfare services	12.8	119	28.2
Education	7.6	87	12.1
Environmental or animal welfare groups	1.2	117	2.6
Health services	3.0	126	6.9
Interest groups	1.1	78	1.6
International aid and development organisations	1.1	72	1.4
Medical research	3.6	51	3.4
Recreational or hobby groups	1.0	162	3.1
Religious or spiritual organisations	6.0	136	15.0
Sporting clubs	6.6	136	16.6
Other	0.6	143	1.6

For two fields, health and education, we sought a finer breakdown of the recipients of donations. In education we were particularly interested in giving to private and government schools and universities. The relevant breakdown is shown in Table 49. The success of private schools and the lack of success of universities is the most noticeable of these data. Private schools receive 50% of donations to education. Note that the percentages in the first column (% donating, or giving rate) add to more than the total for education because some donors gave to organisations in more than one sub-field. The numbers are far from reliable; such small percentages carry a high standard error.

Table 49: Recipients of giving to education

	% DONATING	MEAN DONATION PER GIVER (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS
Education – comprising:	16.2	156	6.6
Kindergarten/preschools	2.1	124	0.6
Private schools	5.1	283	3.3
State schools	9.4	103	2.1
Universities	1.1	160	0.4
Other education	0.6	na	0.2

Note: Percentages in the first column add to more than the total for education because some donors gave to organisations in more than one sub-field.

Table 50: Recipients of giving to health

	% DONATING	MEAN DONATION PER GIVER (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS
Health services – comprising:	17.8	88	4.0
Hospitals	10.1	82	2.0
Support groups	2.9	110	0.8
Other health services	5.3	91	1.2

The way the questionnaire was structured meant that more detailed data on the beneficiaries of volunteering in education and health was not collected.

5.3 Giving to nonprofits and giving to governments

There is a common misconception that people give to charities, which by definition are private nonprofit organisations, while they volunteer to a wider suite of nonprofits, such as sports clubs. However, the beneficiaries of a good deal of giving and volunteering are government-run organisations that are mostly funded from the public purse and staffed by government employees. These include government schools, hospitals, art galleries and orchestras. It is difficult to clearly distinguish government organisations that are the recipients of peoples' donations of money and time – not all donors/volunteers are aware or care about the ownership of the recipient of their gift. More importantly, the formal recipient of people's donations may be a nonprofit foundation, but one whose sole purpose is to collect funds for the government hospital, gallery or school. However, government entities are concentrated in several fields. Almost all public hospitals are government-controlled; government schools and all but four small universities are also. So too are most emergency services organisations, though once many organisations such as bushfire brigades were member-controlled. A small percentage of arts organisations, the large state galleries and the symphony orchestras in the capital cities, are still effectively government-controlled. When we made adjustments for giving to different fields to exclude giving to government-controlled entities, we estimated that nonprofit organisations received 92% of funds donated by individual Australians in 2004.

5.4 Tsunami giving

Respondents were asked to exclude the gifts they had made to the tsunami appeals from their answers to the survey, but they were asked if they had given to a tsunami appeal and how much they had given. Fifty-four percent claimed to have given a total of \$1 billion to the appeal. This seems far higher than the amount the main international aid and development agencies have recorded. People may be claiming donations made to the many other nonprofits that held appeals even though they are not usually involved in overseas aid, but there is clearly a good deal of exaggeration. These figures are not counted in any of the data reported previously in this report. Interestingly, 98% of people who reported giving to tsunami appeals claimed to have given to other causes in the previous years, so the belief that the tsunami appeal introduced many Australians to giving for the first time seems misplaced.

5.5 Are some fields growing or declining in popularity?

Do people change their views about where they should commit their donations or their volunteer effort? And if there is some movement, might this be because of greater effort of organisations in some fields than others? In considering these questions we need to recall that in adjusted dollar values and in hours volunteered there has been a significant increase over the period since the previous survey. Since 1997, giving increased 88% or 58% in current dollar values and since 2000, hours volunteered increased by 16%. However, while in some fields the total number of dollars donated or hours volunteered has increased, often spectacularly, in a few it has declined. Table 51 sets out these comparisons. For each field it lists, for 1997 and 2000 respectively and for 2004, the percentage of the total dollars donated and hours volunteered to organisations in the particular field. The total column at the bottom of the table records the total dollars donated and hours volunteered for those years. It should be borne

in mind that in fields where the percentage of dollars and hours given is less than 10% there is likely to be a large error. Indeed, all the movements estimated here are indicative, not definitive.

Table 51 shows that the stand-out fields in giving are the arts, interest groups and environment/animals, but all are coming off a small base (which also increases the likelihood of error). The big winners in overall terms are health and international aid and development organisations. Many organisations in these fields are household names and have invested a lot of effort to increase fundraising income over the past few years. In medical research especially, many new and successful organisations and appeals have emerged over the past five years. The losers appear to be education and sport. Less money was donated to them in 2004 than in 1997. Community and welfare organisations have declined in their percentage take of donated dollars but not in absolute terms.

In volunteering the big growth is in environment and animal welfare organisations and health (though this may be a product of underreporting in the 2000 voluntary work survey which did not explicitly mention medical research fundraising organisations in its survey prompts). Organisations providing community and welfare services also experienced growth. The big losers were arts and cultural associations and interest groups. Although their relatively small numbers to start with make generalisations risky, it appears that they actually received fewer volunteer hours in 2004 than in 2000. In both cases organisations in those fields experienced big increases in donations, suggesting that their supporters are more likely to express their support in terms of money rather than by volunteering time. As far as interest groups are concerned, that reflects an already observed trend to tertiary or chequebook associations and the difficulty experienced by many professional societies in getting volunteers for their various committees. In the case of arts organisations it may point to the success of large professional companies in raising donations but also to a withering away of the purely amateur associations. Educational institutions and religious organisations barely increased their volunteer hours.

Table 51: Recipients growing and declining in popularity

FIELD	% TOTAL DONATIONS			% TOTAL HOURS VOLUNTEERED		
	1997	2004	% CHANGE	2000	2004	% CHANGE
Arts or cultural associations	0.7	2.3	+228	4.8	3.4	-29
Community or welfare services	15.8	12.8	-19	26	28.2	+8.5
Education	15.1	6.6	-57	14.3	12.1	-15
Environmental or animal welfare groups	2.2	4.8	+118	1.3	2.6	+100
Health (including medical research)	11.9	14.2	19	5.3	10.3	+94
Interest groups	0.6	1.6	+166	2.6	1.6	-59
International aid and development organisations	10.3	13.3	+29	n/a	1.4	
Religious or spiritual organisations	34.1	36.1	+6	16.8	15	-12
Sporting and recreational groups	8.1	3.7	-54	21.2	19.7	-7
Other (including emergency relief)	1.3	4.6	+254	7.7	5.6	-27
Total (\$ & hrs)	\$3018m	\$5687m	+88%	702m hrs	836m hrs	+19%

5.6 Where is affiliation giving strongest?

We noted in 4.3.2 that around one-third of giving is to an organisation with which the donor has an association. We suggested that affiliation was likely to be stronger for nonprofits in some fields than others. Table 52 demonstrates that this is indeed the case. For each field it sets out the percentage of donors that have some form of affiliation (member, volunteer or user) with organisations in that field, along with the mean donation to those organisations by affiliated and non-affiliated donors and the percentage of donations made to organisations in that field that are contributed by affiliated donors. The fields where affiliated giving is greater than 60% are: arts, education, sport, recreation, interest groups and religious organisations.

Table 52: Giving and affiliation

	NUMBER CASES	% WITH FORM OF AFFILIATION	MEAN BY NON-AFFILIATED GIVERS (\$)	MEAN BY AFFILIATED GIVERS (\$)	% TOTAL DONATIONS BY AFFILIATED GIVERS
Arts or cultural associations	103	64.1	87	140	73.1
Australian emergency relief services	1,396	23.8	70	76	25.4
Community or welfare services	3,485	24.0	82	96	26.9
Education	631	73.1	54	131	87.0
Environmental or animal welfare groups	895	15.1	64	143	29.0
Health services	836	48.1	65	88	56.1
Interest groups	174	56.6	87	110	62.0
International aid and development organisations	1,038	18.5	252	360	26.9
Medical research	2,629	30.4	77	94	34.3
Recreational or hobby groups	143	66.9	70	63	63.6
Religious or spiritual organisations	1,386	69.8	277	575	82.7
Sporting clubs	556	53.8	42	77	68.3
Other	109	21.3	77	274	47.3
Total	13,381	34.1	114	214	49.2

This table has significant implications for fundraising professionals, though they are at least implicitly aware of its implications in some fields, such as education and religious organisations: there are few public appeals for particular schools or churches. However other fields, such as the arts, may learn from it.

6. Conclusion

The giving both of money and of time by Australians is increasing; more Australians are giving and volunteering, and the overall total of dollars and hours contributed to Australia's 700,000 nonprofit organisations (along with a few government entities) is growing. Such positive trends in both giving and volunteering are not as emphatic in comparable countries.

The reasons for this can only be speculated, but clearly include relatively high levels of employment, rising income and, for many, increasing wealth. These are supply-side factors. An explanation for rising giving and volunteering can also be found on the demand side: in the increasing efforts of nonprofit organisations to solicit donations and volunteers and the increasing originality in some of their appeals. As well, greater media attention has been given to volunteering and, more recently, to giving and has been given in a way that endorses and legitimates that behaviour. Government encouragement has helped here.

There have been some changes in the beneficiaries of this increased generosity, but generally, organisations in most fields are better off.

Two factors shaping giving, and to a lesser extent volunteering, stand out. One is the importance of various forms of affiliation, including religious belief. Prior affiliation with organisations that receive almost half of the monies donated suggests that accounts of giving as charitable and as motivated purely by altruism are over-simple.

Frequent attendance at religious worship is important in prompting people to volunteer, and also important to prompt giving, but the greatest beneficiaries of this are religious organisations, which receive one-third of funds donated.

The research also points to the importance of planned giving. If giving in Australia is to continue to increase (and comparisons with the United States suggest that there is considerable scope for growth), then it will come about as a result of more people committing themselves to viewing their giving as a rational action to be planned in the same way as they might plan their superannuation or other investments. But to grow the proportion of giving that is planned will require a long-term public education campaign and some institutional assistance. Some of the supports needed are already present in the form of tax deductions (though this could be placed on a more rational and principled basis). Also needed is an extensive web-based listing of the variety of organisations that a person wishing to make a decision about where to place a gift to best support a particular cause (whether cancer research or saving the environment) could search. In Australia, Givewell provides a modest example of this, as does the Office of Charities in New South Wales, but their lists are very limited, both in coverage and in information provided. The US Guidestar listing, currently being adopted in the United Kingdom, provides a better example of what can be done.

References

- AAFRC 2005, 'Charitable giving increases 5 percent to reach \$250 billion in 2004', press release, viewed 20 June 2005, www.aafc.org/press_releases/index.cfm.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 1996, *Voluntary Work, Australia, June 1995*, cat. no. 4441.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001, *Voluntary Work, Australia, 2000*, cat. no. 4441.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2003, *General Social Survey: Summary Results Australia, 2002*, cat. no. 4159.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (APPC) 2002, *Investing in ourselves: giving and fundraising in Asia*, Asia Development Bank, Manila.
- Brooks, A 2005, 'Does Social Capital Make You Generous?', *Social Science Quarterly*, vol 86, no1, pp. 1-15.
- Browne, E and Burlingame, D 2001, 'Symposium: methodology in surveying giving and volunteering behavior', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 480-568.
- Givewell 2005, *Australian giving post-tsunami: Australian charities financial analysis 2004*, Givewell, Evans Head, NSW.
- Hall, M, McKeown, L and Roberts, K 2001, *Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: highlights from the 2000 national survey of giving, volunteering and participating*, Statistics Canada, Ottawa.
- Hodgkinson, V and Weitzman, M 1996, *Giving and volunteering in the United States. findings from a national survey*, Independent Sector, Washington.
- Lyons, M and Hocking, S 2000, *Dimensions of Australia's third sector*, CACOM, UTS, Lindfield, NSW.
- Lyons, M and Hocking, S (forthcoming), *Giving by individual Australians to arts and sport*, Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Canberra.
- Lyons, M, Wijkstrom, P and Clary, G 1998, 'Comparative studies of volunteering: what is being studied?', *Voluntary Action*, vol.1, no.1, pp. 45-54.
- Magat, R (ed.) 1989, *Philanthropic Giving*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Reed, P and Selby, K 2000, 'Patterns of citizen participation and the civic core in Canada', paper presented to 29th ARNOVA Annual Conference, New Orleans.
- Schervish, P and Havens, J 1995, 'Do the poor pay more: is the U-shaped curve Correct?', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 24, no.1, pp. 79-90.
- Schervish, P and Havens, J 2001, 'Wealth and commonwealth: new findings from wherewithal and philanthropy', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 30, no.1, pp. 5-25.
- Steinberg, K and Rooney, P 2005, 'America gives: a survey of Americans' generosity after September 11', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp.110-135.
- United States Department of Labor 2002, *Volunteering in the United States summary*, US Department of Labor, Washington DC.