

N. Kushnirovich,
PhD (Economics), Ruppin Academic Center,
D. Ribovsky,
Ruppin Academic Center,
Israel

DETERMINANTS OF VOLUNTEERING AND CHARITABLE GIVING

Introduction. *Theoretic approaches to altruism and its forms.* Altruism and its diverse forms, including volunteering and charity, have been widely studied in the literature. The studies devoted to altruism usually reproduce approaches adopted in sociology, economics, political behavior, sociobiology, etc. Though professional attitudes of scholars differ and shape their definitions of altruism in various ways, most of them distinguish a „costs and benefits” approach. Sociologists define altruism as providing benefits to its recipients, but providing no benefits to the actors and even incurring some costs (Howard and Piliavin, 2000). Wilson (1975) defines it a bit radically as self-destructive behavior performed for the benefit of others. In social psychological work, altruism is, by far, the most prevalent form of pro-social behavior (Collett and Morrissey, 2007). An altruistic act is an intentional act that helps another with no benefit, and perhaps even a cost, to s/he who performs it (Dovidio et al., 2006). According to Bar-Tal (1986), altruism must benefit another person when the benefit is the goal in itself, has to be performed of an individual’s free will and with intention, and not for any expected reward. On the contrary, Piliavin and Charng (1990) posit that the actor need not have consciously formulated an intention to benefit the other for an act to qualify.

In economic literature, traditional models view human behavior as purely self-interested (Einolf1, 2010). The dictator game based on „rational choice” models of human behavior with assumptions on self-interest has become widespread (Bekkers, 2007). Economists also regard altruism considering the „giver’s” utility function. Altruism means that the first derivate of the utility function of an individual with respect to the material resources received by another agent is always strictly positive. Thus, an altruistic person is willing to forfeit his/her own resources in order to improve the well being of others (Fehr and Schmidt, 2005). However, cooperation, the provision of public goods, volunteering, charitable giving and informal helping behaviors are all difficult to explain in self-interest terms (Einolf1, 2010). A motive-based definition of altruism adapted to a cost-benefit approach was given by Piliavin and Charng (1990, p. 30). According to them, altruism is „behavior costly to the actor involving other-regarding sentiments; if an act is or appears to be motivated mainly out of a consideration

of another’s needs rather than one’s own, we call it altruistic”.

Altruistic charitable impulse is usually considered a universal human trait (Maner and Gaillot, 2007). However, it is rather unclear what lies behind this. Besides the theories which emphasize rational action and cost-benefit analysis, there is another approach that explains altruism by pointing to motives, feelings and social ties. The motives for pro-social behavior can be esteem, fear, guilt, social justice and empathy (Banks et al., 2011). Feelings of empathy or guilt are widely discussed in the literature (Mesch, 2009; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Sargeant et al., 2006), while the esteem motivation is an important factor in the Sargeant model of donor behavior (Sargeant, 1999). Anticipation of improving one’s social position as a motive for altruism (Ireland, 2001) can be a result of the expectation of some reciprocity, or paying back received support (Lawson and Ruderham, 2009).

In our opinion, these approaches are not mutually exclusive. In this paper we focus on a broader attitude to altruism, which combines rational choice with feelings and individual motives. Individuals gain utility not only from consumed market goods but also from their feelings (such as empathy or guilt), high esteem and improving their social position as a result of altruistic activity. High quality of wellbeing implies not only a high level of consumption and wealth but also a suitable environment, provision of public and merit goods, and self-satisfaction, whereas self-satisfaction is a function of a sense of accomplishment and public evaluation. Thus, when individuals donate time or money they can be truly „selfish” because this way they increase their common utility; although they concede a certain amount of goods, in total they increase their quality of life and well-being.

In the economic and social sciences, donation of time and money are generally regarded as integral parts of voluntarism. Forasmuch as voluntarism is caused by altruistic motives, the intention to give time and money is commonly discussed as an altruistic action. The chosen resources can take the form of either money or time – or a combination of both. Thus, donation of and donation of time money (volunteering) are the more common forms of altruism. Volunteering is an action that is not easily defined due to the differences in its personal meaning and causes from person to person. In spite of the

difficulties, the UN has defined volunteering as an act that essentially is not performed for any financial gain; rather, it is done from free will, leaving a positive response to a third party as well as to the volunteer (Ironmonger, 2006). Snyder and Omoto (2008) presented a broader definition of volunteering. The supplementary issues of this definition were that the act of volunteering must include reflexive or emergency help or assistance, is spread over a continuous period of time (week, month, year and so on) and not a one-time operation, and includes helping or assisting those who are interested in receiving it. According to Wilson (2000), volunteering is any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group or cause. „As long as the net costs of the volunteer are higher, the volunteer act is purer” (Cnaan et al., 1996).

Consistently with our concept of altruism, some studies on volunteering found that it can be beneficial for the helper as well as the helped (Ironmonger, 2006), as positive effects are found for life-satisfaction, self-esteem, self-rated health, for educational and occupational achievement, functional ability, and mortality (Wilson, 2000). According to Piliavin and Charng (1990), in spite of the fact that volunteers generally have altruistic reasons for participation such as feelings of obligation to the community and wanting to help others, self-oriented reasons such as perceived benefits, gaining job experience, enhancing social status, or simply having social contacts are also very common.

A wide range of studies found a positive relationship between volunteering and donation of money (Drever 2010; Hill, 2012; Ireland, 2001). Because volunteering, like donating money, is a form of formal pro-social behavior, there are many striking parallels between their respective determinants (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011).

Determinants of volunteering and donation. To date, much research has been conducted in order to examine the effect of different variables on participation in altruistic activities. Gender plays a major role in an individual's life, feelings, expectations and overall behavior; therefore, many studies examine gender differences in volunteering and donation of money. Some of them found that men are driven, as in their paid work, by instrumental rewards, whereas women are driven by social rewards (Gerstein et al., 2004). Most studies revealed that women engage in charity giving (altruism) more than men, and give more of their time and money for charity than men do (Andreoni and Vesterlund, 2001; Rigdon and Levine, 2011), although sometimes the differences were very small and inconsistent. In-depth surveys that include a broad range of questions about volunteering and charity, found that the differences between men and women as to volunteering were rather small (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2006). Some scholars even reported the absence of gender differences regarding motives for volunteering (Bekkers,

2006). The results also vary between countries. In Australia, Japan, England women were more likely to volunteer than men, while in Sweden the results were opposite: men were more likely to volunteer than women, and in Canada no gender differences were observed (Musick and Wilson, 2008).

Most studies showed a positive correlation between age and altruism (Eisenberg and Strayer, 1987; Psychol, 1998). Others state that donation of time and money decreases at higher ages (Brown and Lankford, 1992; Lyons and Nivison-Smith, 2006; Tiehen, 2001). Though the exact age at which it happened varied throughout the studies, it tended to be over the age of 65. Auten and Joulfaian (1996) found that donations were higher among those aged 40 – 84 than among those younger or older.

Marital status, together with age and gender, is one of the determinants that should affect altruism participation, and is mostly found to be related to the incidence of giving and the amount donated (Tiehen, 2001). Both married men and women are more likely to give than their single peers, though only married women (not married men) give higher amounts than their single peers (Rooney et al., 2001).

Research done mainly about family characteristics as determinants of volunteering and charity found that having children and the children's age were factors promoting altruism in both its forms. On one hand, volunteerism can be a predictable part of the social role of the parent (Rotolo, 2000). On the other hand, due to limited free time, the parental role can deter one from volunteering, whereas the economic or rational approach assumes that the presence of children imposes additional costs on the volunteer. Although a number of researchers have shown that the presence of children in a household positively affects the parent's volunteer or charity activities (Banks and Tanner, 1999; Tiehen, 2001), a few researchers emphasized the age of the children. Having children under the age of 5 was a strong promoter for parent volunteerism (Caputo, 1997) especially for women (Rotolo and Wilson, 2007). Duncan (1999) found a positive relationship between the level of giving and having children between the ages of three and ten, but no relationship for those with children outside this age range. However, according to Okten and Osili (2004), the number of children younger than 14 is negatively related to the likelihood of giving and the amount donated.

Throughout the pages of literature, religion was always associated with helping others in need and philanthropy. In accordance, it makes sense that many researchers focused on the ties between religion and altruism (volunteerism and money donation). The relationship between religiosity, giving and volunteering is positive (Monsma, 2007). The more often persons participated in religious services, the higher was their

intention to volunteer and the more hours they gave (Lyons and Nivison-Smith, 2006). Church members were more likely to engage in charitable giving and contributed higher donations (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011). Bekkers and Schuyt (2008) found that various streams of religion (Catholics and Protestants) had different norms for charity giving and donation of money.

As education is a strong predictor of altruism in terms of volunteering and charitable giving (Wilson, 2000), those who have a higher education are asked to volunteer more often than their peers with a lower education. In addition, volunteers with higher education levels are more likely to be asked to perform volunteer work in „white collar” fields and to hold positions that require leadership qualities. On the other hand, Bekkers (2005) found that some volunteer organizations do not require highly educated individuals. This tendency has also changed with time: in 1975, Van Ingen and Dekker (2011) found that volunteerism was mainly performed by highly educated volunteers, whereas in 2005 the differences nearly vanished. A positive relationship between the level of education and giving was found in many studies (Bekkers, 2006; Brown and Lankford, 1992; Lyons and Nivison-Smith, 2006; Tiehen, 2001). This is also true for the sums of donated money: the higher the level of education, the higher proportion of the donation came from the donor’s income (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011).

Altruism is also related to employment. Participating in the paid labor force is time consuming, and job intensity directly affects decisions about leisure spending. Ireland (2001) posits that observability (the need for somebody’s contribution to be acknowledged by others), interest (that can be either personal or interest in the group the individual belongs to due to his/her employment status) and approval (being a part of an altruistic act can affect an individual’s status, and thus change the close environment’s approval) trigger employed individuals to participate in acts of altruism. Khoury and Khoury (1981) found that the happier an individual was with his work, the more helpful he would be toward others and vice versa.

An individual’s or a household’s monthly net income can affect their decision to participate in an act of altruism. Ireland (2001) emphasized that great family wealth gave a person greater ability to donate more time. Some studies that found a positive relationship between higher net income and the likelihood to give (Rooney et al., 2001), while others found that people with higher net income, did not show a higher likelihood to give than other people (Wiepking, 2007). In addition, not surprisingly, research has shown that individuals with more financial means gave higher amounts of money (Okten and Osili, 2004). The findings regarding the proportion of the donation of the net income are not as unambiguous. Some researchers found that the farther an individual’s income is from the

average; his donation would relatively be larger than that of individuals with middle incomes (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996). Other studies revealed a reverse tendency: lower income households donate relatively more and higher income households donate relatively less (McClelland and Brooks, 2004).

An additional factor that is commonly associated with altruism is giving or receiving domestic help. Domestic help is most often regarded as a natural part of altruism. Taking care of children or the elderly are just a few of the examples for ways people perceive domestic help as altruism. Furthermore, receiving domestic help can also affect volunteering and donating because persons who receive domestic help usually have more free time to use for other activities including altruism. Rich people have more opportunities to employ domestic help and also to donate because of larger financial resources available to them. In this way, receiving domestic help can also be related to donation.

The study. As mentioned above, altruism has many forms and can be perceived in different ways by individuals. This paper addresses two forms of altruism: the contribution of money and the contribution of time – volunteering. We examine the overlap between these two activities and the determinants driving people to donate time or money.

To investigate volunteering and donating, we used the model of philanthropy developed by Barclays Wealth (Global Giving: The Culture of Philanthropy, 2010). This model, which takes two components – money and time – together, divides different countries in the world into four groups according to their population’s preferences as to volunteering and donating money. The first group is „Go-Givers” – countries whose population is engaged both in terms of money spent and time given to charities. The second group is „Benefactor Donors” – countries whose population prefer to donate money. The third group is „Volunteer Donors” – countries whose population is more inclined to donate time. And the fourth group is untitled; it includes countries in which the percent of both volunteers and benefactors was extremely low. In our study we called this group „Neither Benefactors Nor Volunteers”. The study conducted by Barclays Wealth (Global Giving: The Culture of Philanthropy, 2010) found significant differences between countries: Ireland, India, the U.S. and South Africa were in the „Go-Givers” group, South America, Taiwan and Saudi Arabia – in the „Benefactor Donors”, and the U.K. and Qatar – in the „Volunteer Donors” group.

The literature review revealed that altruism is commonly expressed in terms of volunteering and donating money. The determinants of volunteering and donating most frequently mentioned in the literature were gender, marital status, having children, religiosity, education, labor force characteristics, total net monthly

household income, and receiving domestic help. In our study, these determinants are regarded as factors that are expected to affect altruistic behavior.

Method. Data. We used the data of the Social Survey conducted by the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics (ICBS) in 2008. The survey used the Population Register as a sampling frame, which included the permanent non-institutional population of Israel aged 20 and older, as well as residents of non-custodial institutions (such as student dormitories, immigrant absorption centers and independent living projects for the elderly). New immigrants were included in the survey population if they had been in Israel for at least six months. Interviews were conducted with about 7,312 people aged 20 and over, who represent about 4.6 million people in that age bracket.

Measures. In this study volunteering and donating are described in terms of participation and scope. Dependent variables were: participation in volunteering (coded „0” = volunteered in past year, and „1” = did not volunteer in past year), participation in donating (coded „0” = donated money in last 12 months, and „1” = did not donate money in last 12 months), scope of volunteering in terms of total monthly hours of volunteering in last 3 months (categorized on a scale of 1 – 5 where „1” = once; „2” = less than 5 hours; „3” = 5 – 9 hours; „4” = 10 – 19 hours ; „5” = 20 hours or more), scope of donating in terms of sum of money donated in last 12 months, (categorized on a scale of 1 – 4 where „1” = up to 100 NIS; „2” = between 101 – 500 NIS; „3” = between 501 – 1000 NIS; „4” = over 1000 NIS).

Based on the literature review, we defined the determinants of volunteering and donating. Thus, the independent variables in this study are as follows: gender (coded „0” = female and „1” = male), age (a continuous variable measured in years), marital status (coded „0” = not married and „1” = married), having children aged 0 – 5 (coded „0” = no children aged 0 – 5, and „1” = have children aged 0 – 5); having children aged 6 – 17 (coded „0” = no children aged 6 – 17, and „1” = have children

aged 6 – 17), religiosity (categorized on a scale of 1 – 5 where „1” = non-religious, secular; „2” = traditional; „3” = traditional and religious; „4” = religious ; „5” = very religious), education in terms of highest received diploma (categorized on a scale of 1 – 6 where „1” = secondary school completion certificate; „2” = matriculation certificate; „3” = non-academic post-secondary certificate; „4” = BA, or an equivalent degree, including an academic certificate; „5” = MA, or an equivalent degree, including MD; „6” PhD, or an equivalent degree), labor force characteristics (coded „0” = unemployed and „1” = employed), total net monthly household income (categorized on a scale from „1” = 2,500 NIS or less to „10” = more than 24,001 NIS), domestic help (coded „0” = did not employ domestic help and „1” = employed domestic help).

In order to analyze the determinants of participation in volunteering and donating, and because of the dichotomous nature of the dependent (outcome) variables, multivariate logistic regression was used. For analyzing the determinants of scope of volunteering and donating, we ran multiple linear regressions.

Results. *The relationship between volunteering and donating.* Following a model of philanthropy developed by Barclays Wealth (Global Giving: The Culture of Philanthropy, 2010) mentioned in the previous chapter, we analyzed the frequencies of volunteering and donation of money of the sample population, and grouped respondents according to their preferences (Table 1). The study revealed that the sample population was more likely to donate than to volunteer. Whereas 68.3 percent of the respondents reported that they had donated money at least once in last 12 months, only 19.1 percent reported that they had volunteered. The most common pattern in the sample was the „Benefactor Donors”, namely, having donated money in the last 12 months without volunteering activity; 53.3 percent of the respondents reported this pattern. The second most frequent pattern (27.6 percent of the sample) was „Neither Benefactors Nor Volunteers”.

Table 1

Volunteer activities and donating money in the past year

Volunteer activities in past year	Donation of money in last 12 months	
	Donated	Did not donated
Volunteered % of total sample	„Go-Givers” 15.0% (n = 1096)	„Volunteer Donors” 4.1% (n = 302)
Did not volunteered % of total sample	„Benefactor Donors” 53.3% (n = 3899)	„Neither Benefactors Nor Volunteers” 27.6% (n = 2015)

15.0 percent of the sample of the social survey was „Go-Givers”, both having donated and volunteered in the last year. The smallest part (only 4.1 percent) was „Volunteer Donors”, who volunteered without donating.

We found a significant relationship between volunteering and donating (Chi-square = 81.22, Sig. < 0.000). Individuals who volunteered in the last year were more likely to donate than those who did not volunteer (78.4 percent versus 65.9 percent). Although the study revealed a positive significant relationship between volunteering and donating, we found that only 15 percent of the sample was „Go-Givers”, both volunteering and donating money. We examined whether there was a relationship between the scope of volunteering (in terms of monthly hours of volunteering) and the scope of donating (in terms of sums of money donated in the last 12 months). Table 2 shows results of the analysis.

The study did not find a relationship between donated sums and hours of volunteering (chi-square test was non-significant); the distribution among the groups was rather even. Thus, the decision to volunteer was related to the decision to donate, but the scope of volunteering did not relate to the scope of donating.

Determinants of participation in volunteering and donating. Results of logistic regressions for participation in volunteering and donating are shown in the Table 3. Both logistic regressions were significant (Sig. < 0.000), thus, the set of the chosen determinants predicted participation either in volunteering or donating. The significant predictors of volunteering were gender, marital status, having children, religiosity, education, net monthly household income and receiving domestic help. Males were 1.19 times more likely to volunteer than females. Non-married persons were 1.34 times more likely to volunteer than married. Having children 0 – 5 years old reduced the willingness to volunteer, but having children 6 – 17 years old increased it. Highly educated individuals

were more likely to volunteer than low educated. The one-point rise in the total net monthly household income only slightly increased the willingness to volunteer. The most salient predictor of participation in volunteering was receiving domestic help for a household member (a child or the elderly); people who employed a worker for domestic help were 1.43 times more likely to volunteer. It was not surprising that religiosity increased the probability to volunteer, so that religious persons were more likely to volunteer than non-religious.

The significant predictors of donating were rather similar to those for volunteering, but their impact was not the same. Females were 1.45 times more likely to donate than males; this result was opposite to volunteering, where males were more likely to volunteer than females. Married persons were 1.63 times more likely to donate than non-married. This result was also the opposite of the finding as to volunteering, since married people were less likely to volunteer than non-married. The third contrary finding was that having children 6 – 17 years old reduced the willingness to donate, although it increased the willingness to volunteer.

The impact of religiosity, total net monthly household income, and employing domestic help on willingness to donate and to volunteer was similar. The higher religiosity and total net monthly household income were, the higher willingness both to volunteer and donate was. The most salient predictor of donating was receiving domestic help, whereas persons who employed a worker for domestic help were 1.67 times more likely to donate than those who did not.

The study revealed some predictors that were significant for donating but non-significant for volunteering, namely labor force characteristics and age. Though we did not find a significant relation between employment and volunteering, being employed was a significant predictor of donating. Employed individuals

Table 2

Sum of money donated in last 12 months according to monthly hours of volunteering in last 3 months, in percent

Total monthly hours of volunteering in last 3 months	Sum of money donated in last 12 months				Total
	Up to 100 NIS	101-500 NIS	501-1000 NIS	Over 1000 NIS	
Once	19.7	18.8	21.7	14.2	18.3
Less than 5 hours	22.7	19.6	25.0	17.1	20.5
5-9 hours	17.3	19.3	17.5	20.7	18.9
10-19 hours	22.0	22.9	19.2	21.5	21.9
20 hours or more	18.3	19.3	16.7	26.4	20.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

were 1.56 times more likely to donate than the non-employed. There was a positive relation between respondents' age and donating, a one-year change in respondents' age increased willingness to donate by 1.03.

Determinants of scope of volunteering and donating. Results of multiple linear regressions for scope of volunteering and scope of donating are shown in Table 4. Both regressions were significant (Sig. < 0.000), hence, the set of the chosen determinants predicted the scope either of volunteering or donating. About 21 percent of the variance in the time of volunteering and about 26 percent of the variance in donated sums can be explained by the independent variables of the models.

Table 4 shows that the scope of volunteering was significantly affected by the following independent variables: gender, age, having children aged 6 – 17, and labor force characteristics. Men reported higher monthly hours of volunteering than women. The older the respondents were, the more hours they volunteered. Having children aged 6 – 17 decreased the scope of volunteering. Employed persons volunteered fewer hours than the non-employed did.

The sum of money donated in the last 12 months was significantly affected by almost all independent variables in our set. Men, educated and employed individuals donated larger sums than women, non-educated and non-employed people did. Older

respondents donated larger sums than younger respondents. Persons, who had children up to 5 years old, also reported larger donated sums than others. It was not surprising that the total net monthly household income and employing a worker for domestic help positively predicted the scope of donated sums, because both these factors are evidence of the respondent's high economic status. Religiosity also had a significant positive effect on donated sums, namely, more religious people donated larger sums than non-religious.

Conclusions. The study revealed that the pattern of donating is preferred by the Israeli population more than the pattern of volunteering. Whereas about a half of the sample donated at least some money in the last year, only a fifth of the respondents volunteered in the past year. The most common pattern found in the survey sample was donating money without volunteering activity. Thus, according to the Barclays Wealth philanthropy model, the Israeli population is predominantly „Benefactor Donors”, rather than „Volunteer Donors” or „Go-Givers”. About a quarter of the population was „Neither Benefactors Nor Volunteers”, and was not involved in altruistic activity at all. The study also revealed a positive relationship between volunteering and donation of money; this finding is consistent with the studies of Drever (2010), Hill (2012) and Ireland (2001).

The predictors of participation in volunteering and

Table 3

Results of logistic regressions for participation in volunteering and donating

Determinants	Volunteer activities in past year („1”= Yes, „0” = No)		Donated money in last 12 months („1”= Yes, „0” = No)	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Gender	0.177	1.194**	-0.370	0.691****
Age	-0.017	0.983	0.026	1.027*
Marital status	-0.296	0.744****	0.487	1.628****
Having children aged 0 – 5	-0.236	0.790**	-0.007	0.993
Having children aged 6 – 17	0.151	1.163*	-0.289	0.749****
Religiosity	0.294	0.745****	0.283	0.753****
Education (Highest diploma received)	0.184	1.202****	0.020	1.020
Labor force characteristics	-0.007	0.993	0.446	1.562****
Total net monthly household income	0.069	1.071****	0.182	1.199****
Domestic help	0.354	1.425****	0.510	1.666****
Chi-square	180.383****		446.847****	

Table 4

Results of multiple regressions for scopes of volunteering (in hours) and donating (donated sums of money)

Determinants	Total monthly hours of volunteering in last 3 months		Sum of money donated in last 12 months	
	B	Beta	B	Beta
Gender	0.160	0.057*	0.198	0.094****
Age	0.041	0.090**	0.024	0.067****
Marital status	-0.175	-0.059	0.066	0.028
Having children aged 0-5	-0.002	-0.001	0.075	0.032*
Having children aged 6-17	-0.297	-0.105***	0.021	0.010
Religiosity	0.056	0.057	0.360	0.441****
Education (Highest diploma received)	-0.012	-0.011	0.042	0.054****
Labor force characteristics	-0.330	-0.106***	0.084	0.035**
Total net monthly household income	0.014	0.025	0.095	0.216****
Domestic help	-0.069	-0.020	0.238	0.091****
R Square	0.212****		0.255****	

Notes: ****Sig.<0.000; *** Sig.<0.005; ** Sig.<0.05; * Sig.<0.10.

the scope of volunteering were rather different. Only gender and having children 6 – 17 years old predicted both participation and scope of volunteering. Men were more likely to volunteer and volunteered more hours than women did. The parents of children aged 6 – 17 were more likely to volunteer, but when they did so, they volunteered less hours than the others. Yet, other predictors of participation in volunteering did not coincide with those of its scope. Whereas the decision to volunteer was positively affected by religiosity, education, net monthly household income and receiving domestic help, and was negatively affected by being married and having children aged 0 – 5, these factors were not found significant for the number of hours devoted to volunteering. Furthermore, age and employment were strong predictors of the scope of volunteering, but not for the decision to volunteer.

However, we found some conformity among determinants of participation in donating and its scope. Gender, age, religiosity, labor force characteristics, net monthly household income and receiving domestic help were significant predictors for both. Men were less likely to donate, but when they did so, they donated larger sums than women. Age was a positive predictor both for the choice to donate and the donated sums: older persons were more likely to donate and they donated larger sums than younger ones. Having children had opposite effects on the donation choice and the scope of donating. Respondents who had children aged 6 – 17 were significantly less likely to donate, but having small children (aged 0 – 5) significantly increased donated sums. The study revealed that the economic status was a strong predictor of donating: employed, high-income individuals and those who were

able to employ domestic help, were more likely to donate and donated larger sums than the others.

We found some striking parallels between determinants of volunteering and donating. However, some determinants positively predicted volunteering, but negatively predicted donating and vice versa. For example, men were more likely to volunteer, but less likely to donate than women. The same was revealed for people who had children (aged 6 – 17). Married persons, on the contrary, were more likely to donate and less likely to volunteer, than non-married. Gender, religiosity, household income and domestic help affected participation in volunteering or donating, whereas gender, age and employment affected their scopes.

In sum, gender, age, having children aged 6 – 17, religiosity, labor force characteristics, net monthly household income and receiving domestic help were salient factors predicting altruistic activity in terms of volunteering and donating money. The most salient of them was gender, significantly affecting all four analyzed dimensions of altruism.

References

1. **Andreoni, J. and Vesterlund, L.** (2001). Which is the fair sex? Gender differences in altruism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116 (1), pp. 293 – 312.
2. **Auten, G. and Joufaian, D.** (1996). Charitable contribution and intergenerational transfers. *Journal of Public Economics*, 59(1), pp. 55 – 68.
3. **Banks, J. O., Raciti, M. and Gadenne, D.** (2011) Why give? A multi-charity study of motivation. Proceedings of the *Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC)*

- Conference 2011: Marketing in the age of consumerism: Jekyll or Hyde?*, Perth, Western Australia : Edith Cowan University, 28-30 November 2011, pp. 1 – 9. 4. **Banks, J. and Tanner, S.** (1999). Patterns in household giving: Evidence from U.K. data. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10 (2), pp. 167 – 178. 5. **Bar-Tal, D.** (1986). Altruistic motivation to help: Definition, utility and operationalization. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 13, pp. 3 – 14. 6. **Bekkers, R.** (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, Personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26, pp. 439 – 54. 7. **Bekkers, R.** (2006). Traditional and health related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68 (4), pp. 349 – 366. 8. **Bekkers, R.** (2007). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1(3), pp. 139 – 144. 9. **Bekkers, R. and Schuyt, T.** (2008). And who is your neighbor? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 50 (1), pp. 74 – 96. 10. **Bekkers, R. and Wiepking, P.** (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy : Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), pp. 924 – 973. 11. **Brown, E. and Lankford, H.** (1992). Gifts of money and gifts of time: estimating the effects of tax prices and available time. *Journal of Public Economics*, 47, pp. 321 – 41. 12. **Caputo, R. K.** (1997). Women as volunteers and activists. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26, 156–174. 13. **Cnaan, R. A., Handy, F. and Wadsworth, M.** (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25 (3), pp. 364 – 383. 14. **Collett, J. L. and Morrissey, C. A.** (2007). *The social psychology of generosity: The state of current interdisciplinary research*. Report for the John Templeton Foundation Generosity Planning Project. – 45 p. 15. **Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A. and Penner, L. A.** (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum. 16. **Drever, E.** (2010). *2008-09 Citizenship survey: Volunteering and charitable giving topic report*. Department for Communities and Local Government: London. 17. **Duncan, B.** (1999). Modeling charitable contributions of time and money. *Journal of Public Economics*, 72, pp. 213 – 242. 18. **Einolf, C.** (2010). Does extensivity form part of the altruistic personality? An empirical test of Oliner and Oliner’s theory. *Social Science Research*, 39, pp. 142 – 151. 19. **Eisenberg, N. and Strayer, J.** (1987). *Empathy and its development*. Cambridge University Press. 20. **Fehr, E. and Schmidt, K. M.** (2005). *The economics of fairness, reciprocity and altruism – Experimental evidence and new theories*. Munich Discussion paper No. 2005-20, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. 21. **Gerstein, L. H., Wilkerson, D. A., and Anderson, H.** (2004). „Differences in Motivations of Paid Versus Nonpaid Volunteers.” *Psychological Reports*, 22. **Hill, M.** (2012). *The relationship between volunteering and charitable giving: review of evidence*. Working Paper, Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy (CGAP), Cass Business School. – 8 p. 23. **Hodgkinson, V. A. and Weitzman, M. S.** (1996) *Giving and volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector. 24. **Howard, J. A. and Piliavin, J. A.** (2000). *Altruism, in Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Ed. by E. F. Borgatta. New York: Macmillian. 25. **Global Giving: The Culture of Philanthropy** (2010). *Report of Barclays Wealth*. Retrieved from <http://www.barclayswealth.com/insights/global-giving-and-the-culture-of-philanthropy.htm> 25/09/2012. 26. **Ireland, N. J.** (2001). Status-seeking with voluntary contributions of money and work. *Annales d’Economie et de Statistique*, 63 – 64, pp. 155 – 170. 27. **Ironmonger, D.** (2006). *The economic value of volunteering in Queensland*. A report commissioned by the State of Queensland, Department of Communities. Retrieved 25/09/2012 from <http://www.communities.qld.gov.au/resources/communityservices/volunteering/documents/economic-value-of-volunteering.pdf>. 28. **Khoury, R. M. and Khoury, D. C.** (1981). Professionalization of police: A question of altruism. *Psychological Reports*, 49(3), Dec, 896-898. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1981.49.3.896. 29. **Lawson, R. and Ruderham, R.** (2009). Integrating fundraising and campaigning, *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 14, pp. 379 – 386. 30. **Lyons, M. and Nivison-Smith, I.** (2006). Religion and giving in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 41 (4) pp. 419 – 436. 31. **Maner, J. and Gaillot, M.** (2007). Altruism and egoism: Prosocial motivations for helping depend on relationship context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37 (2), pp. 347 – 358. 32. **McClelland, R. and Brooks, A.C.** (2004). What is the real relationship between income and charitable giving? *Public Finance Review*, 32 (5), pp. 483 – 497. 33. **Mesch, D.** (2009). Women and philanthropy: A literature review. Working Paper 4/09, The Center of Philanthropy, Women’s Philanthropy Institute, at Indiana State University, 14 p. 34. **Monsma, S. V.** (2007). Religion and philanthropic giving and volunteering: Building blocks for civic responsibility. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Religious Research*, 3, Article 1: www.religjournal.com. 35. **Musick, M. A. and Wilson, J.** (2008). *Volunteers: The social profile*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press. 36. **Okten, C. and Osili, U.O.** (2004). Contributions in heterogeneous communities: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17, pp. 603 – 626. 37. **Piliavin, J. A. and Charng, H.-W.** (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, pp. 27 – 65. 38. **Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. and Schervish, P. G.** (2001). A

methodological comparison of giving surveys: Indiana as a test case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30 (3), pp. 551 – 568. 39. **Rotolo, T. and Wilson, J.** (2007). The effects of children and employment status on the volunteer work of American women. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36 (3), pp. 487 – 503. 40. **Rotolo, T.** (2000). A time to join, a time to quit: The influence of life cycle transitions on voluntary association membership. *Social Forces*, 78(3), pp. 1133 – 1161. 41. **Rigdon, M. L. and Levine, A. S.** (2009). *The role of expectations and gender in altruism*. MPRA Paper No. 19372, University Library of Munich, Germany. 42. **Psychol, J. G.** (1998). Effects of age, gender, and participation in volunteer activities on the altruistic behavior of Chinese adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 159 (2), pp. 195 – 201. 43. **Sargeant, A.** (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behavior. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4), pp. 215 – 238. 44. **Sargeant, A., Ford, J. and West, D.** (2006). Perceptual determinants of nonprofit giving behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, pp.155 – 165. 45. **Snyder, M. and Omoto, A. M.** (2008). Volunteerism: Social issues perspectives and social policy implications. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 2 (1), pp. 1 – 36. 46. **Tiehen, L.** (2001). Tax policy and charitable contributions of money. *National Tax Journal*, 54 (4), pp. 707 – 723. 47. **Van Ingen, E. and Dekker, P.** (2011). Changes in the determinants of volunteering: Participation and time investment between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(4), pp. 682 – 702. 48. **Wilson, E. O.** (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press. 49. **Wilson, J.** (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, pp. 215 – 240.

Кушнірович Н., Рібовські Д. Чинники волонтерства і добродійності

Метою розвідки є дослідження волонтерства й добродійності як двох складових альтруїзму. У статті досліджений взаємовплив таких видів діяльності, а також розглянуто чинники волонтерства і добродійності. Робота заснована на моделі філантропії, розробленої Барклайс Велс, яка розглядає взаємодію між грошовими сумами і часом, витраченими на добродійну діяльність. Проведене дослідження виявило прямий зв'язок між волонтерством і добродійністю, хоча модель поведінки, що передбачає пожертву грошових сум, переважає над волонтерством. Визначено детермінанти волонтерства і добродійності, а також знайдено паралелі між ними. Основними чинниками, що визначають обидві розглянуті складові альтруїзму, є стать, вік, наявність дітей, релігійність, зайнятість, чистий місячний прибуток і наявність допомоги у

веденні домашнього господарства, а також по догляду за дітьми і літніми людьми.

Ключові слова: добродійність, зайнятість, дохід, діяльність.

Кушнірович Н., Рібовски Д. Факторы волонтерства и благотворительности

Целью данной статьи является исследование волонтерства и благотворительности как двух составляющих альтруизма. В данной статье исследовано взаимовлияние данных видов деятельности, а также рассмотрены факторы волонтерства и благотворительности. Данная работа основана на модели филантропии, разработанной Барклайс Велс, которая рассматривает взаимодействие между денежными суммами и временем, потраченными на благотворительную деятельность. Проведенное исследование выявило прямую связь между волонтерством и благотворительности, хотя модель поведения, предусматривающая жертвование денежных сумм, преобладает над волонтерством. Определены детерминанты волонтерства и благотворительности, а также найдены значительные параллели между ними. Основными факторами, определяющими оба рассмотренных составляющих альтруизма, являются пол, возраст, наличие детей, религиозность, занятость, чистый месячный доход и наличие помощи в ведении домашнего хозяйства, а также по уходу за детьми и престарелыми.

Ключевые слова: благотворительность, занятость, доход, деятельность.

Kushnirovich N., Ribovsky D. Determinants of Volunteering and Charitable Giving

The purpose of this study was to investigate altruistic activity in terms of volunteering and donation of money. The study examined the overlap between these two dimensions of altruism, as well as determinants driving people to volunteer or to donate money. The Barclays Wealth model of philanthropy, that takes the two components – contribution of money and time – together, was used. The study revealed a positive relationship between volunteering and donation of money, whereas the pattern of donating is preferred by the population more than the pattern of volunteering. Some striking parallels between determinants of volunteering and donating were found. Gender, age, having children, religiosity, labor force participation, net monthly household income and receiving domestic help were salient factors predicting altruistic activity in terms of both volunteering and donating money.

Key words: charity, employment, profit, activity.

Received by the editors: 07.09.2012
and final form 20.11.2012