1-1-2013

Charitable Giving: Motivations, Deterrents & Consequences

Jennifer Lawson
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations

CHARITABLE GIVING: MOTIVATIONS, DETERRENTS AND CONSEQUENCES

by

JENNIFER M. LAWSON

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2013

MAJOR: SOCIOLOGY

Approved By:

_____
Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Emma Lou Peterson, and my father J. B. Lawson.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Charitable giving is suggested to be the most beneficial exchange that anyone can engage in as all parties involved in the activity benefit. Past studies have indicated donors receive intangible and tangible rewards from benevolent acts (Andreoni, 1990; Duclos, 2008; Houle, Sagarin & Kaplan, 2005; Schervish, 1997; Shervish, 2000; Schervish & Havens, 1998). The recipients of gifts, often nonprofits, have also benefited from the contributions of donors who are often motivated to reap a reward (Anik, Aknin, Norton, & Dunn, 2009). Donating financial resources (Barman, 2007; Lee Piliavin, Call, 1999), personal "time" (Barman, 2007, 1416; Goss, 1999; Lee, Piliavin, Call, 1999), blood (Barman, 2007; 1422 Healy, 2000; Lee, Piliavin, Call, 1999), helping activities (Barman, 2007, 1419), body parts, and organs are all examples of charitable giving (Barman, 2007). In 2009, $303.75 billion (Giving USA, 2010) and approximately 8.1 billion hours of volunteer work were donated to nonprofit organizations (Bureau of Labor, 2011; Independent Sector, 2010). The majority of funds and time donated was designated to faith based organizations, educational entities, foundations, and human service organizations (Giving USA, 2010).

Past studies on charitable giving have focused on defining charitable giving and identifying mobilizing factors. Studies have also uncovered positive consequences of charitable giving. These studies have used both quantitative and qualitative methods and they have been based on a variety of theoretical frameworks such as the identification model, the family life course perspective, human capital theory, and social exchange

theory. These studies have also originated from a variety of disciplines such as political science, sociology, economics, psychology, consumer sciences, and religious studies. Much of this work assumes the reasons for participation in charitable giving provide a foundation for deduction into the reasons for non-participation. Additionally, these studies have implied that charitable giving is a win-win situation for all parties involved. There is no research, to my knowledge, that has identified negative consequences of charitable giving or how individuals who participate in charitable giving differ from individuals who do not participate.

Originating Questions

What are the reasons that a person decides not to participate in charitable giving?

What are the reasons that a person participates in charitable giving?

What are some of the consequences of engaging in charitable giving?

How are individuals who engage in charitable giving different than individuals who do not participate?

Rationale

The purpose of this study is to learn why individuals engage in charitable giving, to learn why individuals choose not to participate in charitable giving, to uncover any consequences, positive and negative, that result from engaging in charitable giving and to learn how individuals who participate in charitable giving differ from individuals who do not participate. Research has identified several factors that influence individuals to engage in charitable giving; however, I wish to uncover additional motivating factors.

Limited research has focused on the items that influence a person not to participate in charitable giving and outcomes of charitable giving. Past research on giving cessation has been quantitative and conducted mostly by the Independent Sector (Independent Sector, 2001). Research on giving cessation has also focused on populations of wealthy donors who identified four primary reasons that they ceased participation in charitable giving: "too frequent solicitation, being asked for an inappropriate amount, the decision to support another cause or a change in household circumstance" (Indiana University, 2010, 65).

Charitable giving statistics indicate fewer people volunteered in 2010 than in the previous year. It is estimated that approximately 26% of the United States population in 2010 volunteered time, a decline of 0.5% from the previous year (Bureau of Labor, 2011). Additionally, a reasonably small percentage of individuals, approximately 20%, have been credited for the livelihood of most nonprofit organizations (Iannaccone, 1997; Wilhelm, 2006). Moreover, existing literature on charitable giving has only discussed positive outcomes of the activity and research has failed to provide information as to how individuals who participate in charitable giving are different than non-participants. If charitable giving is truly an activity that benefits everyone, one would think that more people would participate.

This qualitative research will add further knowledge to the literature on charitable giving by showing charitable giving is not beneficial for all participants. It will provide further insight into the reasons a person chooses to engage or not engage in charitable

giving. In addition, it will describe the circumstance which influences charitable participation or abstention. Most importantly, it will debunk the myth that charitable giving yields only positive results by explaining some negative outcomes of the activity. The information gathered from this study will provide nonprofit organizations with valuable information that can assist in cultivating relationships with donors, the most important resource if charitable organizations wish to continue to provide needed resources in a time of unstable and declining funding sources.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

<u>Altruism: The Basis of Charitable Giving</u>

Charitable giving originates from the idea of altruism. Altruism in summary is "a concern for others" (Rushton, 1982, 425). Altruism is a concept that is found throughout the world yet is defined differently in the various disciplines. The contrasting definitions of altruism lead many to ask whether altruism really exists and what comprises altruism. In sociobiology, "the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior" (Wallace and Wolf, 2006, 297), altruism is defined as any behavior that an organism engages in to benefit another organism or improve life opportunities (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Rushton, 1982; Simmons, 1991; Wuthnow, 1993). According to this definition, plants can be altruistic if they deliberately alter their growth so that another plant benefits (Rushton, 1982) and a person that provides free tutorial services to a student is also altruistic.

Sociobiologists such as Edward Wilson suggest that all species including humans are programmed to engage in altruistic behavior. Altruism has roots in genetics and culture. The form of altruism, intensity, and manner in which the behavior is displayed is determined by society yet the essential sentiment of altruism is heredity (Neal, 1982; Simmons, 1991). There are two types of altruism: egotistic (Neal, 1982; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Simmons, 1991; Wuthnow, 1993). and "pure" altruism (Piliavin and Charng, 1990, 53) Egoistic altruism results from an individual wanting to increase personal mood, because one has learned that the behavior is appropriate, to relieve or eliminate negative

feelings of self, garner praise from peers, avoid or reduce punishment or to create a positive self image (Duclos, 2008; Neal, 1982; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Simmons, 1991;). Egoistic altruism, the most common form of altruism, is also known as "soft core altruism" (Neal, 1982, 9). It is defined as any helping behavior that is reserved only for a specific group of people and is influenced by culture (Neal, 1982; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Simmons, 1991). Individuals who engage in egoistic altruism often do so because society has trained them to do so (Neal, 1982; Simmons, 1991). This altruism is often rooted in "lying, pretense and deceit-including self deceit" (Neal, 1982, 9) because the individual performing the act has convinced others including self that he or she is performing the act to benefit someone other than self (Neal, 1982; Wuthnow, 1993).

Pure altruism or "hard core" altruism (Neal, 1982, 9) is normally behavior that is exhibited towards loved ones or relatives. Pure altruism typically occurs when an organism or species is trying to ensure its survival or kin survival. This altruism is done without the expectation of any reward or punishment and involves performance of a behavior that society considers extremely harmful such as organ donation (Neal, 1982; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Simmons, 1991). Results from research conducted by Roberta Simmons on organ donors indicated that 57% of all donors were family members (Simmons, 1991).

In the field of psychology, the definition of altruism is focused on "intentions,… benefits, …and costs to the actor" (Piliavin and Charng, 1990, 30). Psychologists define altruism as any action that meets the following criteria: "(a) The action must benefit

another person, (b) the action must be voluntary, (c) the action must be intentional, (d) the only benefit of the action is the benefit to the other person, and, (e) the action must be performed without expectation of reward" (Piliavin and Charng, 1990, 30). If one defines altruism using the definition commonly used in psychology, charitable giving is not always an altruistic behavior because individuals sometimes engage in charitable giving to reap rewards (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Rushton, 1982; Schervish, 1997). In sociology, altruism is commonly defined as any behavior that appears to be performed by an actor for the benefit of someone else (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Rushton, 1982). Historically, sociologists have focused on the behavior and not the intentions behind the behavior (Rushton, 1982). Comte (Neal, 1982; Simmons, 1991; Wuthnow, 1993), Rousseau (Wuthnow, 1993), Durkheim (Simmons, 1991; Simpson, 1953; Wuthnow, 1993), Weber (Wuthnow, 1993), and Sorokin (Neal, 1982, Simmons, 1991; Simpson, 1953; Wuthnow, 1993) are all noted sociologists who discuss altruism.

Altruism was invented by Auguste Comte, the founder of sociology (Neal, 1982; Wuthnow, 1993). Comte defined altruism as an "unselfish regard for the welfare of others" (Neal, 1982, 6). For altruism to exist, Comte believed that:

> The individual must subordinate himself to an Existence outside of himself in order to find in it the source of his stability. And this condition cannot be effectually realized except under the impulse of propensities prompting him to live for others. The being, whether man or animal, who loves nothing outside himself, and really lives for himself alone, is by that very fact condemned to spend his life in a miserable alternation of ignoble torpor and uncontrolled excitement. Evidently the principal feature of Progress in all living things is that the general consensus which we have seen to be the essential attribute of vitality should become more perfect. It

follows that happiness and worth, as well as individuals as in societies, depend on adequate ascendancy of the sympathetic instincts. Thus the expression, Live for Others, is the simplest summary of the whole moral code of Positivism. (as cited in Campbell, 2006, 359-360).

Comte's definition of altruism is unlike the definition used in psychology or sociobiology. It is not focused on the motive or possible benefits the actor will receive. It is simply concerned with the well being of the collective (Campbell, 2006).

According to Jean Jacques Rousseau, altruism is natural for all men. Rousseau is known for his work on the natural state of man. He believed that man lived in two environments: "the natural and the social" (Zeitlin, 2001, 17). In the natural state, man lives primarily isolated and focused only on resources that are available to fulfill his needs. Man in the natural state requires the minimum-nutrition, sleep and a partner. As a result of the simple environment that man exists in, he is able to fulfill his needs and live comfortably. Despite living predominantly in isolation, Rousseau suggests that it is in the natural state man learns how to feel sympathy for the less fortunate. Man's ability to empathize and relate to others is something that goes against his instincts but it is something that commonly occurs. Rousseau's idea of this natural state was one of great conflict because it contrasted the ideas of Thomas Hobbes (Zeitlin, 2001).

Thomas Hobbes asserted that the natural environment of man was one filled with conflict and competition. As a result of the conflict, altruism was impossible. Hobbes believed that altruism was not possible because man lived in a society that contained limited resources such as nutrition and a partner. The lack of resources created environments in which man was not interested in understanding the feelings of others, but

only interested in fighting for resources that would guarantee personal survival (Zeitlin, 2001). Rousseau countered Hobbes, arguing that tension, competition, and the idea of scarce resources are things that man learns in the social environment and as a result, tension and competition are created. Rousseau further suggested that if man never learned about tension and scarce resources, conflict may never exist (Zeitlin, 2001).

Emile Durkheim is arguably the most important contributor to functionalism because his ideas regarding social solidarity (Wallace and Wolf, 2006) suggested that altruism exists in every society, mechanical or organic, and is found "…at the very dawn of humanity and even in the form that exceeds all bounds…" (Durkheim, 1997, 144-145). It is one of the many moral rules that govern human behavior (Wallace and Wolf, 2006). Mechanical societies are small homogenous populations linked together via economics, politics, and religion (Morrison, 2006). One will find strong social cohesion that stems from low individualism and a system of law that is based on custom, obligation, and social duties in these environments (Durkheim, 1997; Morrison, 2006). In mechanical societies, altruism is commonly exhibited in the form of altruistic suicide. Altruistic suicide occurs because social ties are tremendously strong and one feels that "it is his duty" (Durkheim and Simpson, 1997, 219) to do so. Failure to perform this duty will lead to punishment, loss of honor, and a life of turmoil. Examples of altruistic suicide are present throughout history. Danish warriors often terminated their lives to avoid the shame of old age and an existence full of suffering that they would face if they chose to continue living (Durkheim and Simpson, 1997). In 1817, over 700 women committed

suicide after the death of their husbands. In Gaul, servants committed suicide after royal leaders died (Durkheim and Simpson, 1997). In each circumstance, the parties involved committed suicide out of obligation.

Organic societies have large populations of individuals who are dispersed across large geographic areas. Organic societies are characterized by individualism and job specialization. In these environments, individuals are tied together because each person is an expert in one area only and that forces him or her to depend on someone else (Durkheim. 1997; Morrison, 2006). Altruistic behavior is commonly exhibited in organic societies. Examples of altruistic behavior in organic societies include research conducted to see if individuals would assist someone who fell in a New York subway. In this study, the investigator observed that over 80% of the passengers offered assistance to the injured person (Rushton, 1982). Other examples of altruism in the present include the immeasurable number of individuals who provide directions to a person in need (Rushton, 1982) or the millions of people that donate blood each year (American Red Cross, 2006; Rushton, 1982).

Max Weber recognized that goals and values influence societal functioning and power structures in society. He suggested that power was obtained in society through three types of authority: "traditional, rational, and charismatic" (Weber, 1978, 215). Traditional authority is rooted in historical context, i.e., authority is passed down through successive generations according to established tradition. Rational authority stems from formal rules created by individuals placed in power (Weber, 1978). Charismatic authority

is power that results "from devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Weber, 1978, 215). Individuals who possess charismatic authority are considered to have the "gift of grace" (Morrison, 2006, 364) and posses qualities that go beyond mundane activities of life (Morrison, 364). These individuals often come forward from society and they may be religious leaders. These individuals may or may not engage in altruistic behavior. Nevertheless, if they choose to engage in such behavior, it is because they feel it is their duty to carry out the requests of the people who support them which may include conflict resolution and improvement in social conditions (Morrison, 2006). Martin Luther King, Jr. and Moammar Ghadafi are examples of charismatic leaders. King is known for his work with the Civil Rights Movement, which fought to eliminate inequality and discrimination faced by African-Americans. Moammar Ghadafi, the current leader of Libya, is known for killing his own followers, an action that many consider to be everything but altruistic.

Pitirim Sorokin devoted a significant amount of time to the study of altruism. Sorokin was the first director of the Harvard Research Center in Altruistic Integration and Creativity (HRCAIC) which had a mission to conduct research that focused on fostering altruism and understanding and creating tools that would allow scholars to distinguish between egoistic and altruistic behavior (Neal, 1982; Simpson, 1953). Sorokin's contribution to the literature on altruism aligned with the mission of the HRCAIC. His most notable work focused on the process that leads a person to engage in altruistic

behavior and the techniques one could use to develop an altruistic personality (Allen, 1963). Sorokin suggested:

> The transformation of man, in the sense of his becoming altruistic, can be achieved only through the maximum realization of his superior potentialities: supraconscious and conscious. Through mobilization of these superior energies, the individual succeeds in organizing, ordering, and controlling the inferior and unconscious forces and in using them, at the same time, as a means of vital and mental, as well as social ennoblement (as cited in Allen, 1963, 174).

Once man has completed the mobilization and reorganization process, he will be able to eliminate the negative influences in his life and engage in altruistic behavior (Allen, 1963). Sorokin asserted the altruistic personality is developed when the following factors are present: genetics, innovation, ideas, free will and chance (Allen, 1963). These five factors create three types of altruists: "the early fortunate altruist, the late altruist and the intermediate altruist" (Allen, 1963, 175).

Individuals who are considered to have extraordinary abilities because of their heredity may engage in altruistic behavior. These individuals often assume the role of the early fortunate altruist, a person who engages in selfless behavior because he has been given authority, praise, and fortune due to his family of origin (Allen, 1963). Some examples of early fortunate altruists include John Woolman and Albert Schweitzer (Allen, 1963). It should be noted that not all wealthy heirs partake in altruistic behavior. In 2010, Forbes published its list of the world's wealthiest 400 people; however, only seventeen people on the list were recognized on the list of the world's top 50 philanthropists (Di Mento and Preston, 2010).

Individuals who encounter conflicting ideas and values in life may become late altruists (Allen, 1963). These selfless people are typically born from life experiences such as "depression" (Allen, 1963, 175) and "disillusionments" (Allen, 1963, 175) that alter their attitudes, values, and identity (Allen, 1963). People who become late altruists experience a transformation process that is characterized by a period of isolation similar to the experience of individuals who enter into monasteries (Allen, 1963). St. Francis of Assisi and Buddha are two examples of late altruists (Allen, 1963). Intermediate altruists, such as Gandhi, engage in selfless behavior; yet, their primary motivation is unknown. These individuals are typically motivated by a combination of factors such as environment, conflicting views, past experiences, and family ties (Allen, 1963).

Sorokin suggested that a common set of tools must be available to encourage individuals to engage in altruistic behavior and advocated for the use of the following techniques as effective measures to evoke altruistic behavior: "self identification of the individual with altruistic values" (Allen, 1963, 177), examples of heroic behavior, "pressures of public opinion" (Allen, 1963, 177), "psychoanalysis, the fine arts, private and public prayer, an examination of the conscience, private and public confessions" (Allen, 1963, 177), promises, and periods of silence (Allen, 1963). Sorokin also suggested that one should promote a "monastic life" (Allen, 1963, 178) full of education to encourage altruistic behavior. This life focuses on living life based on love and with God. If one wishes to live such a lifestyle, then he or she must show dedication and complete a "series of tests" (Allen, 1963, 178) that include a display of humbleness,

discipline, submission, and the ability to live life without material objects, affluence, and even family (Allen, 1963). The monastic life provides the opportunity for individuals to begin the transformation process necessary to develop the altruistic personality (Allen, 1963).

Examining the various sources of literature on altruism has led one to select a working definition of charitable giving that is comprehensive and includes ideas from the various perspectives. For the purpose of this research, charitable giving is defined as any behavior, voluntary or involuntary, that one engages in to benefit someone else. This behavior may or may not be self harming and may benefit the actor. Behavioral scientists throughout history have provided examples of behavior that has been defined as altruistic that satisfies all of the above criteria.

__Determinants of Charitable Giving__

Individuals participate in charitable giving for a variety of reasons that include the following: "communities of participation, frameworks of consciousness, direct requests, models and experiences from youth, discretionary resources, rewards, demographic characteristics, and urgency and effectiveness" (Schervish, 1997, 112-113; Schervish and Havens, 1998; see also Duclos, 2008; Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan, 2005). Communities of participation are "formal or informal networks" (Schervish, 1997, 112) or "groups and organizations in which one participates" (Schervish, 1997, 112). Communities of participation provide opportunities for social interaction that allow donors to maintain relationships with loved ones and people of importance (Garner and

Wagner, 1991). Individuals who have multiple communities of participation are more likely to volunteer than individuals with a few because most invitations to participate in charitable giving result from private requests (Wilson, 2000).

Communities of participation are jobs, and normative organizations. They may also be people who align to provide assistance to the needy (Schervish and Havens, 1998). Fifty percent of all individuals who are asked to participate in charitable giving at work decide to participate. As a result, workplace campaigns have become an important source of support for many nonprofit organizations (Barman, 2007; Hodgkinson and Wetizman, 1994).

The United Way is known for conducting workplace charitable campaigns. Founded during the Progressive Era to ensure nonprofits had an efficient system to seek funding, the United Way has become renowned for working with agencies which desire to raise funds for charities. Recently, scholars have shown interest in the way that workplace campaigns influence charitable contributions (Barman, 2007).

Donor control research studies the conditions and restrictions that donors place on gifts to charity (Barman, 2007). Modern research on donor control has studied donor designations in workplace settings in which organizations have provided employees with the option to choose the charitable organization (Barman, 2007). This research has shown that work environments influence donor control. Workplace campaigns that occur in organizations where donors are encouraged to give to any charity of their choice have a large number of donors who give to a wide range of charities. Additionally, it has been

noted that donors are more likely to donate larger gifts when allowed to pick the recipient (Barman, 2007; Miller, 1991). Campaigns that occur in companies that do not encourage donors to give to various charitable causes have a significantly smaller number of donors (Barman, 2007).

Frameworks of consciousness are patterns of "thinking and feeling" (Schervish, 1997; 114) that lead one to commit to a charitable organization or cause (Schervish, 1997; Schervish & Havens, 1998). Empathy and anger are two of the most influential frameworks of consciousness that motivates individuals to participate in charitable giving. In one study that examined empathy levels in high school and college students, participants were given a 33 question empathy survey that asked about empathetic behavior. Individuals who responded favorably to questions such as "it makes me sad to see a lonely stranger in a group" (Rushton, 1982, 432) were determined to have high levels of empathy and more likely to participate in charitable giving (Rushton, 1982).

A study that was conducted to uncover the motivation of September 11, 2001 (9/11) volunteers indicated that many individuals helped out because they were angry (Beyerlein and Sikkink, 2008). Frameworks of consciousness are similar to the values function that psychologists maintain motivates individuals to participate in charitable giving. The values function states that individuals engage in altruistic acts because they are concerned about others and have a desire to help (Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan, 2005; Schervish 1997). In a study conducted to test the legitimacy of the values function, over

70% of all respondents stated they engaged in charitable acts because they wanted "to help others" (Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan, 2005, 338).

Direct requests by individuals or organizations often lead many to participate in charitable giving. Research indicates individuals are more likely to give if they are solicited. However, the method that one uses to request participation may contribute to a higher donation. Direct requests are most successful when they come from someone who is involved in the same community of participation as the donor. According to Schervish (1997), requests for charitable gifts are the least successful when they are from a phone solicitations, door-to-door solicitations, or from a coworker requesting a donation for a workplace campaign or charity (Schervish, 1997; Schervish and Havens, 1998).

Models and experiences from youth are "positive models or experiences" (Schervish and Havens, 1998, 2) from childhood that influence one to participate in charitable giving. They are sources of knowledge (Schervish and Havens, 1998). Parents are the most common models for children and they are believed to have the biggest influence on a child's behavior. Lee, Piliavin and Call (1999) and Rushton (1982) have suggested parents are the primary influence in the formation of altruistic behavior in their children and modeling often leads a child to engage in charitable activities. Studies have shown that adolescents are more likely to participate in charitable giving if their parents participate. This is suggested to occur because parents, through modeling, teach their children the importance of charitable giving (Wilson, 2000). Research on Jewish rescuers indicated that most of the rescuers engaged in altruistic behavior because they observed a

parent who engaged in a similar behavior (Pilavian and Charng, 1999). Lee, Piliavin, and Call (1999) conducted research on mobilizing factors for financial donations, volunteerism, and donations of blood. It was discovered that many present day blood donors witnessed a parent giving blood during childhood. In a study on helping behaviors conducted by Piliavin and Callen, over 60% of university students revealed they donated blood because their families donated (Piliavin and Charng, 1999).

The amount "of one's discretionary resources of time and money determine charitable giving involvement" (Schervish; 1997, 115; Schervish and Havens, 1998). Most research has suggested that individuals with large amounts of discretionary time, such as the retired, are more likely to volunteer. However, some studies have argued that individuals with more flexible time volunteer less often than someone that works full-time (Wilson, 2000). Individuals who are not in the labor market, such as the unemployed, do not volunteer as much because they lack an important community of participation that provides opportunities for social interaction needed for invitations to charitable giving (Schervish and Havens, 1998; Wilson, 2000). While contrasting views exist regarding discretionary time, research has proven repeatedly that individuals and families with higher incomes and wealth are more likely to participate in charitable giving.

Families of varying affluence participate in charitable giving. It is estimated that "65% of all households donate to charity each year (COPPS, 2007, 5). The "average household gift to a charitable cause is currently $2,213" (COPPS, 2007, 5). It has been

documented that the proportions of financial resources donated vary as a result of wealth (Schervish, 2008). Families with incomes of $125,000 or less "donate an average of one to two percent of their income" (Shervish, 2000) to charities while families with higher incomes give a maximum of five percent of their income to charity (Schervish, 2000). Approximately 98% of all affluent families give to charity each year (Indiana University, 2010). The majority of these families indicated that supporting their neighborhood was their primary motivation. These families for the most part supported organizations that provide "basic needs education, health, or religious services" (Indiana University, 2010, 25). "Approximately $800 billion" (Schervish, 2000, 5) will get allocated to charities by wealthy families (e.g. families with wealth over "one million" (Schervish, 2000, 5) by the year 2020 (Schervish, 2000; Schervish, 2008). Schervish (2008) has suggested that involvement in charitable giving is the strongest amongst wealthy individuals because of hyperagency.

Hyperagency is a trait that leads the wealthy to donate. It provides well-to-do individuals with the opportunity to control circumstances in which they coexist with others and create worlds that are full of autonomy, self rule, and free of regulation (Schervish, 2008). Hyperagency is dependent on a donor accepting self as a "demigod" (Schervish, 2000, 7), self-empowerment, and the ability to construct an environment that will meet personal interests. A demigod is person who realizes his or her ability to cause change surpasses that of the average person (Schervish, 2000: Schervish, 2008). Many wealthy donors are able to dictate their circumstances to produce situations that benefit

themselves such as jobs, homes, and even charitable organizations (Schervish, 2008). It is believed that the majority of money donated to charity by the year 2052 will be given to new nonprofits that have been created by the wealthy (Schervish, 2008; Strom, 2002). By the year 2009, 1,238,201 nonprofits existed in the United States. This is an increase of four percent from the year 2008 and an increase of 51% from the year 2000 (Giving USA, 2010).

Individuals from low-income families also participate in charitable giving. However, their involvement differs from wealthy families. Individuals from low-income families volunteer large amounts of time to religious and community activities as well as youth (McBride, Sherradon, and Pritzker, 2006). They dedicate time to activities that benefit the entire community, in particular its elderly members (McBride, Sherradon, and Pritzker, 2006).

The rewards of charitable giving, whether intrinsic or extrinsic, have also been identified as motivations (Schervish and Havens, 1998). It is not uncommon for individuals to give to organizations and charitable causes that will benefit self (Garner and Wagner, 1991). Each year, many people make donations because they want the recognition that accompanies the gift. Alumni of universities frequently donate large gifts so that they may be recognized with a building, landmark, or in the media (Harbaugh, 1998). When an individual engages in altruistic behavior to reap such a benefit it is called "impure altruism" (Andreoni, 1990, 464) or "warm glow giving" (Andreoni, 1990, 464). Improvements in self-esteem, improvements in cognitive interest, guilt reduction,

approval of friends, prestige, and social acclaim are common rewards that some charitable giving participants receive from their donation (Duclos, 2008; Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan, 2005; Schervish, 1997).

In 2008, Duclos conducted a three stage research project on motivations of volunteerism and financial giving using students from a southeastern American University that experienced "ego-threats" (2). Ego-threats are any circumstance or event that threatens an individual's sense of self worth such as failing an exam or ending a relationship (Duclos, 2008). His research revealed that individuals with low self-esteem as a result of ego-threats engage in altruistic behavior to improve their image of self. Duclos (2008) also discovered these individuals, on average, donate more time and money to charitable causes than individuals with favorable opinions of self. However, he noted that individuals with low self-esteem preferred to donate time to charitable causes. Duclos (2008) concluded that people who have negative self images due to ego-threats choose to volunteer time because it provides an opportunity to reestablish self respect. For example, an individual who performs horribly on a biology exam is likely to engage in charitable giving activities that allow him or her to assist someone with biology to prove to self that he or she knows biology.

Cialdini et al., (1987) performed research to determine if individuals engage in charitable acts to relieve personal feelings of grief. They theorized that individuals experience feelings of sadness when they observe others in need. It was further suggested that an individual's feelings of sorrow motivated them to give. However, they asserted

that people provide assistance simply because they want to eliminate their feelings of grief and not because they want to help the less fortunate. The results of this research supported the ideas of Cialdini and et al. that most participants assisted someone in need so that they could eliminate their individual unhappiness and not because they were generally concerned (Cialdini et al., 1987).

While research on charitable giving suggests that rewards are mobilizing factors, there is other evidence that suggests that rewards are not the strongest predictors of charitable giving. Schervish & Havens (1998) discovered that a donor's "communities of participation, direct requests, and discretionary income" were the foremost predictors of altruistic behavior (2). These results have been supported in various media sources such as the Straits Times. Wendy Cheng (2003), a National Kidney Foundation donor, states that many donors do not give to charity for a reward and she also suggests that charities should not reward donors with gifts. "….I would not give to organizations that use gifts to raise funds. I also want to point out that there are a lot of like minded people out there….After all charity is about giving and giving freely" (Cheng, 2003, 1-2).

Demographic variables such as employment status, sex, position in life course, and education influence decisions to engage in charitable giving (Schervish, 1997). Each year, millions of people donate time and financial resources to organizations. In 2010, over 62 million individuals volunteered time with a charitable organization (Bureau of Labor, 2011). Many organizations are able to provide services to people in need because they receive support from volunteers (Reed, Aquino, and Levy, 2007; Giving USA,

2010). Individuals with high ranking jobs or high status in the community are more likely to give money to charitable causes. This is suggested to occur because these individuals allocate most of their time to their careers and activities associated with their employment. It has also been suggested that these individuals have less time to donate to activities that are not tied to their employment (Reed, Aquino, and Levy, 2007). Sundeen (1990), however, disagrees that individuals in high status roles volunteer less time than people in lower status roles. Sundeen (1990) has argued that people with jobs dedicate large amounts of time to volunteerism but their time is spent with professional organizations and not agencies that provide direct services.

Middle-aged adults who are married with or without children have been shown to volunteer time more than anyone else (Sundeen, 1990). However, single parents with children of "preschool age and school age" (Sundeen, 1990, 492) volunteer more frequently than individuals who do not have children. It has been suggested that these parents engage in charitable activities so frequently because their children are older and don't require the same high level of care that they did when they were younger (Sundeen, 1990). Married individuals with children dedicate the majority of their volunteer time to educational and religious organizations while single parents spend most of their time volunteering in religious organizations. This has been suggested to occur because most single parents are employed and faith based organizations provide resources that single parents need such as childcare (Sundeen, 1990). Regardless of income, studies have shown that women participate in charitable giving more often than men and they give

more financially to charity than men (Garner and Wagner, 1991). Twenty nine percent of all women volunteer versus 23% of men and it is asserted that Caucasians volunteer at more than other ethnic groups (Bureau of Labor, 2011). Education correlates with volunteerism (Wilson, 2000). Individuals who have a college degree participate in charitable giving more often than individuals without a high school diploma (Bureau of Labor, 2011). Education provides information about social problems, fosters empathy and self esteem development. Additionally, it fosters skill development, skills that are valuable to employers (Schervish and Havens, 1998; Wilson, 2000).

Urgency and effectiveness is an individual's sense of how essential and valuable his or her assistance will be in meeting a need (Schervish, 1997). If people feel that their assistance is needed to solve a problem, they are more likely to provide help (Schervish, 1997). Urgency and effectiveness is impacted by circumstantial factors such as the bystander effect, also known as free-riding. It is also impacted by the characteristics of the population in need, the sex of the potential helper, and the cause of need (Kreps, 1984; Piliavin and Charng, 1990). The bystander effect states that individuals are less likely to get involved in charitable giving or any helping behavior if others are available to provide help (Pillivan and Charng, 1990). Bystander effect occurs when a potential helper questions why he or she should provide aid when someone else is available, if the potential helper is influenced not to help by others, or if the potential helper has personal beliefs that influence their decision to provide help (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Simmons, 1991).

Sex differences influence urgency and effectiveness. Men and women both engage in helping activities; however, research on helping behaviors indicates that females are more likely to provide assistance and receive help (Eagley and Crowley, 1986). Helping behavior is regulated by social norms as other social behaviors and as a result, women are often encouraged to disregard their own needs to fulfill the needs of others (Eagley and Crowley, 1986). Women are taught from birth to assume social roles which encourage service such as being a caregiver and often find employment in fields in where they are to support someone else. Women also occupy a lower status in society in comparison to men. As a result, they are often only left with options to provide assistance to the less fortunate (Eagley and Crowley, 1986).

Men are encouraged to provide aid but the circumstances in which they are taught to provide help vary completely from circumstances of women. Men are not socialized to help routinely like women. They are taught to provide help only in the most dangerous and risky situations or circumstances that typically involve a threat to a woman or child (Eagley and Crowley, 1986). Since risky occurrences are rare, men have been shown to provide help less often than women. Additionally, women in general receive more help than men (Eagley and Crowley, 1986).

Disaster research indicates that helping behaviors increase during a catastrophe or crisis (Kreps, 1984; Simmons, 1991). Disaster research focuses on "events, observable in time and space, in which societies or their larger subunits (e.g., communities, regions) incur physical damages and losses and/or disruption of their routine functioning" (Kreps,

1984, 312). Disaster research first became an area of interest in the 1950's when scientists wanted to know how human behavior changed during a crisis (Fritz and Williams, 1957).

In 1957, Fritz and Williams analyzed human behavior in over 40 local and national disasters, and discovered that disasters lead to an increase in altruistic behaviors. According to Fritz and Williams (1957), there is "strong movement toward the disaster" (46) by individuals impacted by the crisis as well as outsiders:

> Within minutes following most domestic disasters, thousands of persons begin to converge on the disaster area and on first aid stations, hospitals, relief, and communications centers in the disaster environs. Simultaneous with this physical movement of persons, incoming messages of anxious inquiry and offers of help from all parts of the nation and foreign countries begin to overload existing telephone, telegraph and other communications and information facilities and centers. Shortly following, tons of unsolicited equipment and supplies of clothing, food, bedding and other material begin arriving in the disaster area or in nearby relief centers (46).

Two examples of this convergent behavior are the 1953 Flint-Beecher Tornado and the 1952 White County Arkansas tornado. In June 1953, Flint, Michigan was overwhelmed by a tornado. Volunteers were the primary source of support for the community and evacuated the majority of the victims to hospitals within two hours of the disaster (Fritz and Williams, 1957). On March 21, 1952, a tornado devastated White County, Arkansas injuring and killing many people (Carr, 1952). During this disaster, 32% of the population near to the disaster area volunteered and provided emergency relief within 30 minutes of the disaster (Fritz and Williams, 1957). In both the Flint-Beecher and White

County disasters, volunteers responded with assistance before emergency personnel (Fritz and Williams, 1957).

Disaster researchers maintain disasters increase social solidarity, which results in an outpouring of support (Beyerlein and Sikkink, 2008; Nelson, 1977). Emergencies lead to a "resurgence of mechanical solidarity" (Nelson, 1977, 264) or "Gemeinschaft" (Nelson, 1977, 264). On September 11, 2001 (9/11), the World Trade Center was bombed and approximately ten percent of all Americans provided aid to victims of the bombing. The majority of people who provided help to victims of the attack did so because they identified with the victims or felt it was their duty to provide assistance. Their identification stemmed from the following: closeness to the disaster site, feelings of sorrow or empathy, a personal relationship with a person impacted by the disaster, and their involvement with other organizations (Beyerlein and Sikkank, 2008).

Approximately 18.1 % of all 9/11 volunteers resided near the disaster site. Forty six percent of all 9/11 volunteers participated because they empathized with victims and 30% helped because they knew a person directly affected by the bombing. A significant portion of all volunteers provided aid efforts because they were involved with other organizations that provided relief or organized commemorative events (Beyerlein and Sikkink, 2008). The results of the Murrah Federal Building Bombing study of human behavior yielded similar results. On April 19, 1995, the Alfred Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma was bombed (Belluck, 1995). Approximately 75% of the Murrah bombing volunteers had a history of volunteering and the majority of the

volunteers participated because they personally knew someone that was injured or killed because of the event (St. John and Fuchs, 2002).

Charitable Giving: Political Ideology as a Possible Motivation

In self-governing societies such as the United States, the role that politics plays in charitable giving is of great interest. Political scientists are aware the topic of charitable giving facilitates disagreement amongst individuals that align themselves in opposing teams of liberals and conservatives. These two groups have historically assumed antagonistic stances on the importance of charitable giving, in particular forms of charity that are known as social welfare programs or public charity (Huddy, et al., 2001; Obler, 1986). Social programs, such as Medicaid, have been praised by liberals as being a form of needed charity as they provide assistance to the less fortunate, but they have been criticized by conservatives who are not eager to provide support to a group of people whom they feel are only in need of assistance as a result of their failure to adequately prepare for life (Huddy, et al., 2001). Political scientists have been able to explain how politics influence an individual's opinion of public charity using two models: The State Charity Model and Moral Duty Model. Both were used to investigate the impact attitudes have on charitable support and through the development of personality scales of liberals and conservatives (Obler, 1986).

The State Charity Model implies that support of social programs or public charity has resulted from donors feeling concern for the less fortunate. This concern leads to generosity. Unsure exactly how to support the needy, liberals may decide to rely on the

government to distribute resources and aid to less fortunate members of society (Obler, 1986). The Moral Duty Model argues liberals support public charity not because of an innate need to help the less fortunate, but because each donor receives gratification from knowing the disenfranchised are now much better. Each person who subscribes to the Moral Duty Model chooses to engage in charity because they are at liberty to provide assistance and not because they are unselfish. Furthermore, these donors often do not want to participate or support charity. These donors choose to provide assistance because they feel they are violating a moral rule (Obler, 1986).

Numerous political scientists have investigated the influence of "other regarding motives" (Huddy et al, 2001, 445) such as "merit, equality and need" (Huddy et al., 2001, 445) to see if they shape ones opinion of public charity (Huddy et al., 2001). It has been asserted in research the mind-set of donors shape their judgment of a possible recipient's worthiness of public charity (Huddy et al., 2001). Additionally, such research has indicated that a donor's political outlook often influences conclusions about fairness, causing one to question whether aid is reasonable and/or provides the recipient with the same opportunities that others possess (Huddy et al., 2001). Furthermore, the simple belief that an individual will benefit from public charity has influenced many people to support social programming (Huddy et al., 2001).

Williams (1984) conducted research on university students who identified as conservative or liberal to see if their political ideology influenced their opinion of welfare recipients' worthiness of public assistance and empathy for recipients. Williams also

sought to understand if a relationship existed between political ideology and the amount of empathy extended to victims of crime. Results of the study showed that students who identified as being conservative blamed individuals who were currently receiving welfare for their current situation (Williams, 1984). In addition, the study revealed that liberals felt more sympathy for the welfare recipients in comparison to conservatives who often appeared sickened by the welfare beneficiaries. In regards to the crime victimization, conservatives attributed fault to victims of crime unlike liberals who did not assume victims were at fault for the crimes committed against them (Williams, 1984). Conservatives also showed less sympathy for the victims in comparison to their liberal counterparts (Williams, 1984).

Feagin investigated assignment of poverty responsibility and discovered many individuals, presumably conservatives, suggest others find themselves living a life of poverty as a result of personal flaws such as lack of skills and an improper belief system (as cited in Williams, 1984). Furnham investigated attribution of poverty and unemployment. He was interested in determining if individuals who blamed victims for their circumstance exhibited distinctive patterns of voting in comparison to their peers who felt individuals experience poverty or unemployment as a result of societal operation. Results of this research indicated that individuals who identify as conservative also assume that a person currently living in poverty or a person that is unemployed is the sole reason for his or her current condition (as cited in Williams, 1984).

Bobo and Klugel (1993) conducted research to see what factors, if any, lead individuals to support social programs such as Affirmative Action. This study suggested that individuals often rally behind social programs if they believe it is required to ensure equal rights. For example, some individuals who participated in this study believed African-Americans did not get the same opportunities as other members of society due to race and supported Affirmative Action. Various studies have shown that a person's perception of need influences their support or lack of support for social welfare programs.

Cook and Barrett discovered individuals who feel elderly members of society are in need of social security benefits for survival are more likely to support the program (as cited in Huddy et al., 2001). Huddy et al. (2001) expanded research on public charity and perception of need. They hypothesized that potential donors are likely to feel a group is deserving of public support if they feel the program will one day benefit them (Huddy et al., 2001). Their study, nonetheless, revealed that support of social programs is not based on the possibility of self benefit; rather, support of social programming is based merely on a sincere concern for the interests of others (Huddy et al., 2001).

Social scientists have been intrigued by the very different opinions of public charity, as well as concerns of conservatives and liberals. This curiosity led some individuals to study conservatives and liberals and, as a result of their investigations, personality summaries of individuals that identify as conservative and liberal were created. Carney, Jost, Gosling, and Potter (2008) are a few of many scholars that have conducted research that indicates conservatives and liberals exhibit comparatively

different personalities. Carney et al. (2008) state "liberals "more open, tolerant, creative, curious, expressive, enthusiastic, and drawn to novelty and diversity in comparison with conservatives, who appeared to be more conventional, orderly, organized neat, calm, reserved and rigid" (834). This information is not new as pioneers in the field of personality and politics, such as Jaensch, indicated as early as 1938, in his study of Nazi's, that some soldiers possessed characteristics that made them completely similar to some of their peers and utterly different from others (as cited in Carney et al., 2008). Fromm (as cited in Bem, 1970; see also Carney et al, 2008) attributed the differences to a "love of life versus the attraction to what is not alive" (20; 812). Maccoby (as cited in Bem, 1970; see also Carney et al, 2008) described the very distinct differences between conservatives and liberals:

> A person with intense love of life is attracted to that which is alive, which grow, which is free and unpredictable. He has an aversion to violence and all that destroys life. Thus he dislikes sterile and rigid order. He rejects being mechanized, becoming a lifeless part of the machine-like organization. He enjoys life in all its manifestations in contrast to mere excitement or thrills. He believes in molding and influencing by love, reason and example rather than by force. At the other pole, there are individuals attracted to that which is rigidly ordered, mechanical and unalive. These people do not like anything free and uncontrolled. They felt that people must be regulated within well-oiled machines. The extreme are those who are attracted to what is dead (20; 812).

Block and Block (2006) argue that differences in personalities between conservatives and liberals are noticeable in children during their early years. These differences are observable in daily interactions and are believed to ultimately impact all decisions and interactions that occur in life (Carney et al., 2008).

Religious Giving and Secular Giving

Religious and secular giving are assumed to be completely different (Hrung, 2004); however, it is known that charitable giving, religious and worldly, share the distinctive feature of skewness (Iannaccone, 1997; Wilhelm, 2006). Skewness indicates that ten to twenty percent of all donors provide at minimum 80% of all support to an organization or cause. Three items determine skewness: variation in household giving, money donated, and the "lack correlation between the amount of income a household has and the share of income that it donates to religion" (Iannaccone, 1997, 144).

Studies on religious giving have indicated that, as the age of the donor increases, the amount of religious giving increases (Hrung, 2004). This has been suggested to occur because older donors have been observed to have "higher levels of religiousness…or disposable income" (Donahue, 1994, 155). Other studies have shown that, as income increases, the percentage donated to religious organizations decreases because donors direct more to educational organizations (Donahue, 1994; Hrung, 2004;). However, most studies have shown that a positive relationship exists between church attendance and overall charitable giving. Individuals who attend church allocate higher gifts to religious and non-religious organizations when compared to their peers that do not attend church (Clain and Zech, 1999; Forbes and Zampelli, 1997; Iannaccone, 1997).

Charitable giving varies by faith denomination. Protestants and Catholics who earn the same income give different amounts to religious organizations. Catholics donate less to religious organizations than Protestants (Forbes and Zampelli, 1997). The

difference in giving was attributed to the fact that Protestants on average tithe more often than Catholics. The increased tithing frequency is associated with "a more formalized giving process found in Protestant denominations" (Forbes and Zampelli, 1997, 17). Other factors that have been associated with donations to religious organizations are religion of spouse, denomination of spouse, and race.

Individuals who are married to someone who shares the same religion attend religious services more often than individuals married to someone with a different religion and this increase in service attendance is linked to an increase in donations. Individuals who identify as Baptist or Methodist donate the most to their church but less to outside charities (Donahue, 1994). However, individuals who identify as Presbyterian and members of the United Church of Christ (UCC) donate the most to charities not affiliated with the church (Donahue, 1994).

Religion is a major part of life for many African-Americans. Religion has played a major role in child rearing (McAdoo, 2007). Many African-Americans were exposed to charity at an early age through their religious community leaders that instilled in them the importance of helping those in need (CPCS, 2005; Duran, 2001; McAdoo 2007). It can be argued that African-American religious leaders valued philanthropy due to its ability to generate revenue that could be used to address community needs. Black religious organizations such as churches and mutual aid societies have received support from the African-American community because they provide resources that many African-Americans need. Additionally, these organizations receive continued support because

they provide opportunities for networking and they have a long history of working to improve social conditions for African-Americans (CPCS, 2005; Duran, 2001).

Reciprocity: An Ambiguous Motivation for Charitable Giving

Reciprocity is a familiar yet obscure concept which has been suggested to be a motivating factor for charitable giving. Made popular in the 1960's by Alvin Gouldner, reciprocity has been a topic of discussion for many scholars interested in understanding human behavior such as George Simmel, Robert Merton, and Bronislaw Malinowski. According to George Simmel, the most basic human relationship, a dyad, is based upon reciprocity, which he defined as simply a "schema of giving and returning the equivalence (as cited in Gouldner, 1960, 162).

Functionalist theorists such as Talcott Parsons suggested all social patterns, including reciprocity, yield opposite consequences that are necessary to maintain continued survival of a social system. Additionally, it was recommended that the outcomes are beneficial to society. The ideas advanced by Parsons were challenged by Robert Merton, a fellow functionalist, who suggested patterns and their functions can only be explained in terms of their consequences and there are no actions present on earth that exist which guarantee an outcome which will benefit the social system. Reciprocity, per Merton, is nothing more than a mere consequence of an action which has occurred (Gouldner, 1960; Wallace and Wolf, 2006). According to Merton, all consequences are not beneficial, in particular unexpected or latent consequences. In addition, it should be noted that all outcomes are not of equal importance or equivalence as the preceding

action. This disagreement amongst functionalists and their perspective of reciprocity has contributed the ambiguity associated with the concept (Gouldner, 1960; Wallace and Wolf, 2006).

Malinowski defined reciprocity as a rule of behavior that is sometimes accepted and other times rejected. Malinowski believed that reciprocity is an important concept to understand as it has strong sociological significance; further, it is merely an obligation people have to one another to give back. In addition, reciprocity is based on a mutual reliance that is honored through the provision of complementary and equal services that yield gratification for all parties involved (Gouldner, 1960).

Recent work on the notion of reciprocity has supported some of the original tenets of the concept while expanding it to include ideas which refute once commonly advanced notions. Gouldner (1960) suggested a "norm of reciprocity" (171) exists in all societies which advances the following demands: "(1) people should help those who have helped them and (2) people should not injure those who have helped them" (171). Gouldner also suggested reciprocity, while at hand, is not unconditional and is often displayed differently within varying cultures. Reciprocity, in some cultures, is an act which only occurs in intimate relationships such as with friends and family, while other cultures engage in reciprocity with anyone (Gouldner, 1960).

Baldwin (2008) investigated the impact, if any, reciprocity had in determining if alumni would make a donation to their alma mater. Results indicated alumni opted to donate to their school if they possessed a strong belief in the university's leadership, felt

an obligation to the institution, and felt happy about their gift. In addition, her study revealed reciprocity was a primary reason many individuals chose to make charitable donations to their alma mater. Many of the participants decided to donate money to their alma mater because they felt the university had provided them with some assistance and/or benefit (Baldwin, 2008)

In 2008, Michael Moody reexamined the four types of reciprocity which are present in society as he tried to provide further understanding of the concept as a whole: direct, indirect, collective, and serial reciprocity. Direct reciprocity is a purposeful transfer between two individuals. This exchange may occur immediately or may be delayed. Nonetheless, it is a trade wherein one person gives and another receives with the "receiver ultimately becoming the giver"(Moody, 2008, 133) at some point later in time (Moody, 2008). According to Moody (2008), this reciprocity is evaluated by "the level of equivalence or balance in what each party gives and receives" (133)…and "equivalence can determine and reflect the dynamics of power in the relationship (133). Indirect reciprocity is an exchange which is more complicated than direct reciprocity because the giver and recipient do not switch places in the future as with direct reciprocity. With indirect reciprocity, the giver provides a recipient with a benefit and the giver receives a benefit from someone other than the recipient of his or her benefit (Moody, 2008). Reciprocity with a collective occurs when individuals who belong to group, such as a university, engage in exchanges. The collective may engage in exchanges as a whole or

individual members may enter into arrangements which ultimately affect the group as a whole (Moody, 2008).

Serial reciprocity is a unique form of reciprocity characterized as "a series of open-ended, "one-way" transfers" of valuables. Each transfer is considered a serial return for a preceding transfer" (Moody, 2008, 133). In addition, serial reciprocity does not guarantee the original giver, will become the receiver (Moody, 2008). Kenneth Boulding stated:

> A very interesting aspect of reciprocity is what might be called serial reciprocity in which a gift from A to B creates generalized sense of obligation on the part of B. This obligation is satisfied by a gift from B not to A but to another party C, who in turn satisfies his sense of obligation to another party D, and so on around the circle, until finally perhaps a gift comes back to A, and the whole process is repeated (as cited in Moody, 2008, 134).

Boulding's definition of serial reciprocity suggests the individual who is responsible for the chain reaction of giving does not expect to receive a benefit in the future (as cited in Moody, 2008, 134). Serial reciprocity only occurs if two scenarios are present: (1) "when direct or indirect reciprocity is impossible" (Moody, 2008, 137) (i.e., the recipient of a gift is unable to pay back his or her giver) and, (2) if a recipient is knowledgeable that a serial gift is preferred by the initial giver) (Moody, 2008). Nevertheless, little is known about reciprocity, in particular, serial reciprocity so one cannot be completely sure to its origins.

Motives for Corporate Philanthropy

Each year, it is estimated that over three billion dollars are donated to nonprofits by corporations (Navarro, 1988). Two dominant explanations have been provided to explain charitable giving by companies: profit maximization and managerial discretion (Burt, 1983; Navarro, 1988, Williamson, 1963). Profit maximization implies that corporations often decide to engage in activities, such as charitable giving, to reduce costs associated with operating, secure tax breaks, and increase profit by appealing to members of the community (Navarro, 1988). Charitable contributions by organizations are a source of advertising for many firms that facilitate a positive environment for them full of public support (Navarro, 1988). Donations by corporations provide organizations with the power to create optimal settings for themselves and residents (Burt, 1983). Corporate giving also allows organizations to be socially responsible and promote social well-being (Navarro, 1988). In a survey conducted by Harris and Klepper, a president of company explains the purpose of corporate giving:

> A corporation exists in a community-local, regional, national, even worldwide. It must be concerned with the condition of the community, with the development of the best and broadest possible base of talents, and with the quality of life. The corporate citizen, like the individual citizen, benefits from a healthy community and should encourage efforts to the make the community better (Burt, 1983).

While corporate philanthropy is often seen as a tool utilized to benefit companies, managerial discretion has argued that corporate giving serves another purpose.

Managerial discretion implies that corporate giving not only reduces costs associated with business function, but it provides company executives with the

opportunity to achieve personal and professional goals of "power, status, prestige" (Williamson, 1963, 1033) and well-being (Williamson, 1963). According to scholars such as Navarro (1988), corporate giving often occurs when leaders of organizations place their personal interests above organizational priorities. The effect of managerial discretion has been investigated in studies on corporate philanthropy and it has been suggested that the religion of an agency's executive leadership impacts chartable participation.

Managerial discretion is influenced by the religious background of executives in corporations. Religion provides everyone with the rules of life which ultimately determine things of importance (Brammer, Williams, and Zinkin, 2007). Brammer, et al. (2007) investigated the effect of religion on corporate social responsibility and discovered that for the most part, agency leaders who identify with any religion find it more important for organizations to support charitable entities, especially if the organization is working to end a social problem such as poverty or unemployment. This study did indicate that agency leaders who identify with some denominations such as Buddhism are least likely to engage in corporate philanthropy. This decrease in charitable giving has been attributed to tenets of Buddhism that promote independence. In addition, Buddhists tend to believe charity should only occur if one is engaging in the act for the sole benefit of someone other than self. Charitable giving, in particular, often yields a benefit to the corporate donor via recognition which influences Buddhist leaders to abstain from the activity (Brammer et al., 2007).

Williamson (1963) has suggested that managerial discretion is one of the most common occurrences in corporate America because it provides leadership with desired outcomes. While being a mundane occurrence in society, corporate giving has received criticism for being a tool that promotes poor usage of resources (Navarro, 1988). It has been argued that justification of corporate donations has led to an overflow of corporate charitable donations which not only disregard stockholders, but provide no benefit to the corporations which give them. In addition, these donations only provide consolation to "shirking managers" (Navarro, 1988, 66) who lose sight of their job responsibilities as they become addicted to the benefits of corporate giving (Navarro, 1988).

Donor Cessation and Consequences of Charitable Giving

People, for the most part, believe that charitable giving is beneficial for both the donor and the recipient (Anik, Aknin, Norton, & Dunn, 2009; Wuthnow, 1991; Wilson, 2000). A large percentage of research on charitable giving is dedicated to understanding donor motivation and only a few studies have focused on charitable giving outcomes for the donor. Modest research has sought to understand why donors stop giving despite articles in popular media sources suggesting charitable giving is not a win-win situation for everyone.

Charitable giving results in the following positive results: "citizenship" (Wilson, 2000, 231), crime reduction, improvements in health, and achievement (Wilson, 2000). A positive relationship between volunteerism and political activism suggests "good democratic outcomes" (Stolle, 1998, 497) occur when people volunteer. Individuals who

volunteer are often "more politically active than non-volunteers" (Wilson, 2000, 231). Volunteering with an agency creates a community of participation for helpers which increases opportunities for interaction and discussion (Wilson, 2000; Knoke, 1990; Stolle, 1998). As interaction between volunteers increase, individuals begin to trust each other and learn how to work together to solve social problems and address other pertinent concerns (Stolle, 1998).

Charitable giving such as volunteerism decreases criminal behavior (Wilson, 2000). Research shows that adolescents who volunteer are less likely to use drugs and female adult offenders have lower recidivism rates if they volunteer with religious organizations (Uggen and Janikula, 1999). Volunteerism overall has been suggested to decrease anti-social behavior such as crime and teen pregnancies, yet no one to date has been able to explain why this relationship is present (Wilson, 2000). Volunteerism has been credited with the reduction of opportunities for individuals to socialize with deviants while others have suggested that volunteering "exposes people to informal social controls" (Wilson, 2000, 231).

People who engage in charitable giving have better physical and mental health than non-participants. Individuals who volunteer typically have better functional health than individuals who do not volunteer (Wilson, 2000). Sabin (1993) conducted research on elderly mortality rates and discovered that individuals 70 years of age and older who volunteer have lower mortality rates than individuals of the same age who do not volunteer. Oman et al. (1994) also studied mortality rates among the elderly and the

research revealed that elderly individuals engaging in volunteerism had improved health. However, it should be noted that individuals who had the best health were actively involved with church (Wilson, 2000). In addition, most volunteers have "higher levels of self-esteem and higher levels of self-confidence" (Wilson, 2000, 232) than non-volunteers. These individuals in general are also more satisfied with life (Wilson, 2000). Simmons (1991) discovered that organ donors and bone marrow donors had higher levels of self-esteem and were happier post donation. It is asserted that volunteerism leads to health improvements because the activity increases opportunities for socialization and opportunities to become integrated in society (Wilson, 2000).

Some volunteers engage in charitable giving to make connections that will benefit their career (Wilson, 2000; Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan 2006). Limited research exists that indicates volunteerism will create career opportunities. Nevertheless, many still believe that it is an appropriate and beneficial platform (Wilson, 2000). Astin et al. (1999) studied volunteerism among undergraduates and uncovered undergraduates who volunteered were more likely to pursue advanced degrees and participate in charitable giving later in life. Volunteering had no effect on an individual's opinion of graduate school but individuals felt more prepared for graduate school if they had volunteer experience (Astin et al., 1999; Wilson, 2000).

Zou et al. (2008) studied the American Red Cross (ARC) donor system to determine the effect it had on available blood and ARC volunteerism. The ARC donor system was designed to ensure that blood donors and blood recipients are disease free and

in the best possible state of health at the time of donation. If a potential donor or recipient was found to be unhealthy (e.g., suffering from a curable illness such as high blood pressure, or infected with an incurable illness such as HIV), he or she is placed on a deferral list. Donors who have a short-term illness are placed on a temporary list and they are asked to return at a later date to give blood.

Between the years 2001 and 2006, the ARC had 47,814,370 potential donors of which 12.8% were deferred for temporary conditions; 647,928 deferrals resulted from recipient concerns and 1,042, 743 were because of donor conditions. All donors who were not allowed to give blood were divided into three categories: first time donors, past donors with no experience with deferral, and past donors with deferral experience. Researchers discovered that deferred first time donors were least likely to return to donate blood at a later date. It is believed that individuals who have a negative experience giving blood are least likely to return. It is possible that first time donors considered their deferral to be a negative and off-putting experience, and as a result, they failed to return. It should be noted that this research did not explore the reasons that donors failed to return (Zou et al., 2008).

Donor cultivation and retention is a concern for all nonprofits. In 1988, the Independent Sector began conducting a national survey to assess financial giving and volunteerism in the United States. This survey focused on the impact the economy had on charitable giving. In the years 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999 and 2001, the Independent Sector asked respondents to explain the reasons that they decided not to

donate money or time to nonprofits. Most respondents attributed their lack of financial support to "not being asked to give" (Independent Sector, 2001, 68) and a lack of discretionary funds (Independent Sector, 2001). Others stated that they failed to give monetary support because they didn't feel the donation was being used properly, they were being solicited too often for charitable gifts and did not like that many "nonprofits were operating like for profits" (Independent Sector, 2001, 68). Most respondents stated they failed to volunteer time because they "had no time," (Independent Sector, 2001, 82), "were not asked" (Independent Sector, 2001, 82), or were unable to volunteer because of poor health (Independent Sector, 2001).

In 2009, The Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University conducted research to understand the reasons affluent individuals stop participating in charitable giving. According to this study, approximately 35% of affluent donors decided to end their support of a charitable organization (Indiana University, 2010). Wealthy donors stopped giving for the following reasons: "too frequent solicitation" (Indiana University, 2010, 65) , the donor "decided to support other causes or organizations" (Indiana University, 2010, 65), the donor's "household circumstance changed" (Indiana University, 2010, 65), "the organizations leadership or activities changed" (Indiana University, 2010, 65), the donor is "no longer involved with the organization" (Indiana University, 2010, 65), the donor felt "the program had completed" (Indiana University, 2010, 65) or the donor felt the agency was guilty of "inaccurate record keeping of information" (Indiana University, 2010, 65).

Over 60% of the donors surveyed stopped giving because their priorities changed, they disagreed with the organizations direction or they felt the organization did not have suitable contact with the donor (Indiana University, 2010). Only 29.4% of donors stated that they stopped giving because their household circumstances (e.g., residence and employment) changed while an even smaller proportion, 10.4%, stated they ended their gift because they felt the organization had "met its goal" (Indiana University, 2010, 66). This study as well as the work by the Independent Sector did not provide any detail as to what each deterring factor meant to the donors but it did show that donors can be influenced to stop giving. Many donors listed over solicitation as the primary reason that they stopped giving to charity; on the contrary, no one is sure of the frequency associated with the respondent's answer of over solicitation. Indiana University respondents (2001) suggested that monthly asks might be too much for donors to handle. This is something that needs to be addressed.

There are two articles that were published in the press in 2009 that suggest charitable giving has negative consequences for donors: "Charity Bankruptcy Leaves Many Donors in Distress" and "Civil Liberties Group Loses $20 Million Donor". In the article, "Charity Bankruptcy Leaves Many Donors in Distress", Deborah Jacobs explains that a substantial amount of donor funds were misused when the National Heritage Foundation filed for bankruptcy. According to Jacobs (2009), "9000 donor advised funds totaling $25 million in value were wiped out under a reorganization plan approved by the Federal Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia" (1). The court ruled that

the donations were assets of the nonprofit agency and could be used to pay off creditors. Richard Fox, an attorney, has stated that the court's ruling was unreasonable and that he didn't "think any donor ever envisioned if the charity does something that screws up its finances that the door advised fund is going to be invaded" (Jacobs, 2009, 1).

On December 8, 2009, The New York Times published the article "Civil Liberties Group Loses $20 Million Donor" which acknowledged an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) donor revoked his $20 million plege. This donor, who placed only one stipulation on his gift (to remain anonymous), was identified by a board member and later in the press as David Gelbaum. Gelbaum has donated over $101.5 million to charity since the 1980's. It was suggested that Gelbaum revoked his gift because his financial circumstance changed; still, no one knows exactly why he cancelled his pledge (Strom, 2009).

Theoretical Frameworks Explain Charitable Giving

Scholars interested in altruism have utilized a variety of theories to explain the reasons that many individuals engage in charitable giving. Theoretical frameworks used to date include the following: the identification theory of care (identification model), family life course perspective, social learning theory, human capital theory, and social exchange theory. The identification model asserts charitable giving occurs because the donor or volunteer identifies with the wants and objectives of other people. This model does not disregard the influence of altruism or self interest but simply suggests that they are not the driving forces that lead one to engage in benevolent giving (Schervish and

Havens, 2002). According to Schervish and Havens (1998), "…Identification comes from encounter, encounter comes from participation" (1). The identification model originates in "western religious tradition" (Schervish & Havens, 1998, 48) and assumes that individuals place the needs of others before their own (Schervish and Havens, 1998).

Schervish, O'Herlihy, and Havens (as cited in Schervish & Havens, 2002) conducted qualitative research to test the legitimacy of the identification model with a random sample of donors who reside in Boston and discovered that respondents agreed with the model. Research respondents attributed their altruistic behavior to a "specific moment in time when the[ir] identification with another [person or agency] was a life changing event, motivating [them to provide] a caring response, and leading to a longer term commitment to philanthropy" (49). This model is similar to the social resources framework which states activity that promotes interaction provides an opportunity for one to learn about others and ultimately increases rates of charitable giving involvement, in particular volunteerism (Wilson, 2000).

The family life course model integrates the individual, family, and history. It views the family as an interdependent unit and suggests that human behavior is linked to the various social statuses and roles one plays in life that result from things such as "age" (Sundeen, 1990, 485), marriage, and children (Sundeen, 1990; White and Klein, 2002). This perspective implies individuals occupy multiple roles concurrently and one must understand the circumstance and the meanings attached to each role (Macmillan and Copher, 2005). This framework has been used in studies of volunteerism and it revealed

that an "inverted U-shaped relationship" (Sundeen, 1990, 485) represents the number of voluntary activities one participates in during positions in life (Sundeen, 1990). Young married parents with preschool aged children and families with children of any age are noted to be involved in the most voluntary organizations (Sundeen, 1990).

Family life course theory has received criticism. Opponents of the framework have argued that it is too complex for anyone to use when studying the family. Family life course is a broad framework that is not necessarily focused on change in family life but only with events that occur in the family (Aldous, 1990). Additionally, this model fails to consider the diversity that exists in family structures. Family life course assumes that all families experience the same stages and fails to consider nontraditional families (i.e. families headed by single parents, grandparents, and others) which may alter the roles and experiences of members (Aldous, 1990; Sundeen, 1990; White & Klein, 2002). If one were truly interested in learning how volunteering changed throughout life, one would have to explain how the various roles and statuses occupied by members of the family influence charitable behavior (Aldous, 1990; Sundeen, 1990; White & Klein, 2002).

Social learning theory suggests that involvement in any activity, such as charitable giving, is impacted by how often a person performs the behavior and their motives. It is also shaped by their history of learning. Individuals learn to engage in helping behaviors through "conditioning…observation…and reinforcements" (Rushton, 1982, 434). Some individuals participate in charitable giving because they have been

trained to engage in the activity. Individuals who were exposed to positive stimuli, such as a reward or praise, as children when they performed a helping behavior will continue to perform such behaviors as adults because they desire another positive incentive (Rushton, 1982). Other people engage in altruistic acts because they observed someone else performing similar behaviors.

Observation is one of the most powerful determinants of altruistic behavior (Rushton, 1982). Rushton and Wheelwright conducted research on the influence of observation on a child's helping behavior and discovered that children observing a person performing helping behaviors were more likely to do so. Rushton and Wheelwright gathered children and taught each child to play a game that required them to collect as many tokens at possible. At the end of each game, the children were asked to give some of their tokens to a charitable organization. While learning how to play the game, the children were exposed to adults who not only played the same game, but adults who were asked to donate their tokens to charity. Children who observed adults who donated tokens to charity also donated tokens at the games conclusion; yet, children who witnessed adults who refused to share tokens failed to give any away (Rushton, 1982).

Individuals who learn to perform any behavior reach a point when they have to decide to continue or discontinue the behavior. It has been suggested that an individual's decision to continue or discontinue any behavior is influenced by the presence or absence of positive or negative reinforcements (Rushton, 1982). Individuals who receive positive reinforcements for a behavior, such as benevolent giving, are more likely to continue the

behavior, while individuals experiencing a negative consequence are more likely to stop the behavior (Rushton, 1982).

Human capital theory and social exchange theory, also known as the theory of rational choice, are two individual level theories that declare individuals only engage in charitable giving after engaging in a rational cost-benefit analysis; however, each framework has distinctive features (Wilson, 2000). The basic assumption of human capital theory is that an individual's investment of quantifiable items, such as education, benefits not only the person but society (Becker, 1962; Sweetland, 1996). Using this framework, researchers have been able to show that people are more likely to volunteer if they have a college degree. Formal education increases an individual's knowledge of social problems, fosters development of positive self-esteem, and provides opportunities to interact with more people and organizations. Charitable organizations benefit from educated donors because they have access to resources that will assist them in fulfilling their mission (Wilson, 2000).

Human capital theory differs from social exchange theory which suggests that all interaction, including charitable giving, is based on the exchange of intangible and tangible items. Social exchange theory implies that people engage in charitable giving only after they weigh the benefits and costs of their involvement and compare the outcome to alternatives. If a person feels he or she will benefit from charitable giving of any kind, then he or she will participate. On the other hand, if it is determined that charitable giving will lead to no personal benefit, individuals abstain or find a way to

limit the costs associated with the act (Wilson, 2002; Wallace & Wolf, 2006)). Additionally, the theory postulates that the decisions one makes are influenced by social institutions, access to resources, and groups to which one belongs. James Coleman argued that it is important for one to understand individual decisions as they provide insight into group dynamics (Wallace and Wolf, 2006). It is the expectation of this study that many individuals are influenced to engage in or discontinue charitable giving as a result of the effect it will have on not only themselves, but possibly others.

Human capital theory and social exchange theory have received much criticism. Both frameworks have been criticized for focusing on individualism and assuming rationality (White and Klein, 2002; Wilson, 2000). Additionally, each has suggested that all decisions are based on reason. A considerable amount of research on human behavior has revealed that all humans have "restricted cognitive limits, avoiding broad ranging calculation" (Wallace and Wolf, 2006, 378). Human capital theory has been criticized specifically for focusing on measurable items such as education. This framework has falsely assumed that items such as education are an asset to everyone when it is not true. Every society determines things of value and it is possible that items such as education have little value to some people (Wilson, 2000).

Summary:

Numerous studies have occurred with various theories to explain charitable giving. This study will expand the current literature on the concept by investigating the motives for charitable participation, reasons for charitable cessation, and the outcomes of

charitable giving under the guise of social exchange theory/rational choice. It is has been proposed in previous research that individuals participate in charitable giving because it yields a benefit and yields positive outcomes. This study will explain the benefits and positive outcomes of charitable giving which have been attributed to benevolent participation. It will also explain the reasons that individuals choose not to participate in charitable giving and the negative outcomes of the activity which may lead one to stop charitable participation. This research will most importantly describe the context which is of utmost importance if one wishes to understand reasons for charitable participation, abstention and a donor's opinion of a charitable experience. By understanding the circumstances that influence charitable participation, one will be able to discern how participants and nonparticipants differ.

CHAPTER 3 METHODS

This qualitative research consisted of one to one, semi-structured, open-ended interviews to investigate the following: the reasons that a person decides to participate in charitable giving, the reasons that a person decides not to participate in charitable giving, the consequences of engaging in charitable giving, and how individuals who engage in charitable giving differ from individuals who do not participate. This research was guided by constructivist grounded theory. Constructivist grounded theory is a "variant" (Creswell, 2007, 65) of systematic grounded theory (Creswell, 2007). Unlike systematic grounded theory which focuses on the development of theory by conducting research which follows predetermined steps (performing a predetermined number of interviews, theoretical sampling and a coding process), constructivist grounded theory asserts that research is conducted to establish or refute a suggested assumption (Creswell, 2007). This research is being guided by the notion that charitable participation or abstention is a rational process.

Constructivist grounded theory is based on the interpretative process of the interviewer to accurately reflect the opinions, feelings, assumptions and experiences of research participants. In addition, it welcomes the idea of "multiple realities" (Creswell, 2007, 63) which systematic grounded theory does not emphasize by seeking saturation (Creswell, 2007); Constructivist grounded theory does not support the thought that research can only occur using prescribed steps and emphasizes the "role of the researcher" (Creswell, 2007, 66) in the research process, acknowledging that the steps the

researchers takes such as category development ultimately creates further questions, imposes personal opinions and views (Creswell, 2007).

The interview guide consisted of a selection of topics which included the following: experiences of charitable giving, frequency of participation in charitable giving, first experience with charitable giving, motivation for participation in charitable giving, memorable charitable giving experiences (positive and/or negative), and giving cessation (reasons people have decided to end charitable giving). All interviews began with broad ranging questions regarding charitable giving (i.e. Tell me about your experience with charitable giving). The broad introduction question allowed each participant to define charitable giving. The definition provided by each respondent allowed the researcher to understand the motivations, deterrents, and outcomes of charitable giving for each person. The broad questions also provided an opportunity for the researcher to describe and explain with accuracy participants' experiences, values and beliefs (Creswell, 2007). Individuals were asked questions that extended the interview guide if they were deemed appropriate to the scope of the study and if they provided the researcher with detail about the participants charitable giving such as motivational factors, reasons for ending participation, or insight into a positive or negative experience.

Data was gathered for this research between August 2011 and January 2012. All participants were gathered via snowballing. All participants were referred to the researcher by an acquaintance, friend, or family member. This method was selected because snowball sampling is a proven technique when one is trying to contact difficult

to reach populations or individuals who may refuse to speak to an unknown researcher about topics that may be considered personal (Chambliss and Schutt, 2006). Literature on charitable giving has suggested that it is a very delicate subject research participants may not volunteer to discuss (Connor, 2010). Residents of Wayne County, Michigan were chosen due to the density of charitable organizations. There are currently over 10,000 nonprofit agencies in the county that are dependent on charitable donations for their continued survival (Personal Communication, March 29, 2011).

Each participant was provided with an informed consent form and asked to review and sign the document prior to beginning the interview. Participants were asked after they reviewed the consent form if they had any questions about the research and encouraged to ask questions at any time during the interview. They were also informed they may stop the interview at any time, omit any questions, and contact the researcher or the advisor of the research at any time if they had questions or concerns.

Sixteen residents of Wayne County Michigan participated in this study. Interviews took place at a location that was mutually agreed upon by the participant and the researcher. Each participant was asked to complete one demographic profile at the beginning of each interview. Three participants abstained from completing the profile. Interviews lasted between 20 minutes and 75 minutes. All interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Transcripts were sent to each participant for review.

Data was coded first into major categories: definition of charitable giving, motives, and outcomes. This process is known as open coding (Creswell, 2007). Within

each major category, subcategories were created which defined charitable giving, the reasons individuals choose to participate or not in the activity and positive and negative outcomes. Once subcategories were developed, axial coding occurred and relationships were developed between the subgroups and actions that resulted. Context or conditions which influenced the motives, reasons for cessation and outcomes of charitable giving for charitable giving were noted. Lastly, the researcher created a narrative which explained why participants chose to participate or not participate in charitable giving. If the researcher was unable to explain a participant's reason for charitable participation, abstention or the circumstance that influenced a participant's benevolent activity, a follow-up discussion occurred in which the participant provided additional information.

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS

Description of Participants

Sixteen individuals participated in the study; however, only thirteen completed the demographic profile. Three males and ten females completed the demographic profile. Nine participants identified themselves as being African-American/Black and four individuals identified themselves as being White, not of Hispanic Origin. Four respondents are between the ages of 25 and 34, one is between the ages of 35 and 44, five are between the ages of 45 and 54, and three are between the ages of 55 and 64. Two of the participants have completed some college, five have obtained a college degree, and six have an advanced degree or professional degree. Six participants are married or in a committed relationship, six are single, one respondent is divorced, and seven respondents have children.

Ten participants are employed full time, one participant is employed part-time and one respondent is an entrepreneur. This respondent failed to state if his employment status is full time or part time. Eight participants reside in the city of Detroit, one lives in Grosse Pointe, one resides in Grosse Pointe Park, one dwells in Grosse Pointe Farms, and one respondent lives in Southgate. One individual chose not to disclose his city of residence; however, he assured the researcher that he lives in Wayne County. One participant earns between $0-$24,999 per year, five earn between $25,000 and $49,999 per year, three have annual incomes in the range of $50,000 -$74,999 per year, one

person earns between $75,000-$99,000 each year, and three respondents have a minimal annual income of $125,000.

<u>Defining Charitable Giving</u>

Charitable giving is defined commonly throughout the literature as the donation of time (volunteerism), financial resources (cash, check and stock), and engagement in helping activities (Barman, 2007). For the most part, these actions have been discussed in relation to formal entities or nonprofit organizations which reap some benefit from these activities, while little effort has been exuded to explore charitable giving and how it relates to unofficial events (Duran, 2001) possibly because it is not easy to monitor (Wuthnow, 1991). Duran (2001) criticized the emphasis which is frequently placed on easily proven charitable giving, arguing it paints a picture which leads people to assume fewer people are involved in charity. Charitable giving has also been defined as an advantageous trade between a donor and a recipient which often leads to a benefit for one or all parties involved (Anik, Aknin, Norton, & Dunn, 2009; Barman, 2007).

Participants of this study were asked at the beginning of each interview to share their experiences with charitable giving and many provided answers that not only mirrored existing literature on charitable giving by actively discussing their involvement in the donation of time and financial resources to charitable agencies, but they also spoke in great detail about their involvement in unofficial charitable activities. A few individuals discussed their experiences in neatly constructed cataloged groups of formal or informal experiences. Some participants described official charitable giving as an

exchange, a definition which is present throughout the literature, while others described official charitable giving as a course of action or procedure utilized to achieve a goal. For some respondents, charitable giving was portrayed as an activity which they felt was necessary, but not an activity they always want to engage in. There were some participants who chose not to classify charity into groupings as they defined all charitable giving, formal or informal, as a way of life, similar to religion, an item they chose not to question. It should be noted that some participants provided multiple definitions of charity which has led to the determination that is possible for an individual to maintain numerous definitions of charitable giving which may be shaped by context.

<u>Official and Unofficial Charity</u>

Some participants categorized their participation in charity as official and unofficial charity. These individuals discussed their involvement in activities which involved nonprofit organizations separately from their experiences with unknown or not easily recognized causes such as a friend. It should be noted that none of the participants who sorted their charitable experiences into distinctive groups mentioned that either type of charity was of more importance than the other, even though these respondents did consistently discuss their experiences independently. As a result of some respondents categorizing their involvement in charity, the two types of charity will be discussed separately (as necessary) as these participants shared their experiences with both independently. For the purpose of this analysis, official charity is being defined as the donation of time, resources, or helping activities beneficial to a charitable organization

(O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy and Havens, 2002). Unofficial charitable giving is being defined as the donation of time, resources, or helping activities to people, or causes that are not easily recognized or reported (Duran, 2001; O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy and Havens, 2002; Wuthnow, 1991).

Respondent #5 classified his involvement with charity into groups of official and unofficial charity. He often engages in helping activities with nonprofit organizations. Respondent #5 is a video production specialist who provides agencies with his services as needed:

> …..I basically provide them [nonprofit organizations] with video production services….

He also engages in unofficial charitable activities regularly:

> ….family…a lot of time people will approach me and tell me they do not have the budget or finances for a project and I will help.

Respondent #10 also grouped his charitable giving into clusters of acknowledged versus unfamiliar activities. Respondent #10 donates large sums of money to nonprofit organizations:

> I personally give to several charities…There are probably 20 different charities that I have given to this year….

Respondent #10 also supports many unofficial charities:

> I tend to give a lot of charity to people who are in financial straits.

Respondent #7 arranged her charitable activities into two groups of official versus unofficial. Respondent #7 donates money to charitable organizations and volunteers time:

> I have in the past donated money [to police organizations]…I am volunteering at a shelter for domestic and sexual assault. I just started there.

With regards to informal charity, Respondent #7 will do pretty much anything to help someone in need:

> I say for the longest, every once in a while, I pick up [people]. I spend a lot of time taking people around. If people have a need…I take people around. Sometimes, yes especially with children, I will give them money.

An Exchange

Some participants chose to describe their experiences with official charity as an exchange wherein they provided something to a charitable recipient through an organization and received something or expected to receive something in return. Individuals who defined official charity as an exchange likened their charitable acts to business transactions under the guise of 'quid pro quo'. It should be noted that all participants who defined official charity as an exchange did not consider the experience to be positive.

Respondent #5 feels official charitable giving is a simple exchange. Respondent #5 gives agencies his services and he believes he is due to receive something from the charities:

I barter services with an organization and I basically provide them with

video production services and in exchange they advertise for me….

Respondent #1 also considers official charitable giving to be a trade. Respondent #1

donates money and time to charitable agencies and as a result of her donations, she is

often invited to events in which she can "network" with other people. Respondent #10

considers his participation in official charity to be an exchange. Respondent #10 is

involved with a local agency which works to eradicate homelessness in Detroit,

Michigan. He feels that his financial donations aide the agency in achieving its goal.

Furthermore, he believes that he will reap something from giving to charitable agencies:

…there is a cycle in charity and if it is fed it will make people give and get

from charity in some form or another. …there is [are] less homeless

people on the street because the agency I am involved with is able to serve

more and they are not nagging me.

<u>A Means to an End</u>

Discussions with some participants regarding their experiences with official

charitable giving provided a perspective of the activity which was of interest as these

individuals implied charity was a means to an end. For some participants, official charity

was defined as an activity which they felt was necessary to complete for a goal to be

attained. Respondent #3 and Respondent #15 consider themselves to be very giving. Both

men described official charity as being a necessary step for goal achievement; however, it

was obvious after speaking with each and comparing their provided responses that they

would have differing rationales for engaging in charitable giving. It is important to interject at this time that Respondent #15 has had less than favorable official charitable experiences which has influenced his definition of official charitable giving.

Respondent #3 is involved in official charitable giving "daily". He donates money and volunteers time with a literacy program. He also spends significant amounts of time with arts and cultural organizations in his community that work with educationally and economically disadvantaged members of the community. Respondent #3 believes his work with these agencies will have a positive impact on the lives of the disadvantaged, an influence which will help them be productive and successful:

> …I truly believe that Detroit's cultural institutions can help define/inform the future and address issues …The things that I have done with a [local school district]…you can see what has been accomplished/the impact with the kids. You can see the kids that needed extra help succeed…the literacy center I participle with…it uses the money to advance the mission and you can see people who now can read and now able to take care of their families…

Respondent #15 disclosed that his involvement with formal charity sometimes has only occurred due to coercion. For Respondent #15, his participation in official charity sometimes resulted from his need to cease the nonstop requests to give he would receive from employers:

> There were companies when they say they want 100% participation…I
>
> pull out a dollar and say that is my participation.

Charity Equals Culture

The term culture is loosely defined as a system of "meaning and behavior that defines the way of life for a given group or society" (Andersen and Taylor, 2013, 24). When some individuals shared their charitable experiences, one word came to mind and that word was culture. Their descriptions of their charitable activities exhibited many of the characteristics of culture such as: being shared, being learned, and having representational meaning. For these respondents, charitable participation has become a routine or a tradition, similar to religion, which many of them choose not to question or wonder about. These respondents believe in charitable giving, whether it is formal or informal, and as a result, it has become a standard for their lives. Individuals who described charitable giving as a way of life did not make any distinction between formal or informal charity as they shared their experiences which can easily be grouped into categories of official and unofficial charitable acts.

Respondent #16 is a middle aged man who described official charitable giving as culture. He affirmed during our discussion that charitable giving has been a mainstay in his life. He first became involved in charity at a young age when his mother would arrange for he, his siblings, and her friends to collect items for the needy. It was during his childhood that he learned the importance of helping someone who was in need:

> …My mother raised me and we would go around and collect clothes for the Salvation Army before they had boxes on every corner and do stuff like that. She would get us together usually during the holiday time and hit up her friends and we would collect stuff and take it to the Salvation Army. Stuff like that as a child sticks with you and…has the biggest impact on me.

Respondent #14 also feels charitable giving is a way of life. Some of her first memories of charitable experiences are unofficial but they are no doubt some of her most fond experiences which is evidenced by the smile she displayed on her face as she shared how she first became engaged with benevolent giving. She was first introduced to charity as a child by her mother but remembered everyone around her participated:

> Giving has always been a part of my life….It is in our [my] blood. I grew up in the south and if someone needed something and they needed it, you gave it. I gave out the bacon. I used to borrow money from my boyfriend to give to someone else. That is what I do!

Respondent #4 has been participating every since she was a child with her family:

> My parents, especially my father, was very active in the church and I know he gave financially…He gave time and expertise. I grew up in a home in which there was a commitment to volunteerism. I got married…I become more involved…I founded a nonprofit when I moved to Michigan. I am a Rotarian…I am involved in the church….I am also tutoring an adult that can't read.

Respondent #9 has been active in charity her entire life. She learned at an early age from her membership in the Girl Scouts that charitable giving was the thing to do:

> Girl Scouts. You learn through that organization and you end up visiting nursing homes or visiting and doing things for other children that don't have as much as you…In high school, I was working at a bible camp/bible center in Ohio and we helped out in the projects. We went over to help. It was probably the first time I was able to do things on my own.

Respondent #7 stated that charity, whether formal or informal, had become a way of life for her as a result of her familial involvement. She shared intimate details of growing up in a family which housed people who were visiting from "out of town" or how it was nothing special for her mother to cook a meal for a neighbor.

Charitable Giving: The Loan

 During an interview with Respondent #10, a captivating discussion about charitable giving occurred in which he described unofficial charitable giving as being a loan. Respondent #10 stated several times that he "gives away a lot of money". His donations are directed more so to informal charities, in particular individuals, who are in need; nonetheless, his donations are to be repaid. It should be acknowledged now that many of his donations have been defaulted on. Respondent #10 was visibly disappointed (he frowned and gave a nervous laugh) as he discussed one of his experiences.

> I give away a lot of money. Someone that I care about can call me and say they didn't want to tell me that they have been parking around the corner because they think their car is going to get repossessed because they are two months behind. They will tell me they have one month but was wondering if I would be willing to help them with the other month. They offer if I want to they will write me a contract for the other month. As soon as they say that I know they are going to have problems paying me back and that is why they offer insurance…. So I will give people money and if they say they will pay me back I will say ok. I will not ask them for it.

Summary

 This section has presented distinctive definitions of charitable giving provided by individuals who engage in the activity. There are some people who separate charitable acts into two equally important groups of activities which benefit dissimilar groups of recipients, while there are others who fail to group charitable giving into unique categories. Individuals who fail to classify charity into groups view the activity, whether it is formal or informal, as a way of life, similar to a custom, which has been a constant in their lives. There are some respondents who define official charitable giving as a swap of

resources such as goods and services that may lead to benefit for one or all parties involved, while there are others who view official charitable giving as a possible solution to a predicament. There is one individual who considers unofficial charitable giving to be simply a loan, a temporary of allocation of resources to be repaid to the contributor. The varying definitions of charitable giving provided by participants can only be emphasized and fully understood as subsequent sections explain how these definitions sometimes influence a person's rationale or motivation for engaging in charitable activity. In addition, the definitions shape a person's opinion of a positive or negative charitable experience.

First Involvement

The participants of this study are very active in official and unofficial charity. With such high participation, it would only be natural to inquire about each person's first experience with charity, more specifically, how each person began participating in charitable giving. Literature on charitable giving has indicated many people are introduced to the activity by family, friends, co-workers, school, employers, and religion (Schervish, 1997; Schervish and Havens, 1998). It has also been proven individuals who are exposed to charity at a young age by family and friends often continue to engage in similar activities as they progress through life (Pilavian and Charng, 1999). Some respondents credited their involvement with formal and informal charity to known sources such as family, friends, coworkers, and employers and many admitted to continued engagement in the same type of charity they were exposed to years earlier.

Other respondents, two in particular, were first introduced to charity as a result of their own personal desires and interests, while one individual stated she first became involved after she joined a service organization. Two other respondents stated they are now involved in charitable giving as a result of their collegiate experiences. For these two individuals, they were first exposed to charity after leaving home to attend college.

Family

The family, parents in particular, has been credited throughout the literature as being the primary reason individuals choose to engage in charitable giving (Lee, Piliavin and Call, 1999; Rushton, 1982; Wilson, 2000; Piliavan and Charng, 1999). Four individuals who participated in this research stated they were first exposed to charitable giving by their family members, three individuals were introduced to charity by their parents, and one was introduced to charity by her husband. Respondent #16 was first introduced to charity by his mother, who would take he, his siblings, and family friends around to collect clothing for the Salvation Army during the holiday season. Respondent #4 grew up in a home in which both of her parents participated in charity. Respondent #14 was also first exposed to charity by a parent:

> Mama, Mother. It was your [my] upbringing. I grew up…and if a family needed something and they needed it you gave it.

Respondent #2 is a very successful banker in Metropolitan Detroit who has "given to lots of different organizations", so many that is she is not able to recall them all. She is also a dedicated volunteer who does a variety of tasks. Unlike many of her counterparts who

started participating in charitable giving at an early age, she had a late start which she credits to her husband:

> Rotary. I have been a member of that group for a long time….My husband was a member of Rotary and I knew about it from him….That is how I got involved and that was longer than 16 years ago....about 18 years.

Personal Choice

For Respondent #1, charitable giving is something she "just decided" to do. In 1973, she was looking for an activity to occupy her time and she decided to volunteer. Since her first volunteer experience, she has continued to participate in charitable giving.

College

Literature on philanthropy has indicated individuals who participate in charitable giving during college years develop skills which are of value to future employers. In addition, the college experience teaches many students how to be socially aware (Wilson, 2000; Schervish and Havens, 1998). Respondent #13 first became involved in charitable giving during college:

> I was involved with an organization at school and we would pick the charity and raise money for it and sponsor different events like basketball games….With my organization, we raised money for a girl's charity and it was for young girls with children. We did a car smash. We paid money to wreck a car, beat the car.

Respondent #12 also began participating in charitable giving after leaving home to attend Eastern Michigan University. According to Respondent #12, it was her time away at college that allowed her to realize how bad things were for some people in her home city:

> When I went to college, basically from being removed from the things I was around even though I went to Eastern, each time I would come back home I would see how things really were. Once you are removed from things…you can see how things really are. It wasn't until I was in college that I started to see that I need to do something to make a change. I guess around 2000-2002.

Friends

Respondent # 15 was first introduced to charity by his friends; however, his first exposure to charity occurred as an adult:

> Friends asked [me to give] because they gave. They would mention it….If they tell me they give to that I may give.

As of this interview, Respondent # 15 discussed donating money to a variety of causes, many of which he became aware of as a result of his friends.

Co-Workers

Respondent # 11 participates in charitable giving as a result of his co-workers:

> A coworker got me involved. I attended a few meetings and realized it was something that I wanted to be involved with.

Solicitation

Research has shown individuals are more likely to give to charity if they are asked to engage in the activity, so it is no surprise that three individuals stated they became involved in charitable giving as a result of a simple request (Schervish, 1997; Schervish and Havens, 1998). Respondent #5 never participated in any charitable giving until he was asked:

> I did not volunteer. I was approached about charitable giving. I was hesitant….why should I give my time, and equipment and resources to somebody else. After thinking about it…I felt it was necessary.

Respondent #6 also became involved in charitable giving after she was called on the phone and solicited by a charitable organization which supports the police. To this date, Respondent #6 engages in charitable giving with the same organization who phoned her. Respondent #7 started giving to charity over 24 years ago when she began working at her current employer. She was exposed to charity during her childhood because she witnessed her mother participate in various activities via the church; however, it wasn't until she began working at a local company which asks employees to donate via payroll deduction that she began participating.

Membership in Service Organization

Respondent #8 is a highly active volunteer in Metropolitan Detroit. She volunteers often with local charitable organizations which include local soup kitchens. Respondent #8 credits her charitable deeds to her involvement to membership in a sorority:

> I first got involved by giving through my organization and then I realized that I kind of liked it so I kept doing it on my own.

Awareness of a Need

Respondent #3 was unlike other respondents of this study as he didn't credit his involvement to a well known agent of socialization; he simply stated he became involved as a result of his individual interest in improving his community:

> My interest in making this local community the best it can be. Understanding that there is a tremendous amount of need and understanding that the role of government support and other support and now organizations are more reliant on private donations….Recognizing that there is need in this world. There are the have and the have nots and regardless of the economy, struggling economy, there are many people that are in the position, have the resources to provide support…..

The Media

The media has been credited in various fields such as sociology, risk communication, and gender studies for its ability to shape attitudes, actions, behaviors, and ideologies. Scholars over the years have debated the role that media plays in encouraging behavior; however, many scholars have concluded it is a tool that not only provides information but it is used by many individuals to make decisions in life (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, and Sasson, 1992). Respondent #10 is unlike his counterparts as his first exposure to charity did not result from family, friends, or even coworkers; his first experience with charity was a direct result of the media:

> I saw a minister at a church on TV…. I have been contributing to this church about 20 years.

Summary

This section explained how some individuals become involved in charitable giving, official and unofficial. For some respondents, their charitable participation began as a result of an agent of socialization which has been mentioned previously in literature

for jumpstarting charitable behavior such as the family, friends, coworkers and religion. There is one individual who credited his charitable giving to an agent of socialization previously unmentioned in the literature, the media. What role, if any, does the media play in influencing a person to engage in charitable giving? This question is one which has not been posed or answered in the literature on charitable giving to my knowledge, so I will assume at present one cannot be certain the media directly influences anyone to start participating in charitable giving.

While agents of socialization were mentioned as the reasons many respondents decided to start engaging in charitable participation, it is important to reiterate that there were other individuals who discussed their charitable giving resulted from their personal choice, such as their desire to find an activity to occupy personal time, a simple request of support, or their personal recognition of a need. How many individuals engage in charitable giving because they are looking for something to do or because they feel it is necessary? The respondents who stated they engage in charitable giving due to individual choice or personal awareness present two interesting aspects of charitable giving which indicate further study into charitable involvement is necessary. It is not known how many people become engaged in charitable giving because they view it as a hobby or simply because it is deemed a necessity. Past research has indicated individuals participate in charitable giving because they feel it is essential (Schervish, 1997, 112-113; Schervish and Havens, 2008; Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan, 2005); however, one cannot be sure leisure pursuits or personal interest are introductions to charitable giving.

<u>Understanding Charitable Giving</u>

Are two types of charitable giving present in our society? Research on charitable giving for the most part has focused on official methods of charity (also known as formal charity). These studies have investigated topics such as motivational factors of official charity and reasons for cessation. These studies, while informative, have been critiqued by scholars in the nonprofit sector who have asserted these studies have a narrow focus which has painted an unrealistic picture of charitable giving (Duran, 2001; O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herlihy, and Havens, 2002). O'Neill (2001) conducted research on charitable giving in California and focused on official and unofficial methods of charity. Results of his research revealed unofficial charitable giving is a common occurrence, in particular with minority groups. In addition, O'Neill (2001) discovered approximately 60% of all households participate in unofficial charitable giving.

Schervish, O'Herlihy, and Havens (2002) also investigated informal charitable giving and results of their research showed that informal giving is a major type of charitable giving. Unofficial giving accounts for charitable giving totaling between $58 billion and $102 billion each year. Children receive the most informal charitable gifts which include donations of money and other items of value. The study by Schervish et al (2001) also showed that individuals typically give over 7% of their income to informal charities and these gifts account for approximately "76% of the total gifts given to official charities" (Schervish et al, 2001, 2). It has been estimated that a gift of $1,479 to a formal

charitable entity yields a comparable gift of $1,130 to an informal cause (Schervish, O'Herhilhy, and Havens, 2002).

The research conducted by O'Neill, Schervish, O'Herlihy, and Havens provided further insight into charitable giving by confirming two types of charity are present in our society and individuals allocate a similar amount of resources to each type of charity. Unfortunately, the research failed to explain why individuals choose to engage in unofficial methods of charity and it didn't explain the reasons a person abstains from informal charity or ceases participation. Furthermore, the research did not explain if the previously advanced motivational factors of official charity as well as reasons for cessation apply to unofficial charity.

As a result of some participants reiterating the fact that two types of charity are present in society, additional information regarding charitable giving, official and unofficial, has been provided. In the following two sections, motivational factors, positive and negative outcomes of official and unofficial methods of charity will be discussed. In addition, the reasons individuals choose to abstain from the activity will be explained.

<u>Understanding Official Charitable Giving</u>

It has always been important for researchers to fully understand why individuals choose to engage in charitable giving, in particular official charity. Considerable research has occurred in which participants have been asked to explain why they choose to engage in official charitable giving. This research has for the most part yielded results which

suggest individuals are interested in participating in official charitable giving because of altruistic and egoistic reasons, as well as because they identify with the charitable cause (Duclos, 2008; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Schervish, 1997). Analysis of the data collected during this study has suggested that an individual's decision to engage in charitable acts cannot be fully explained with only simple rationales. In fact, other reasons have to be considered extending beyond the common advanced notions of philanthropic motivation. In the following sections, information gathered from respondents regarding their rationale for engaging in official charitable giving, positive and negative outcomes of official charitable giving, as well as the reasons they have chosen to abstain from official charitable giving presently and in the past will be discussed.

<u>Motivations for Official Charitable Giving</u>

Official charitable giving is defined in this analysis as the donation of time, financial resources, or helping activities to benefit a charitable organization (O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy and Havens, 2002). There are some participants who stated their formal charitable participation occurs for altruistic or egoistic reasons, as there are individuals who do not suggest altruism, whether pure or impure, is a motivating factor. One respondent failed to mention altruism or egoism as a rationale for official charitable participation as she stated she participates in official charitable acts because it is a habit. The following motivational factors will be discussed as motivational factors of official charitable giving: altruism, egoism, and routine.

Altruism

There are individuals who participate in official charitable giving because they are purely concerned about the well-being of others. Altruistic donors appear to have an unwavering desire to ensure everyone is doing well even if their behavior is possibly detrimental to self (Simmons, 1991). These individuals, such as Respondent #6, are interested in making sure others have the things needed to do well:

> I donate to police organizations, fraternal orders and professional organizations for police officers….Police officers put their lives on the line so if they are killed the money at least goes to support their children and wives.

Respondent #2 is motivated to engage in formal benevolent acts because she is concerned about the well being of others, even animals:

> I just contacted the Michigan Humane Society… I am a big animal lover. We have a place up north and [I] said [I] have to check out that shelter….I signed up to volunteer. I am great at cleaning litter boxes and it is not glamorous work but you wipe the dog kennels from top to bottom…I want to take care of them…

Respondent #10 also engages in charitable work because he is altruistic:

> I …give to several charities. There are probably 20 different nonprofits
>
> that I have given to this year, at least $100 and there are probably two or
>
> three that I have given $500…

Egoism (Impure Altruism)

There are some participants who stated they participate in official charity because they have a concern for the well-being of others as well as themselves These individuals confessed that their charitable participation, while beneficial to others, is dependent on

the benefits, intrinsic and extrinsic, in which they are to receive. Individuals who shared that charitable giving is merely a "give and take relationship" or exchange are by definition impure altruists or egoistic donors (Duclos, 1990).

Expectation of Reward

Individuals often engage in formal benevolent activities because they anticipate a reward (Duclos, 1990; Schervish & Havens, 1998). Several individuals discussed the rewards they anticipated from their formal charitable participation, including public recognition, mood enhancement, and even future blessings. Respondent #5 is an egoistic donor. If you recall, he provides video production services to organizations:

> I always enjoy helping [organizations] because I would occasionally like to be able to help myself….

Respondent #2 is very active in formal charity. She engages in official charitable acts to help others as well as herself; however, she is expecting a benefit which is not necessarily tangible: mood improvement:

> It sounds corny but I like helping….I don't go into it thinking I am going to be miserable…I think it is a person's nature or if it were not rewarding for me, I don't think I would do it…I want that feeling and that is why I keep doing it.

Respondent #1 is encouraged to engage in official charity because she feels she always receives a blessing after she donates time to a charitable organization:

> I have always felt that I have good luck when I donate time. It is always that I have good luck with things that are not related. I volunteer time for something else and I write a big account for something that is not related. I feel when things are kind of slow I need to go volunteer.

Coercion

Respondent #10 donates large sums of money and time to agencies; however, his decision to support these agencies is often influenced by his fear of chastisement or termination from his employer:

> With walkathons, there was an expectation that every employee would give [money and participate]. I would give [money] and have to go and walk the 6.5 mile walk and I ran it every year. I am a supervisor…. If you were a manager and did not do it, you would be looked down upon…It would lead to firing or you would have a mark on you…

Respondent #15 also shared that coercion serves as a motivating factor for his official charitable giving. Respondent #15 previously defined charitable giving as mere means to the end. For him, formal charitable giving ended the consistent and forceful requests he would receive from his bosses who demanded he donate to a charitable organization supported by his employer. According to Respondent #15, individuals are often forced to give to charity by employers and as a result, he often donates the minimum cash donation possible as his employers often demand a donation from everyone. Respondent #15 further stated his donation is given only to pacify his supervisors and ensure they would not continue to bother him about donating money to charity. Respondent #15 showed no interest in the well-being of recipients of his donation.

It's a Habit

There is one individual who stated official charitable giving was a habit. Respondent #1 stated she gives to a group of charities each year during the Christmas season. She did not share any reason for her formal charitable activities that occur yearly

besides the fact she has been doing it for a considerable amount of time during the holiday season.

Positive Outcomes of Official Charity

The positive outcomes associated with participation in charity have been mentioned in various sources of literature and include: the development of socially aware individuals and the reduction of deviant behavior (Wilson, 2000). Individuals who engage in charity overall have better physical health than their peers who abstain. In addition, these individuals tend to have higher self-esteem than their peers who chose not to engage in the charitable acts. Individuals who participate in official charity also receive career advancement as it has been proven to be a successful tool in assisting with attaining employment (Wilson, 2000). It should be noted that research has been unable to explain if the participants engage in charity because they have better health or if the activity leads to better health. The literature on the outcomes of charity, in particular the positive ones, is lacking as it does not explain if the positive outcomes are associated with official or unofficial charity which could arguably lead individuals to assume these benefits are the same across the two categories of charity.

Some individuals, in particular, those who made a clear distinction between formal and informal charity, provided insight into the positive outcomes of participation in charitable giving. The following section will discuss the positive outcomes of official charitable participation: goal attainment, education, and entertainment. It should be mentioned at this point that the positive outcomes of official charity discussed by

respondents did not perfectly overlap with the one positive outcome of unofficial charity. The positive outcome of unofficial charity will be discussed in a subsequent section, which further stresses the importance of distinguishing between the two types of charity.

Goal Attainment

Individuals engage in formal charity for altruistic and egoistic reasons. These motivations often provide respondents with the results they deem acceptable and positive. Respondent #14 participates in formal charity because she is able to assist the agencies work towards their goals and mission. Respondent #14 donates time and resources to organizations that work with children who live in unstable environments. The staff of the organization she involves herself with work diligently to create a sense of normalcy for the children they serve. For her, the best result of her involvement with the children's organizations is she is able to see how her efforts actually help the agency achieve its goals:

> I was with the children organizing events for them for Christmas…We just had a big party that was fun with other people that made them feel more normal. The children's reactions! A lot of times when you see the children they are really withdrawn…and [at the party] they are [were] dancing and having fun and you are [were] able to see the joy in their faces and they are no longer carrying this weight…For a couple of hours they were children.

Respondent #4 volunteers as a tutor with a nonprofit agency in Detroit that helps women who have dropped out of high school earn a GED. She enjoys volunteering at the agency as she is able to see the progress the women make from the time they enter into the program until the time they complete the GED:

> Most recently and it has been such a delight, is that I am working with women that are earning their GED and seeing them in the morning that they come in after they pass the GED test. Just being a part of their lives for years and then they pass the test. We had one come in yesterday and she is done. Monday morning she goes to …community college to register and that is so rewarding. It is such a long journey and it is an individual journey to see them travel it from where they come from and with their aspirations. I consider myself lucky because I see results because many times you give and you don't see results.

Education and Entertainment

An examination of the variables educational obtainment and charitable participation has shown individuals who have a college degree are more likely to participate in charitable acts than individuals who do not have a college degree. There has been no literature, to my knowledge, that has suggested or even investigated if individuals choose to engage in charitable giving because it serves as a source of formal education. In addition, entertainment has not been focused on as an outcome of formal charity. Education and entertainment are two outcomes of formal charity for two respondents in this study. Respondent #2 is a banker who has been involved in Rotary for 18 years. She loves the organization because its activities provide her with the opportunity to learn about not only her local community but communities all over the world:

> They have a program called group study exchange….It is a great experience for me and them because they and I get to see a different part of the world and how people work. It is a vocational type exchange program. If [some]one is a banker [and] they want to know how our banks work….they can see how I work in my bank and I get to see how he works in his bank.

Respondent #1 appreciates not only the education but the entertainment she receives from participating in official charity. She is always thrilled when she attends an agency event which educates and entertains the guests:

> I don't like a lot of the dinners you go to for nonprofits. They are all the same. The food is all the same, the format is always the same but the venue is not. From my perspective they are all boring….I go because I want to be supportive but I don't really like going. One of the most fun ones I attended was by an agency and they had a band and did Detroit line dancing at the Renaissance Center and the rest of the event was dancing and eating. It was one of the most fun ones….I like the ones done by one agency….about current topics because you get two for one.

<u>Negative Outcomes of Official Charity</u>

Are there any negative aspects of charitable giving? It has been implied throughout the literature that the activity yields nothing but positive results for all involved entities (Anik, Aknin, Norton, & Dunn, 2009; Wuthnow, 1991). Discussions with many individuals have shown that charitable giving, formal and informal, has negative outcomes which should be acknowledged. In the following sections, the reader will learn about negative outcomes of official charity. Six negative outcomes of official charity were mentioned by respondents, including unsatisfactory results, lack of appreciation, anger, betrayal, skepticism, inability to help, and discouragement. Each of the outcomes will be discussed below in detail with each respondent's perspective on the outcome.

Unsatisfactory Results

Respondent #5 donates his audiovisual and video productions services to agencies in exchange for free marketing; yet, he admits he has not received promotion equal to the services he has donated:

> …I have provided them [organizations] with $25,000 worth of video work
>
> and I have only received $500 of exchange/advertisement from them.

Respondent #5 felt unacknowledged and taken advantage of by the agencies. He believed they were engaging in an exchange which would provide benefit to all parties involved; yet, he feels he has reaped no benefit from the exchange.

Lack of Appreciation

Nonprofit organization staff are very important parts of the organizations they serve as they are responsible for ensuring the mission of the agency is fulfilled. Unfortunately, these individuals were mentioned by some respondents as being one of the unpleasant aspects of charitable giving since they often times lack appreciation for the things volunteers do for organizations. Respondent #13 is a member of a national organization which is highly involved in volunteerism. She enjoys helping others but she feels staff of nonprofits often take volunteers for granted:

> …I think it was more of the organization [soup kitchen] we were working with. I don't know if they were frustrated but they had the attitude that this is what you are supposed to do so just do it! I don't have to do it. People do it [volunteer] out of the kindness of their hearts. [An organization that I am involved with] donated money and members donated time. We worked the soup kitchen and the staff acted as if this is what you should do.

Respondent #4 echoed the sentiments of Respondent #13 as she shared that staff members of nonprofits often mistreat volunteers:

> I get tired of the paid on your phone, paid professional fundraisers that are representing the veterans and police organizations. They can be rude….when you say I gave four months ago in another year and they give you a rude response…I can't believe it.

Anger and Betrayal

For Respondent #14, formal charity presents negative outcomes when you are made aware your donation of time or money was not utilized correctly. Respondent #14 experienced intense anger when she learned her financial donations were used inappropriately by a nonprofit to which she donated:

> …When you find out that people are not doing what they say they will with your gift or donations. You find out it went more towards not the people that were hurting but more towards the people that were asking for the donations…I was angry! That is stealing to me…

In further conversation, Respondent #14 expressed the feelings of betrayal she felt as she learned via the media an agency she had supported engaged in misappropriation of funds:

> … I want to say they were busted and were on the news. That is the worst way to find out; you look up and see them on the news.

Respondent #10 shared a similar story of charitable giving that resulted in him feeling angry and betrayed. Respondent #10 became irritated once again as he relived this experience in which he was forced to make a donation to an employer only to learn at a later time the money was being allocated to a politician for his campaign:

> At my previous employment, they were doing campaign contributions to a political candidate that I did not support and this candidate was up north in a location where the agency was building a new facility and the person was in a position to make decisions regarding us, land space usage and zoning. It was a part of the philosophy of contribute to my campaign and part of my political power will do you favor. If you were a part of the organization looking to expand its location and a political candidate was going to vote yes so you could be there, you were expected to contribute $25 to the person's campaign. I hated it so much but I knew better than to say a word!

Skepticism

Respondent #10 is now skeptical of many agencies he has donated money to after he has received reoccurring requests for a program which should have adequate funding. He is aware the agency met its financial goal and assumes the agency should be able to meet is need; yet, the agency continues to request money for the program:

> …you give money to [formal organizations] and you… see that what they told you that you were giving to is still challenged. So you wonder did they use the money? The goal was $25,000 for a specific purpose and you raised $30,000 but the purpose has not been addressed.

Respondent #14 is also skeptical. She donated money for three years to a charity which was to benefit student performers:

> Another child was from [the same] local performing arts academy and they had the opportunity to study with Debbie Allen and that was 5-6 years ago and they have not made it to study with her yet. I have a problem with it because they have asked me three times and you have not gotten there yet…. I think charitable organizations… have the responsibility to drop me a line or put me a brochure in the mail and say Mrs., this is what we did and I if I decide to drive through that part of town I should see a stick house with your name on it that shows that you did something.

Inability to Help

Formal charity presents many donors with the opportunity to provide assistance to groups of people who are in need of assistance. Individuals who engage in charity with the primary focus of lending a helping hand are often unaware their actions are unable to provide assistance; consequently, donors suggested one of the most negative outcomes of engaging in formal charitable giving is realizing the frequent inability to make things better for recipients. Respondent #2 provided an example of a time when she realized her donation to a charitable organization was ineffective:

> One time I was calling around looking for something to do for a family and I know there are millions of kids that need help. I called an agency and they sent me two families and I selected a family in which the mom was a single mom with children and they were not going to have a Christmas. They sent the names of the kids and what the mom needed for the kids and it was specific and I went out … and I put an outfit in for each kid that was inexpensive and underwear, pajamas, a toy. One of the girls liked Dora the Explorer and I was thinking who is that and I got her a Dora doll …. because the agency requires you call… I called the mom… and I asked her if they liked them [the gifts] and she…said the kids loved them and my little girl loved the doll. I had a gift bag for the mom and I bought bigger because I didn't know her size and some bath lotion and she was grateful and happy. For some reason, I called her again to check on the kids and she said the kids are not here right now and she said social services took them away and she said they came and we tried to hide the kids and my sister in law said I couldn't hide the kids and I guess they came because I slapped them around. I thought Christmas presents are really nothing if the kids are being abused and living in different places. Here I am thinking that I am going to buy them Christmas presents and they are going to have a good Christmas and then I hear this. It was a wake-up call.

It can easily be assumed that the negative outcome mentioned by Respondent #2 resulted from her having unrealistic expectations of the impact of her charitable support; however, Respondent #2 shared the agency to which she donated often aids families and

individuals who require specialized assistance (i.e., mental health counseling and financial counseling) donors are unable to provide. This negative outcome could have been avoided if Respondent #2 was made aware that her charitable support may not influence great change via a donor/volunteer training program which educates interested supporters on the potential influence of their support. In addition, agencies who serve clients who have specific needs should recruit volunteers who are able to aid in the provision of such requirements.

Discouragement

Charity is important to Respondent #12 because it allows her to help individuals in need; yet, she often tires from the activity because she is discouraged. She is involved with many nonprofit agencies, which could arguably lead her to experience burnout; however, she feels the worst thing that has resulted from her constant involvement in charity is being told by individuals she encounters that her efforts are pointless:

> When you are trying to do something positive and bring forth change, there will always be someone negative telling you that you cannot do it.

Official Charity Cessation

Previous research investigated the reasons individuals stop donating time and money to charitable organizations and it has indicated donor cessation often occurs for the following reasons: if donors lack time or money, if donors are asked too frequently to engage in charitable giving, if donors find a new agency or cause to support, if the donor is no longer a supporter of the agency or community; or if the donor develops a lack of

trust for the agency (Independent Sector, 2001). Some respondents stated their cessation resulted from a lack of resources, while others attributed their halt in formal charitable support to a lack of trust and lack of appreciation. Participants in this study were asked if they had at any point stopped participating in official charitable giving. Respondents who were at the time of the interview not participating in official charity provided the reasons they had chosen to abstain from the activity, Also, individuals who had decided to stop participating at any time in the past explained why they previously refrained.

Lack of Discretionary Resources (Money and Time)

Respondent #16 has opted out of formal charitable giving as he does not have discretionary money to donate to his favorite causes:

> Currently, I am going to say no, [I am not participating in charitable giving]. Money is tight and my number one charity right now is me.

Respondent #11 is no longer volunteering with a local parent organization because he no longer has the time:

> I have not participated in the past year [due] to a conflicting time schedule. I haven't had the time.

Both Respondent #11 and Respondent #16 insist they will resume their formal charitable participation when they are able.

Lack of Appreciation

Some donors described a lack of appreciation as one of the negative outcomes resulting from participating in formal charitable giving. For some participants, such as

Respondent #5, the negative outcome ultimately caused him to cease charitable participation. Respondent #5 has had more than one negative formal charitable experience in which he has felt unappreciated. One of his standout experiences occurred when he agreed to produce and edit a video for a local nonprofit for free:

> …One individual [agency] representative took my kindness and ran with it. She was never satisfied with the service even though it was free. She just kept wanting to add more and more to it and demanding more and more as if now I am required to provide her with more…That was not the case…

An additional negative experience shared by Respondent #5 that contributed to his formal charitable cessation occurred at a local award ceremony in which he and others agreed to provide free video production services to the agency which hosts the yearly award ceremony:

> [At the awards]….the majority of artists wanted us to work with them and provide our services for free. We are already there giving out our services for free but on top of that, the majority of artists wanted us to work with them for free! That stood out because it was too much and there was no way we could do all that.

Too Frequent Solicitation (Over-solicitation)

The frequency of donor requests for gifts has been cited as a reason individuals often abandon formal charitable giving (Indiana University, 2010). Respondent #1 has stopped her support of charitable organizations because she has been asked for a gift of time or money too often:

> I get frustrated with certain nonprofits…because they send the constant envelopes...I stopped donating to this agency because they put me on a list in which I was getting something by email every single month and it is ridiculous. I don't like it so I don't give to them anymore.

Life Course

As individuals progress through life, their involvement in charity often decreases as responsibilities associated with parenting and employment increase (Sundeen, 1990; Reed, Aquino, and Levy, 2007). Respondent #2 ended her charitable giving as her duties as a mother increased:

> When my kids were growing up, it was harder because they all had things like soccer. It was harder to be engaged…

Respondent #16 attributed his charitable cessation to changes in his career:

> I would say as my career started taking off I ended up spending more time on that and less on outside activities.

<u>Summary</u>

This section illustrates individuals choose to engage in charitable giving for a variety of reasons which include altruism and egoism. Altruistic individuals suggested they engage in charitable giving because it is one of the most beneficial methods to use if they wish to provide assistance to people who are in need. Egoistic donors, on the other hand, participate in the activity because it allows them to help others and themselves. For some egoistic donors, the reward they seek appears to be more important than the assistance they provide, while others use charitable giving as a tool to provide satisfaction to others and relieve personal punishment.

Charitable giving is consistently portrayed as a beneficial activity for all participants. This idea has been perpetuated by research that has suggested official

charity often leads to good outcomes for donors such as career advancement and higher self-esteem. Study participants stated formal charity has wonderful outcomes for them and some shared that they engage in formal charity because it allows them to help an agency achieve its goals. Additionally, individuals participate in charity because it is a source of education and entertainment.

It is important for individuals to realize charitable giving is not always beneficial. Some research participants provided insight into the activity which indicates participants may receive less than optimal results from engaging in the activity. The participants who shared negative outcomes of charitable giving have shown that formal charitable giving is not always a positive experience for all participants involved as it leads to feelings of sadness, doubt, and other outcomes individuals do not enjoy or expect. For many individuals who discussed negative outcomes of official giving, their negative endings resulted from interaction with staff. More research should be conducted to understand how staff behaviors impact formal chartable participants.

In addition, the results of the study have shown that the not always pleasant activity of charitable giving may lead individuals to discontinue their participation for reasons which include lack of resources, too frequent solicitation, changes in life, feeling they are not appreciated, and uncertain motives. Individuals who do not have the resources necessary to engage in formal charity or people who are experiencing life changes display a commitment to resuming their charitable acts. Unfortunately, research participants who ceased charitable participation due to feeling unappreciated and/or

betrayed were unable to provide a return date to their charitable acts. The sheer fact that some individuals are willing to resume official charitable participation while others have no desire to re-engage in the activity suggests that further studies into reasons for cessation should occur to uncover and understand all of the reasons a person will end official charitable participation indefinitely.

Understanding Unofficial Charitable Giving

Why do individuals engage in unofficial charitable giving? Unofficial charitable giving is the donation of time, resources or helping activities to people, or causes which are not easily recognized or reported (Duran, 2001; O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy and Havens, 2002; Wuthnow, 1991). The previous sections of this analysis provided insight into official charitable giving including motivational factors, outcomes, and reasons individuals choose to stop engaging in the activity. In this section, the focus is unofficial charitable giving, a type of charitable activity which has received minimal attention in mainstream literature. The motivations, outcomes, and reasons for unofficial charitable cessation will be highlighted.

Motivations for Unofficial Charitable Giving

Altruism

Altruistic donors desire to provide assistance to individuals even if they harm themselves (Simmons, 1991). There were a few respondents of this study who stated without hesitation unofficial giving stems from altruism and altruism only. Respondent #8 is an instructor in a local school system. She chooses to provide unofficial charitable

assistance to individuals because she realizes there is always someone who is need even

when she may not be doing her best:

> Knowing that there are people that are less fortunate and even though times are harder for everyone, myself included,…there is always someone worse off [than me]…that can use the assistance so that motivates me to give…

Respondent #10 stated one of his primary motivations for unofficial charity is altruism.

Respondent #10 has given large amounts of money to individuals, such as personal

friends who have a need. His support of such causes has arguably slowed his own

personal progress in achieving a goal he has set for himself:

> Someone…can call me and say they didn't want me to know that they have been parking around the corner because they think their car is going to be repossessed because they are two months behind. They will tell me they have one month but was wondering if I would be willing to help them with the other month….So I will give people [them] the money….I gave someone $1000 for their mortgage….I like that about me but I am questioning… Didn't you say you wanted a Mercedes? How are you going to get the Mercedes when every time someone gives you a sob story you have given away the Mercedes payment? You have already bought the car in other peoples light payments and car notes?

Reciprocity

Reciprocity is a human action that has become a social norm wherein individuals

feel the desire to return or share benefits they have received (Wallace and Wolf, 2006).

Reciprocity has been investigated as a rationale for helping behavior and results have

indicated recipients of altruistic acts will often try to perform an equal philanthropic act

to benefit the person(s) or entity that assisted them. Research has shown if a recipient of

an selfless act is unable to return the kind deed, he or she may enter into a state of serial

altruism in which the recipient will become a donor to an unknown individual (Moody, 2008). Respondent #12 is often motivated to participate in unofficial charitable giving because she feels obligated to "help other people" because she has been assisted in the past:

> It is a good thing to help other people. Umm, in life you gotta realize in life it is not all about yourself and I just believe that I would not be where I am today if someone did not extend a hand to me, so in return I like to help people out basically.

Positive Outcomes of Unofficial Charity

Providing a Helping Hand

Individuals who participate in informal charity appear to be motivated simply because they want to improve the lives of another. All of the participants who discussed the positive outcomes of unofficial charity clearly expressed their dedication to helping someone and were not interested in formalities such as awards and personal benefits often associated with formal charity. In addition to lack of interest in recognition, all participants collectively provided an example of the positive outcome of engaging in unofficial charity. It was the realization, or the knowing you helped someone who has a need. Respondent #12 was more than elated as she described how her efforts led to the release of two wrongfully convicted men:

> One guy was sentenced to 25 years in prison and he would basically write me and say I didn't commit the crime. I read his transcripts and saw that he should not be in prison and after nine years, I wrote the Supreme Court, Jeffrey Fieger and the Center for Wrongful Convictions and he got out….He was convicted of shooting someone from Ecorse and paralyzing the individual. Actually, he and his uncle were convicted. It felt good to

get them out. I didn't go around and say look what I did….He is out of prison after serving a 9 years prison sentence, he and his uncle…

<u>Negative Outcomes of Unofficial Charity</u>

Two negative outcomes of unofficial charity were mentioned by respondents: the unknown and being misled. These outcomes are unique, unexpected, and they show how important it is for nonprofits and scholars to recognize unofficial charity is an important activity to some donors and needs more consideration in studies of philanthropy.

An Unknown Daily Occurrence

A fascinating aspect of informal giving was presented during this research by one of the participants that reaffirms informal giving is more popular than ever imagined as individuals engage in unceremonious giving as they complete mundane tasks. Wuthnow (1991) suggested that unofficial charity occurs more often than imagined; however, few have really focused on the activity. Respondents in this study have suggested informal charity occurs not for recognition, but because the focus is shifted from self to the welfare of other(s). Respondent #8 is a school teacher in Wayne County, Michigan and she described her daily involvement with unofficial giving which is often overlooked:

> …Since I work in the education field, everyday is charitable giving to me. It is not a day that goes by that you are not sharing a snack with one of the children you work with and even though it is not recognized as charitable by most, a lot of charitable giving goes unnoticed because you don't do it for people to notice or be proud of you, you do it because you see a need is present.

Respondent #8 wanted the public to recognize that informal giving may occur daily due occupation. She theorized that it is an activity that people typically do not hear about

because the focus is on other things. Respondent #7 also referred to all of the informal

giving that occurs on the job. Respondent #7 felt police officers and firemen engage in

informal giving often; unfortunately, it is rarely recognized:

> I look at their job as dangerous, on the spot thinking and decision making…they have stressful jobs…and they have problems but every day they get up and every day and put their uniform on. The only ones you see on the news are the ones that have broken the law…You do not see the ones on TV that don't have bad things going on in their lives…You don't hear about the ones that ran into a building.

Being Duped

Respondent #10 provided a unique definition of informal charity. He described it

as a loan often defaulted on. Further discussion revealed a negative outcome of the

activity where he stated was being "made a fool of":

> I give. I give a lot of money away. I gave someone $1000 for their mortgage. They told me they would give me the money back on September 23rd and they called me on September 18th and told me I am not going to have your money on the 23rd and there is nothing you can do about it. I am considering trying to have it on October 23rd and called me on about October 15th and said I don't know when I am going to have your money. I said fine. I am glad I gave it to someone that really needed it and if I am going to be made a fool of at least they needed for their house. In the meantime, you can't get 13 cents from me ever again in life. Keep the grand.

Unofficial Charity Cessation

Individuals who engage in unofficial charity can be influenced to end

participation just as individuals who engage in official charity. Unofficial charitable

participants provided three reasons to explain current and past reasons for cessation. A

lack of appreciation was mentioned as a reason for unofficial charitable cessation just as

it was discussed as contributing factor to official charitable cessation. Two additional and unique rationales of unofficial charity cessation were discussed by participants, the expectation of aid and unsure motives.

Unofficial Charity Cessation: Expectations of Aid

Individuals may disengage from informal charitable giving for the same reasons people may stop engaging in official charity such as lack of resources. Participants in this research provided insight into the factors that caused them to end informal charity and they surpassed the reasons provided for formal charitable cessation. For some donors, their informal charitable support ended as a result of recipients expecting them to provide aid, feeling unappreciated and because the donor began to question personal motives for engaging in the activity. Respondent #5 engaged in informal charity often with his family and friends. Unfortunately, he had to end his support because he felt his kindness became an expectation:

> Family expects me to do everything all the time for free and that happens once or twice per month. A lot of times people will approach me…and I will help….it becomes an issue when they keep demanding more and more and more…

Unofficial Charity Cessation: Lack of Appreciation

Respondent #7 engages in unofficial charity because she "wants to". She often provides rides for people she knows who lack transportation or individuals who are not familiar with Michigan's transportation system. She enjoys providing assistance to "people who have a need" but she often feels individuals she assists are ungrateful for her

help as they often try to force her to help them. Recently, she suspended providing transportation for an acquaintance because she felt unappreciated.

Unofficial Charity Cessation: Unsure Motives

Respondent #10 is an advocate of informal charity. He gives money, material items and anything he can to a person in need. He is not interested in any recognition. Recently, he began to wonder why he gives so much:

> …I will help someone and I like that about me but I am questioning, Is
> there some time of people pleasing co-dependency going on with you?

Respondent #10 wanted to understand his motivation for informal giving, so he indicated that he was making an effort to abort his charitable acts for a brief time period.

<u>Summary</u>

Individuals engage in informal charitable activities because they desire to assist someone who has a need or because they have been recipients of help in the past. For the most part, people enjoy engaging in informal charitable giving because it allows them to help the less fortunate; however, some participants feel their unofficial benevolent acts are disregarded, or unnoticed, which often turns their charitable activities into negative experiences. In addition, informal charitable acts can become unpleasant experiences if recipients choose to mistreat and/or deceive donors.

Individuals who engage in unofficial charitable giving can be influenced to end their participation just as participants of official charity. For some participants of informal charitable acts, their participation in the activity has stopped because gift

recipients feel they are entitled to the support of donors. Other donors have stopped engaging in unofficial charitable giving because they feel unacknowledged. The notion that individuals will stop engaging in unofficial charitable giving because they lack recognition suggests that participants of unofficial giving desire acknowledgment for their benevolent acts.

Additional Motivating Factors: The Influence of Religion

Three motivational factors were shared by respondents were not grouped as motivational factors for official or unofficial charity. These factors were not directly linked with a mode of charity simply because the participants did not connect them with either type of charity. Each participant shared the reason he or she engages in the activity and provided examples which suggest these factors could be used to explain their participation in any charitable activity. In the following section, religious beliefs, God's mission and simplicity will be discussed as reasons for charitable participation.

Religious Beliefs

There are individuals who suggested charitable giving has become a part of their lives. For four individuals, charitable giving has become a mainstay because of their strong religious beliefs that they believed obligated them to assist others. Two individuals were adamant about charitable participation because they felt they were blessed with wonderful lives and as a result they needed to help the less fortunate. The third individual simply participated, not because she had an abundance of resources to assist or because her life was the best, but because she believed it is what God wanted her to do. The fourth

respondent who discussed being motivated for charitable giving as a result of religion simply stated he participates because his bible instructs him to do so and it can be assumed that this allows him to participate in charitable giving with ease.

Two respondents are self-professed "God fearing" individuals who subscribe to the principle that individuals who have an abundance of resources are required to help people who are in need; however, it should be noted that it was unclear if these people really wanted to engage in charity to help or if they participated because they felt required to do so. Respondent #10 is committed to charitable giving because he has had a privileged life:

> I have been very blessed and fortunate in many ways and I am compelled
>
> to give and extend charity.

Respondent #4 is also committed to charitable giving because of her advantaged life. According to Respondent #4, "Everyone must give back! We are blessed…". Respondent #4 is an upper-middle class woman who resides in an affluent suburb in Wayne County, Michigan. She has been able to dedicate large amounts of time to helping the less fortunate. Respondent #4 did not grow up prosperous as she recalled memories from her childhood in which her parents "barely have [had] enough money to buy groceries" yet, she learned via church how important it was to help others especially if you have the means to provide assistance.

God's Mission

Respondent #11 is also committed to charitable giving as a result of her religious beliefs. She has one of the strongest commitments to charity of any of the respondents, and as a result of her dedication, has done some remarkable things such as assist two wrongfully convicted gentlemen secure freedom from life sentences in prison. When asked during her interview why she chooses to engage in charity, she stated she was "compelled to do something" as a result of God wanting her to get involved. At no point did Respondent #11 mention she felt obligated to help because she had an overwhelming surplus of resources; however, she did affirm during the interview that she found herself engaging in charitable work, often time consuming tasks because she felt it was something God wanted her to participate in. Respondent #11 did not make any distinction between official and unofficial charity and each charitable experience she engages in results from her assuming a task God desired for her, which made them of equal importance.

Simplicity

Respondent #10 participates in charitable giving for a variety of reasons. One of the reasons he participates in charity, in particular with his church, his primary charity, is because the bible instructs him to do so. According to Respondent #10, his charitable donation to his church is not based only on a connection, or even coercion, a method which has influenced him to donate to other organizations. His decision to donate to his church is based on the fact that the bible provides him details as to how he should be

charitable. Below is an excerpt in which his shares he gives a set amount to his church possibly with simplicity because it is spelled out in his bible:

> …I am giving a lot of money to church…. Church is my number one charity and that is spiritual and profane for me. It is written in the book the amount one should give.

Summary

This section reiterates known information on charitable giving which is religion often influences an individual to engage in charitable giving (Wuthnow, 1991). As a result of discussions with some participants, it has been reaffirmed that religion often influences individuals to engage in charitable acts, whether formal or informal; yet, it is unclear if individuals who participate in charitable giving due to religion do so because of free will or coercion. In addition, this section has prompted me to wonder if individuals who are influenced to engage in charitable giving due to religious beliefs are more prone to engage in formal methods of charity or less recognized types of charity.

Official Versus Unofficial Charity

The purpose of this research was to learn why individuals choose to engage and disengage in charitable giving. It was also important to learn about the outcomes of charitable giving. This study has reinforced the notion that two types of charitable giving are present in society, and as a result, this section will compare and contrast the two types while reviewing the motivations, outcomes and reasons for cessation for each.

There are two types of charity: official and unofficial. Official charity, also known as formal charitable giving, is the donation of financial resources, time, or helping activities to recognized entities such as nonprofit organizations (O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy, and Havens, 2002). Unofficial charitable giving is the donation of time, resources or helping activities to people, or causes which are not easily recognized or reported (Duran, 2001; O'Neill, 2001; Schervish, O'Herhilhy, and Havens, 2002). Respondents in this study are motivated to participate in official charitable giving for the following reasons: altruism, expectation of reward and even coercion. Individuals who engage in informal methods of charitable giving do so because they desire to ensure other people are doing well. For some of the participants who have a desire to assist others, engaging in official charitable giving has become the best method to use to help the less fortunate. This investigation into the motives for charitable giving, whether formal or informal, has shown individuals who engage in official and unofficial charity may have the same rationale for participating (i.e., altruism), but it has also suggested individuals who engage in more recognized forms of charitable giving may choose to do so because they can reap a benefit (i.e., public recognition) which may not be as easily attained from informal charity.

Each type of charity yields results which participants labeled as positive or negative. Positives outcomes of official charity shared by respondents in this study were the following: goal attainment (i.e., providing assistance), receiving education, and being entertained. On the other hand, participants of informal charity shared only one positive

outcome which is being able to assist someone who is in need. This study has proposed individuals who engage in official giving are more likely to reap an outcome that is deemed beneficial in comparison to individuals who engage in informal charity, the method of benevolence which is not typically recognized, because more positive outcomes where discussed for official charity. On the contrary, it could be argued individuals who engage in more recognized methods of charity tend to avoid informal methods because they are seeking a very specific outcome which may be perceived to be limited if they choose to engage in unofficial charity. For example, charitable giving studies have shown individuals often engage in formal methods of charity because it provides them with the opportunity to be recognized for their deeds (i.e., awards and tax breaks) (Schervish and Havens, 1998) unlike unofficial charitable participants who rarely get acknowledged for their efforts. It could also be suggested that many participants may engage in informal charitable giving but fail to consider it altruistic at all which has led to limited information regarding the outcomes of the act. Respondents in this study stated that unofficial charitable giving occurs daily as a result of a person's employment; however, the individuals who are engaging in the daily benevolent acts often fail to define their actions as charitable because they occurred during a routine task.

Both official and unofficial charitable participants discussed the negative outcomes of their participation in charitable giving. Respondents who shared negative outcomes of official charity stated the following things may occur from engaging in the activity: the donor may receive substandard results; donors may feel unappreciated;

donors may end the experience feeling angry and even betrayed; donors may become

skeptical of the agencies they have chosen to support; or the donors may realize they are

not able to provide assistance which they feel is necessary. Donors may also become

unenthusiastic from their participation. Participants who engage in formal charity

sometimes feel their efforts do not yield the result they expected (i.e., recognition). This

negative outcome is avoidable if donors and recipient agencies are aware of each other's

expectations. Many formal charity participants feel nonprofits mistreat their advocates

which has left many supporters less than satisfied with their charitable experiences. In

addition, poor management of nonprofit agencies (i.e., misappropriation of funds and

poor communication with community supporters) has upset donors and led them to

distrust nonprofits. For some formal charity proponents, a misunderstanding of the power

of their support has created a negative outcome (i.e., donors recognize their donations did

not benefit recipients). Formal charitable participants also become indifferent to

continuing charitable participation after being discouraged by onlookers who question the

donor's ability to influence change. It is important for nonprofit staff to continuously

educate advocates as to the value of their support if donor indifference is to be avoided.

Individuals who engage in informal charitable giving acknowledged the activity

has the ability to yield two negative outcomes of great magnitude: deceit and

obliviousness. For individuals who engage in informal charity, similar to official charity

participants, betrayal is an outcome neither expected nor desired. This outcome is one

which has led participants to cease all charitable participation for substantial periods of

time and even permanently. Obliviousness is the second negative outcome which was mentioned by informal charitable participants that taints the charitable experience. Participants of informal charity feel people are unaware of the frequency in which unofficial charity occurs, in particular, via mundane tasks which are associated with employment. The fact that informal charitable giving is such as common activity has suggested further investigation into the activity is necessary to fully understand charitable giving in its entirety.

Participants in official and unofficial charitable giving can be influenced to end involvement in the activity. Official charitable participants will stop engaging in the activity if they lack discretionary resources of time and even money; if they feel unappreciated by the agencies they choose to support, or if they are asked to provide charitable support too often. While there are no studies that have been able to identify the frequency of solicitation that will influence a donor to end charitable support of an agency, this research has indicated that monthly solicitation may be deemed inappropriate by some individuals. Respondents may also end official charitable activities if changes in their life such as assuming new roles and responsibilities or changes in the family structure occur making charitable giving difficult. Participants in unofficial charitable giving are also prone to end their benevolent acts; however, their cessation is linked to feeling unappreciated; recipients of their support feeling their aid is a requirement, and questionable personal motives (i.e., donors began to wonder why they engage in charitable giving at all).

Understanding Corporate Giving

The primary purpose of this study was to learn why individuals choose to engage in or opt out of charitable giving; however, the research was able to reaffirm the known reasons corporations often choose to engage in formal charitable giving because some of the participants who were interviewed are representatives and/ or owners of corporations who frequently participate in formal charitable giving.

Corporate Motivations for Official Charity

Corporations engage in charitable giving because it allows them to decrease operating costs, build a positive relationship with members of the community and fund things of importance such as improving the community. In addition, charitable giving provides organizations with advertisement (Burt, 1983, Navarro, 1988). Several respondents in this study engage in formal charitable giving because they are representatives or owners of corporations, and according to them, their organizations often engage in formal charitable giving because it provides opportunities to network, advertise, benefit the community, and save money.

Networking

Respondent #1 is a business owner. She often donates money to charities through her agency because she believes the donations provide her with opportunities:

> For me, a lot of my motivation is because it is a networking opportunity.

> If I see it as a networking opportunity to help my business, I will go to it.

Helping the Community

Literature has stated consistently that corporations engage in charitable giving because they want to help the community; however, these agencies are very selective when deciding which charitable causes to support (Brammer et al., 2007). Respondent #2 is employed with a corporation that operates a foundation which makes donations to nonprofit organizations. The foundation, according to Respondent #2, is very discerning and agencies that apply to the foundation for money have to meet specific criteria (i.e., provide certain services) before they are awarded funds:

> The agency I work for makes donations. There is a foundation that gives money but they have specific criteria as to what would qualify someone to get their money and if the organization fits into one of the categories… we may choose to give them money.

Advertisements

Corporations, as many individuals, engage in charitable giving because they would like to be recognized publicly according to Respondent #1:

> I look at it as advertising….I want my company name on the board such as the things we are doing for one agency. We will get a banner, sign and table….I want advertisements because of visibility.

Tax Benefits

Corporations are known to engage in charitable giving because of the financial benefits they receive (Navarro, 1988). Respondent #1 is a business owner in Detroit, Michigan who stated her organization often makes charitable donations as a result of the tax incentives provided by the government:

> We always donate the max that our taxes will allow. As a corporation you know how much you can deduct in charitable giving. We always do the max and tend to go over. We never go below…. It is a good selling point … Whatever I don't give I can keep in my pocket….The government changes the amount we can write off. If the government came and said we can write off less I would change the amount especially every time the government got involved.

Summary

Individuals who discussed corporate charitable giving shared motivational factors consistent to the literature that suggests corporations engage in formal charitable giving only because it provides a benefit to the donor organization. While some participants discussed the importance of providing aid to the less fortunate during discussion about their personal charitable activities, it should be noted that none of the respondents stated their corporations were particularly concerned about indigent members of society. In fact, some respondents even stated that an agency can only become a recipient of corporate assistance if the agency meets the pre-determined requirements of the donor company. Furthermore, the charitable organizations who are recipients of corporate donations are often required to provide public recognition that benefits the donor organization.

This section on corporate charitable support has done a good job of reinforcing the fact that corporate charitable giving occurs for egoistic or impure reasons. In addition, it emphasizes that organizations aspiring to become recipients of corporate charitable support should be able and willing to provide a benefit to corporate donors if they are to reap any corporate charitable support.

Perceptions of Charitable Giving

Participants shared their definitions of charitable giving as well as their motivations. In addition, some even discussed the outcomes of the activity, positive and negative. There were a few individuals who failed to discuss any negative aspects of charity as they mentioned they have never had any negative experiences with charitable giving. Individuals who did not disclose a negative experience with charitable giving provided their opinions about negative experiences (and how they avoid them). The two negative charitable experiences discussed by respondents included agencies that lack accountability and agencies that employ staff who are perceived negatively.

No Accountability

Respondent #3 was unable to share any negative outcomes of charitable giving because he has not experienced any. Respondent #3 has not had any negative experiences because he is a "selective" donor. He only supports agencies that use donations "responsibly". He asserts he will only donate to an agency if he feels the majority of donations go toward its mission:

> I have heard about some agencies such as Agency A. It provides services to kids, but my perception is it's a group of wealthy [suburban] ladies that do a car show and the auto show and they do other things. My perception is they may spend too much money on the party and [it] doesn't generate enough money for the agency.

Respondent #16 has not had any negative experiences with charitable giving because he too is very careful. He only donates money to agencies which allocate the bulk of donated funds to programming:

…If I found out that the money that I donated was going more towards administrative/administration type stuff instead of program initiatives. That would bug me because I would wonder what the point is.

Respondent # 15 will not support a well known national organization because he feels the nonprofit wastes money:

> Oddly, I have always hated those commercials for …[Agency A] and they send you a picture… I have never understood that. I have never been on that bandwagon. …[Agency A] wants you to help children in countries that can't afford to keep them. I never understand that. I remember the 70's and …[a celebrity] was on TV crying for kids and what bothered me about that was those same kids probably have had kids by now and they still can't feed them either and people are still giving. People need to move out of those areas because they can't support life because frequently they are in a desert. I don't think that is money well spent. Spend money on offering to move them to another area of whatever country they are in because they can't sustain life or grow food or whatever. Stop feeding them to have kids because everyone is going to starve…

Poor Perception of Agency Staff

Research has indicated donors will end their relationship with a charitable entity if they are not fond of the agency's leadership or disagree with current goals of an agency's leadership (Independent Sector, 2001). Respondent #3 agrees agencies should have respected leadership; however, he wants leadership of agencies to know an individual's opinion of an agency is also influenced by the people he or she interacts with the most, agency staff:

> I think a lot of people make [charitable] decisions in regards to the level of people they know and respect is involved. People give to people…if they don't like you, the fundraiser, or they feel they can't trust you someone will not donate to you.

Summary

Everyone who engages in charitable giving does not have a negative experience. For some charitable participants, negative experiences have not occurred because they are very careful about the agencies they choose to support. While everyone does not have a negative experience, it may be assumed individuals have their ideas of what constitutes a negative experience, and as a result, make efforts avoid them. For the participants who shared their opinions of negative charitable experiences, a negative charitable experience is a belief that an agency, or its staff, is misusing funds. In addition, negative charitable experiences are possible when donors lack respect for agency representatives. It is important for nonprofit organizations to keep donors abreast of the ways they are choosing to allocate donor provided funds as it has been suggested donors will not support an entity if they believe it has poor resource allocation. In addition, donors are not going to support an agency if they do not trust the staff representatives.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

This research investigated the reasons individuals choose to engage in charitable giving or cease charitable participation. In addition, the study examined the positive and negative outcomes of charitable giving while trying to explain how individuals who participate in the activity differ from non-participants. This qualitative study, using one to one interviews of present and past participants of charitable giving in Wayne County, Michigan has successfully done the following: defined charitable giving; confirmed known motivational factors of charitable giving; suggested a new introduction to charitable giving; discussed the positive and negative outcomes of the activity; and provided further insight into the reasons individuals decide to stop charitable participation. In the following sections, the findings of this study will be reviewed and implications for future studies and practice will be discussed.

Defining Charitable Giving

Charitable giving has been defined generally in the literature as the donation of money, time, activities, body parts, organs, and blood (Barman, 2007). Participants of this study provided definitions of charitable giving which encompass the activities which have become common examples; however, they provided perspectives on the activity that surpass widespread ideas. Respondents of this study described charitable giving as the following: (1) Categories of official and/or unofficial activities; (2) An exchange; (3) A means to an end; (4) Culture; and (5) Loan. It should be noted the definitions of

charitable giving provided sometimes corresponded with one form of charitable giving (official or unofficial) and a motivation for engaging in the activity.

Some participants actively discussed their donations of financial resources, time, and their engagement in helping activities with organizations and individuals; yet, these participants made clear distinctions between the activities they engage in with nonprofit organizations and unidentified causes such as friends and family. Some individuals defined charitable giving as an exchange wherein they presented vivid examples of providing something to a charitable entity, often a nonprofit agency, because they were due to receive something in return. Other participants simply stated charitable giving served as a means to an end as the activity was something which they engaged in to achieve an outcome. For some respondents, charitable giving was defined as a way of life which had become a custom or ritual. There was one individual who participated in this research who described informal charitable giving as a loan which he expected to be repaid.

Is there any importance to the definitions of charitable giving provided by participants of this study? The definitions of charitable giving provided by individuals who participated in this research tell interested parties how some people view the activity. In addition, the varying definitions suggest that the number of individuals who engage in charitable giving may be quite higher than ever imagined as there may be individuals who engage in activities deemed charitable who fail to divulge their involvement because their classification of benevolent activity does not correspond to general definitions.

<u>Donor Motivation</u>

   Using rational choice as the theory to guide this research, the initial assumption of this study was individuals engage in charitable giving because it provides a benefit. Respondents of this study were asked to share the reasons each decided to participate in charitable giving. Their responses align with common notions of charitable motivation: altruism, egoism, reciprocity, and even religious beliefs. For some participants, charitable activity occurred because they desired to assist someone who had a need (altruism) while others were concerned about helping themselves (egoism). There were some participants who engaged in charitable giving because they at one time in the past had been recipients of aid and felt possibly obligated to lend their assistance to someone while others engaged in charitable giving because they believed it was the right thing to do. It is rather difficult to determine at this time if participants who engaged in charitable giving because of reciprocity or strong religious beliefs wished to provide assistance to the less fortunate, or if they participated because they felt they had no other choice. However, it can be assumed that the reasons provided for charitable giving are correlated to the definitions of charitable giving provided which helps with understanding an individual's motive for charitable participation. For example, some individuals defined charitable giving as being a means to an end. One respondent stated he simply engaged in charitable acts to end requests for participation which he received from his supervisor.

<u>First Involvement with Charitable Giving</u>

Literature on charitable giving has indicated many people are introduced to the activity by family, friends, co-workers, school, employers, and religion (Schervish, 1997; Schervish and Havens, 1998). It has also been proven individuals who are exposed to charity at a young age by family and friends often continue to engage in similar activities as they progress through life (Pilavian and Charng, 1999). Many respondents in this study credited their benevolent activities to the same agents of socialization mentioned in previous research (family, friends, co-workers, and religion). The media, according to one respondent, influenced him to engage in charitable activities.

The media is an agent of socialization which has not been focused on previously, to my knowledge, as an influencing factor for charitable behavior. Since limited information is known about the ability of the media to influence a person to engage in charitable giving, it is important that further research be conducted. The results of studies that investigate the ability of the media to influence charitable giving will be of great value to many nonprofit organizations which have recently started to champion media as the optimal method to engage and cultivate relationships with current and prospective donors.

Outcomes of Official Charity

Literature has suggested that participation in formal charitable giving yields many positive outcomes for participants, including but not limited to: improved career opportunities, improved health, social consciousness (Wilson, 2000), mood enhancement (Duclos, 2008); recognition, and financial relief such as tax breaks (Schervish and

Havens, 1998). Study respondents stated they enjoy participating in formal charitable giving because it provides them with the opportunity to assist an organization meet its goals. In addition, the activity also provides donors with opportunities to network. Charitable giving is a source of education and entertainment which broadens donor's horizons about their community and the world.

Prior to this research, there was no focus on the negative outcomes of charitable giving in literature and this has arguably contributed to the notion that formal charitable giving is a pleasant experience for all participants. Negative outcomes of formal charity were shared by some research participants. It should be noted the common responses regarding negative outcomes indicate participants often feel unappreciated or mistreated as a result of their formal charitable acts. Some participants shared the mistreatment they experience from engaging in charitable giving with some agencies is the worst outcome of the activity. Others cited feelings of anger and betrayal that developed as a result of learning an agency had misled its supporters by misappropriating funds. This was perhaps the most horrible outcome of charitable giving. This outcome was one of concern for many respondents because they admitted it has caused them to not trust charitable entities.

For one participant who engages in charity to provide assistance to the less fortunate, the mere fact that individuals notify her that her efforts are useless is an outcome which is more harmful than anything else because it makes her not want to get involved with formal charity as a whole. An additional negative outcome of formal

charity shared by participants was their realization that efforts are often unable to provide assistance or lead to positive change. It is important to realize that this negative outcome, as well many of the other negative outcomes mentioned by participants of this research are items which can be avoided if staff-volunteer training is provided. This training should focus on educating staff and volunteers on appropriate staff-volunteer interaction, the mission of the agency, and upcoming goals of the agency. It should also inform donors about their role within the charitable agency.

The negative outcomes of formal charity shared by individuals who participated in this study have contradicted the common idea that charitable giving is a pleasant experience for everyone involved. In addition, these outcomes have provided insight into areas that nonprofits need to improve such as staff and donor relations.

Outcomes of Unofficial Charity

The amount of research conducted focusing on informal methods of charitable giving pales in comparison to the amount of research that has occurred with official charity. This lack of interest in unofficial charity has falsely implied that unofficial charitable giving does not exist; unofficial charitable giving may occur (not frequently), and informal charitable giving is not significant. It has been suggested by respondents of this study that unofficial charitable giving is more common than ever imagined.

Individuals who engage in unofficial charity feel the activity allows them to provide assistance to someone in need. Individuals who engage in informal acts of charity do not engage in the activity because they are seeking a personal reward and they tend to

be focused on improving conditions for someone else. It should be noted that individuals who engage in unofficial charity often feel their efforts go unnoticed and are unappreciated by not only the recipients of their charity, but observers of their work because their actions occur often during mundane tasks that others fail to recognize and consider important. This complete disregard of their charitable acts has caused many informal participants to end charitable participation.

It is highly important that researchers and practitioners recognize the frequency in which individuals engage in less recognized methods of charity as it appears many people engage in the activity. Failure to recognize and even accept the prevalence of this type of charity has led to misinformation about charitable participation as a whole. Recent studies have suggested that charitable giving has declined but these studies have rendered results which are based only on formal charitable giving. If we are to fully understand charitable giving, acknowledgement of the positive and negative outcomes of charity must occur. In addition, we must acknowledge that informal charitable giving occurs which has positive and negative outcomes.

Official Charity Cessation

It is a known fact individuals may be persuaded to end official charitable participation. Giving cessation studies conducted by the Independent Sector and Indiana University have shown donors will end support for organizations if they feel the agency leadership is not competent; if the donor lack funds or time due to changes in personal circumstances; if the donor has a new set of interests, or if they are being over solicited

(Independent Sector, 2001; Indiana University, 2010). Individuals who participated in this study supported the results of these studies as some ended participation with charitable organizations because they lacked resources such as time and money or if they are over solicited. It should be noted the individuals who lacked available time and finances plan to resume their support when they are able.

Participants also stated they have ceased support of charitable organizations because they feel unappreciated. Poor staff and donor relationships have also led some individuals to end charitable support. Individuals who stated they ceased formal charitable support as a result of unpleasant staff interaction did not indicate plans to resume their charitable activity in the future, suggesting this negative outcome may be responsible for the decline in charitable participation.

Unofficial Charity Cessation

Individuals who disengage from official charitable giving are not unique as participants in unofficial charity are prone to end all participation also. Participants who have ended informal charitable giving stated their cessation resulted from recipients developing an expectation of their assistance and recipients of charity failing to realize donor support was not a requirement. In addition, unofficial charitable participants, similar to formal charitable participants, attributed their cessation to feeling unappreciated and even uncertainty as one donor stated he began to question why he even engages in the activity. As individuals discussed the reasons each of them chose to end informal charitable participation, it became obvious the activity was deemed as

unbeneficial or too costly as actors were unable to handle continuing the activity. Furthermore, their admission that being mistreated by recipients of charity could influence them to cease participation in informal charity substantiates the importance and prevalence of informal charity.

Perceptions of Charitable Organizations

Everyone who participated in this study did not disclose a negative experience with official charity; however, some individuals shared their opinion of the things that have helped them avoid negative formal charity experiences. They include only supporting organizations that were accountable to their supporters and supporting agencies with respected staff. The viewpoints shared by these individuals show the importance of donor outlook and how an individual's opinion of an agency, including its staff, influences decisions to provide support. Poor staff and donor interactions were mentioned as a negative outcome and as a reason for cessation with charitable giving which suggests opinions of staff members at charities are not always favorable. A negative view of staff may ultimately influence the types and amount of donor support these agencies receive.

Corporate Giving

Businesses often engage in formal charitable giving, according to the literature, because it provides them with the opportunity to reduce costs; cultivate relationships with members of the community; and support personal interests. Corporations also engage in formal charity because it provides them with public recognition that can assist in business

development (Burt, 1983; Navarro, 1988). Some of the participants of this research were managers/owners of organizations or founders of nonprofit organizations who acknowledged their businesses engage in formal charitable giving because it allows their organizations to address issues that may arise in the community. In addition, these individuals emphasized that their organizations often choose to participate in charitable giving because it provides the donor organization with the opportunity to receive recognition. It is important for nonprofit entities who wish to secure support from businesses to understand the motivating factors that influence corporations to provide charitable support because failure to do so may lead to corporate charitable cessation or even worse, it may cause a nonprofit organization to miss out on corporate support.

Participants versus Non-Participants

Individuals who participated in this study shared the reasons each of them choose to participate or not participate in charitable giving. Individuals who engage in benevolent giving do so for a variety of reasons that include rewards and goal achievement. Individuals who do not participate in the activity have attributed their lack of involvement to things such as diminished resources or a negative experience.

Individuals who participated in the study who indicated they are not participating due to insufficient resources were positive they would resume charitable giving in the near future unlike respondents who ceased as a result of feeling unappreciated. It should be noted that all respondents who mentioned a negative experience have not abandoned benevolent giving. After a thorough review of the results, the researcher feels unable to

confidently explain how participants and non-participants differ, suggesting that a follow up study should be conducted that investigates how participants and non-participants differ.

<u>Strengths and Weaknesses</u>

This study explained why individuals choose to engage in charitable giving. It discussed the positive and negative outcomes of engaging in charitable giving and explained why people choose to end charitable activity. It also reinforced the often disregarded notion that two forms of charity are present in society. This research had many strengths as well as weakness. As a result of this study, detailed descriptions were gathered from respondents regarding their definitions of charitable giving and their experiences with charitable giving including how charitable experiences, in particular negative ones, influence donors. It also suggested that the media may influence charitable participation. Unfortunately, this research had a small sample that lacked diversity which may have contributed to the researcher's inability to explain how participants and non-participants differ.

Sixteen individuals participated in this study. All participants were residents of Wayne County, Michigan. Regrettably, most participants resided in the City of Detroit or one of the Grosse Pointes. All participants who completed a demographic survey identified as being either African-American/Black or Caucasian. Wayne County, Michigan is one of the most diverse counties in the state as it is comprised of various ethnic groups. Due to the characteristics of this sample, generalizability is impossible.

Conducting this research on charitable giving was more challenging than the researcher anticipated. Participants were gathered via snowballing due to the topic. As a result, I as the researcher, had to work extra hard to maintain boundaries with participants who felt extremely comfortable with me because they were referred by a trusted source. Additionally, the respondents were privy to personal aspects of my life as a result of being referred by a mutual acquaintance or friend which contributed to difficulty in maintaining boundaries.

Expansion of Qualitative Study to Adjacent Counties

As a result of this study occurring with such a small group of participants from the same geographic areas, it is advised that further investigation using a similar framework is conducted to determine if respondents from different locations within Wayne County and adjacent counties (Macomb and Oakland) will provide similar experiences. Additional studies in Wayne County and adjacent counties will also provide an opportunity for expansion of themes gathered in this research as Wayne County Michigan and surrounding counties are diverse.

Importance of Further Quantitative Research

This study has shown that the topic of charitable giving requires further investigation via quantitative studies to examine areas such as a possible relationship between type of charitable giving and motivations (i.e., are altruistic or egoistic donors more likely to engage in formal charitable giving?). It may also be important to conduct research to determine if one motivation is more common than the others and if the

definitions of charitable giving provided by respondents in this study are widespread. Further studies should also investigate whether a relationship is present between media and charitable activity (i.e., does media influence charitable participation?). The additional quantitative studies should be conducted in adjacent counties (Macomb and Oakland) as well as throughout the entire county of Wayne, State of Michigan and the United States. These studies will help determine if the results of this research are generalizable to each county in Michigan, Metro Detroit and the entire United States.

Implications for Practice

As nonprofits continue to cultivate relationships with present and future donors for official charitable giving, it is important for leaders and staff of these agencies to be mindful of the following: potential and present donors may have varying definitions of charitable giving which may or may not coincide with popular meanings of the activity; motivations for charitable giving vary; and charitable giving has positive and negative outcomes. Charitable giving is defined differently by individuals who engage in the activity. Nonprofits that are interested in encouraging and increasing donor participation should be aware that some donors may engage in benevolent acts overlooked by formal entities. Their involvement in these unnoticed activities may affect their ability and willingness to engage in formal charitable giving.

Individuals engage in charitable giving for a variety of reasons which may ultimately affect their overall charitable experience. Leaders and staff of nonprofits should dedicate time to learning about donor motivation for charitable giving to ensure

the experience is one that meets the expectations of the donor. If staff of nonprofits work to ensure the charitable experience is pleasant for donors, donors will continue to provide valuable aide to nonprofits.

Charitable giving yields outcomes that are positive and negative for not only the donors but nonprofit agencies. The positive outcomes of charitable giving often motivate donors to continue providing support for charitable entities while the negative outcomes have the ability to influence donors to cease charitable participation.   If nonprofit organizations are interested in continued donor support, it is critical that they learn about the outcomes of charitable giving experienced by their donors, positive and negative, and dedicate resources as necessary to ensure the positive outcomes continue and negative outcomes experienced by donors are reduced and even eliminated. Nonprofits can implement donor training programs which provide donors with information on the agencies they choose to support. These programs will also provide staff members with an opportunity to learn about donor expectations and experiences with charitable giving. These sessions should also define donor roles within the agency. Such training can be of great assistance in reducing the negative outcomes of charitable giving which have an effect on the overall formal charitable giving experience.

<u>Concluding Thoughts</u>

Charitable giving, in particular official charity, has been portrayed as a unique experience because it has been portrayed as beneficial to all parties involved (Anik, Aknin, Norton, & Dunn, 2009; Wuthnow, 1991). This research has shown the activity is not as beneficial as once imagined as individuals can be convinced to end charitable giving especially if the activity yields a negative result such as maltreatment. In addition, this study has indicated donors may define charitable giving differently than previously mentioned as they often choose not to focus on donating time or money, but are more interested in delineating between recognizable and less popular modalities of charity or viewing charity as a tool or way of life. It is very important for scholars and practitioners in nonprofit organizations to work diligently to cultivate relationships with donors and potential donors so that they can understand their viewpoint on the activity because it is possible individuals have unique and differing perceptions of charitable giving.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEY

1. Gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female
2. Racial/ethnic status:
   a. African-American/Black
   b. American Indian
   c. Alaskan Native
   d. Asian or Pacific Islander
   e. Hispanic
   f. White, not Hispanic Origin
   g. Other race (please specify_____)
3. Current Age:
   a. 18-24
   b. 25-34
   c. 35-44
   d. 45-54
   e. 55-64
   f. 65-over
4. Education level:
   a. Less than 12 years
   b. High school diploma
   c. Some College
   d. College Degree _____
   e. Advanced Degree/Professional Degree
5. City of Residence:_____
6. Marital Status:
   a. Married/In committed

Relationship
   b. Single
   c. Divorced
   d. Widowed

7. Number of Children:_____

8. Please list the age of your children below.
   _____

9. Employment Status:
   a. Full-Time
   b. Part-Time
   c. Retired
   d. Unemployed
10. Income:

   a. $0-$24,999
   b. $25,000-$49,999
   c. $50,000-$74,999
   d. $75,000 -$99,999
   e. $100,000-$124,999
   f. $125,000 - up

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW TOPICS

<u>Charitable Activity</u>

Tell me about your experiences with charitable giving?

Do you participate in charitable giving? (If not, why not?)

What types of activities do you perform/participate in?

What type of agencies are you involved with?

How often?

With Whom? (Family, Friends, Co-Workers)

<u>Motivations</u>

How did you first get involved in charitable giving?

Why do you participate in charitable giving?

<u>Consequences/Outcomes</u>

Please share with me your most memorable charitable giving experience(s).

Why are these experiences memorable?

What do you remember about them?

Have you had any negative charitable giving experiences?

What made the experiences negative

REFERENCES

Center on Philanthropy Panel Study | Center on Philanthropy. (2007). *Philanthropic Studies | The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University*. Retrieved January 12, 2011, from http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/COPPS/docs/2007COPPS_KeyFindings.pf

Volunteering in the United States, 2011 . (2010). *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Retrieved February 20, 2011, from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm.

Aldous, J. (1990). Family development and life course: two perspectives on family change. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *52*, 571-583.

Allen, P. J. (1963). *Pitirim A. Sorokin in review.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: a theory of warm-glow giving. The Economic Journal, 100(401), 464-477.

Anik, L., Aknin, L., Norton, M., & Dunn, E. (2009). Feeling Good about Giving: the benefits (and costs) of self-interested charitable behavior (Working Paper No. 10-012). Retrieved from Harvard Business School Faculty Publication website: http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/10-012.pdf

Astin, A., Sax, L., and Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education*, *22*, 187-202.

Baldwin, K. (2008). How reciprocity influences alumni giving: a qualitative study. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest. (3334601)

Barman, E. (2007). An institutional approach to donor control: from dyadic ties to a field-level anlaysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, *112*(5), 1416-1457.

Becker, G. (1962). Investment in human capital: a theoretical analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*, *70*(5), 9-49.

Belluck, P. (1995). McVeigh is reported to claim responsibility for the bombing. *The New York Times*, p. 1. Retrieved May 21, 2011, from the Lexis Nexis database.

Bem, D. J. (1970). The cognitive foundations of attitudes. *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs* (pp. 14-39). Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co..

Beyerlein, K., and Sikkink, D. (2008). Sorrow and solidarity: why Americans volunteered for 9/11 relief efforts. *Social Problems*, *55*(2), 190-215.

Block, J., and Block, J. (2006). Nursery school personality and politcal orientation two decades later. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 734-749

Blood Facts and Statistics | American Red Cross. (2006). *American Red Cross - Give blood*. Retrieved April 1, 2011, from http://www.redcrossblood.org/learn-about-blood/blood-facts.

Bobo, L., and Kluegel, J. (1993). Opposition to race targeting: self-interest, stratification ideology or racial attitudes? *American Sociological Review*, *58*(3), 443-464.

Brammer, S., Williams, G., and Zinkin, J. (2007). Religion and attitudes to corporate

    social responsibility in a large cross-country sample. *Journal of Business Ethnics*,

    71(3), 229-243.

Burt, R. (1983). Corporate philanthropy as a cooptive relation. *Social Forces*, *62*(2), 419-

    449.

Campbell, R. (2006). Altruism in Auguste Comte and Ayn Rand. *The Journal of Ayn*

    Rand Studies, *7*(2), 357-369.

Carney, D., Jost, J., Gosling, S., and Potter, J. (2008). The secret lives of liberals and

    conservatives: personality profiles, interaction styles, and things they leave

    behind. *Political Psychology*, *29*(6), 807-840.

Carr, J. (1952). A preliminary report on the tornadoes of March 21-22, 1952. *U.S.*

    Weather Bureau-Monthly Weather Review, n/a, 50-58.

Chambliss, D. F., and Schutt, R. K. (2006). Sampling. *Making sense of the social world:*

    methods of investigation (2nd ed., pp. 85-105). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge

    Press.

Cheng, W. G. (2003). Charity is about giving, not rewards. *The Straits Times*, pp. 1-2.

    Retrieved April 4, 2011, from the Lexis-Nexis database.

Cialdini, R., Schaller, M., Houlihan, D., Arps, K., Fultz, J., and Beaman, A. (1987).

    Empathy-based helping: is it selflessly or selfishly motivated?. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, *4*(749-758), 749-758.

Clain, S., and Zech, C. (1999). A household production analysis of religious and

    charitable giving. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 58(4), 923-946.

Connor, J. (2010). Is your charitable giving getting results?. Kiplinger - Personal

    Finance, Business, Investing, Retirement, and Financial Advice. Retrieved

    February 27, 2011, from http://www.kiplinger.com/magazine/archives/is-your-

    charitable-giving-getting-results.html.

CPCS - Philanthropy.org. (2005). *CPCS - Philanthropy.org*. Retrieved November 27,

    2009, from http://www.philanthropy.org/programs/donor_research_project.html.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five

    approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Donahue, M. (1994). Correlates of religious giving in six protestant denominations.

    Review of Religious Research, 36(2), 149-157.

Duclos, R. (2008). Charitable giving: how ego-threats impact donations of time and

    money. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest. (3304376)

Duran, L. (2001). Caring for each other: philanthropy in communities of color.

    Grassroots Fundraising Journal, *20*(5), 4-7.

Durkheim, E. (1997). Increasing preponderance of organic solidarity. *The division of

    labor in society* (pp. 101-148). New York: Free Press [u.a].

Durkheim, E., and Simpson, G. (1997). Altruistic suicide. *Suicide: a study in sociology

    (pp. 217-240). New York: Free Press.

Eagley, A., and Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: a meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*(3), 283-308.

Forbes, K., and Zampelli, E. (1997). Religious giving by individuals: a cross denominational study. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *56*(1), 17-30.

Fritz, C., and Williams, H. (1957). The human being in disasters: a research perspective. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *309*, 42-51.

Gamson, W., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *18*, 373-393.

Garner, T., and Wagner, J. (1991). Economic dimensions of household gift giving. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, *18*(3), 368-379.

Giving USA. (2010). *Pursuant*. Retrieved February 20, 2011, from http://www.pursuantmedia.com/givingusa/0510/.

Goss, K. (1999). Volunteering and long civic generation. *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *26*(4), 378-415.

Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25(2), 161-178.

Harbaugh, W. (1998). The prestige motive for making charitable transfers. *The American Economic Review*, *88*(2), 277-282.

Healy, K. (2000). Embedded altruism: blood collection, regimes and European union's donor population. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(6), 1633-1657.

Hodgkinson, V. A., and Weitzman, M. S. (1994). *Giving and volunteering in the United States.* Washington: Independent Sector.

Houle, B., Sagarin, B., and Kaplan, M. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: do volunteer motives predict task preference. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(4), 337-344.

Huddy, L., Jones, J., and Chard, R. (2001). Compassionate politics: support for old-age programs among the non-elderly. *Political Psychology*, *22*(3), 443-471.

Hrung, W. (2004). After-life consumption and charitable giving. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *63*(3), 731-745.

Iannaccone, L. (1997). Skewness explained: a rational choice model of religious giving. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *36*(2), 141-157.

Independent Sector (2001). Giving and volunteering in the United. States. Retrieved July 8, 2011, from http://www.cpanda.org/pdfs/gv/GV01Report.pdf

Independent Sector Value of Volunteer (2010). *Independent Sector*. Retrieved February 18, 2011, from http://independentsector.org/volunteer.

Indiana University. (2010). The 2010 study of high-net worth philanthropy. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Jacobs, D. (2009). Charity bankruptcy leaves many donors in distress. *The New York Times*, p. 2. Retrieved April 7, 2011, from the Lexis Nexis database.

John, C. S., and Fuchs, J. (2002). The heartland responds to terror: volunteering after the bombing of the Murrah federal building. *Social Science Quarterly*, *83*(2), 397-415.

Knoke, D. (1990). Networks of political action: toward theory construction. *Social Forces*, *68*(4), 1041-1063.

Kreps, G. (1984). Sociological inquiry and disaster research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *10*, 309-330.

Lee, L., Piliavin, J., and Call, V. (1999). Giving time, money and blood: similarities and differences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *62*(3), 276-290.

Macmillan, R., and Copher, R. (2005). Families in the life course: interdependency of roles, role configurations, and pathways. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*(4), 858-879.

McAdoo, H. P. (2006). Religion in African American families. Black Families (pp. 97-100). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications

McBride, A., Sherraden, M., and Pritzker, S. (2006). Civic engagement among low income and low wealth families: in their words. *Family Relations*, *55*, 152-162.

Mento, M. D., and Preston, C. (2010). Wealthy Americans urged to give billions - Today's News - The Chronicle of Philanthropy- Connecting the nonprofit world with news, jobs, and ideas. Home - The Chronicle of Philanthropy- Connecting the nonprofit world with news, jobs, and ideas. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from http://philanthropy.com/article/Wealthy-Americans-Urged-to/65961/.

Miller, B. (1991). United Way's rivals gain ground. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *4*(4), 24-25.

Moody, M. (2008). Serial reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *Sociological Theory*, *26*(2), 130-151.

Morrison, K. (2006). Emile Durkheim. Marx, Durkheim, Weber: formations of modern social thought (2nd ed., pp. 148-269). London: Sage.

Navarro, P. (1988). Why do corporations give to charity?. *The Journal of Business*, *61*(1), 65-93.

Neal, S. M. (1982). Commitment to altruism in sociological analysis. *Sociological Analysis*, *43*(1), 1-22.

Nelson, L. (1977). Continuity in helping roles: a comparison of everyday and emergency role performance. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, *20*(2), 263-278.

Obler, J. (1986). Generosity, duty and the welfare state. *Polity*, *18*(3), 408-430.

Oman, D., Thoresen, C., and McMahon, K. (1994). Volunteerism and mortality among the community-dwelling elderly. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *4*(3), 301-316.

O'Neill, M. (2001). Research on giving and volunteering: methodological considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 2001*, *30*(505), 505-514.

Piliavin, J., and Charng, H. W. (1990). Altruism: a review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *16*, 27-65.

Reed, A., Aquino, K., and Levy, E. (2007). Moral identity, and judgments of charitable behaviors. *Journal of Marketing*, *71*(January 2007), 178-193.

Rushton, J. P. (1982). Altruism and society: A social learning perspective. *Ethics*, *92*(3), 492-446.

Sabin, E. (1993). Social relationships and mortality among the elderly. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, *12*(1), 44-60.

Schervish, P. (1997). Inclination, obligation and association: what we know and what we need to learn about donor motivation. *Critical issues in fundraising* (pp. 110-138). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Schervish, P., and Havens, J. (1998). Why do people give?. *The Not-For-Profit CEO*, *5*(7), 1-3.

Schervish, P. (2000). The modern medici: patterns, motivations and giving strategies of the wealthy. *The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy*. Retrieved April 9, 2011, from http://cppp.usc.edu/doc/RP5.pdfhttp.

Schervish, P., & Havens, J. (2002). The Boston area diary study and the moral citizenship of care. *Voluntas*, *13*(1), 47-71.

Schervish, P. (2008). Why the wealthy give: factors which mobilize philanthropy among high net-worth individuals. *The Routledge companion to nonprofit marketing* (pp. 165-181). London: Routledge.

Schervish, P., O'Herlihy, M., and Havens, J. (2002). Charitable giving: how much, by whom, to what, and how?. *The Non Profit sector: A Research Handbook* (pp. 542-568). New Haven: Yale Press.

Simmons, R. (1991). Presidential address on altruism and sociology. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *32*(1), 1-22.

Simpson, R. (1953). Pitirim Sorokin and his sociology. *Social Forces, 32*(2), 120-131

Stolle, D. (1998). Bowling together, bowling alone: the development of generalized trust in voluntary associations. *Political Psychology*, *19*(3), 497-525.

Strom, S. (2002). Newly rich are fueling a new era in philanthropy.-NYTimes.com. The New York times. Retrieved April 6, 2011 from http://nytimes.com/2002/04/27/national/27GIVI.html?pagewanted=1.

Strom, S. (2009). A.C.L.U. loses $20 million donor, said to be David Gelbaum - NYTimes.com. *The New York Times - Breaking News, World News and Multimedia*. Retrieved April 6, 2011, from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12.

Sundeen, R. (1990). Family life course status and volunteer behavior. *Sociological Perspectives*, *33*(4), 483-500.

Sweetland, S. (1996). Human capital theory: foundations of a field of inquiry. *Review of* Educational Research, 66(3)

Uggen, C., and Janikula, J. (1999). Volunteerism and arrest in the transition of adulthood. *Social Forces*, *78*, 332-.

Wallace, R. A., and Wolf, A. (2006). *Contemporary sociological theory: expanding the classical tradition* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Weber, M. (1978). The types of legitimate domination. *Economy and society* (pp. 212-301). Berkeley: University of California Press.

White, J. M., and Klein, D. M. (2002). *Family theories* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wilhelm, M. (2006). New data on charitable giving in the PSID. *Economic Letters*, *92*, 26-31.

Williams, S. (1984). Left-right ideological differences in blaming victims. *Political Psychology*, *5*(4), 573-581.

Williamson, O. (1963). Managerial discretion and business behavior. *American Economic Review*, *53*, 1032-1057.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 215-240.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: caring for others and helping ourselves*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Wuthnow, R. (1993). Altruism and sociological theory. *The Social Service Review*, *67*(3), 344-357.

Zeitlin, I. M. (2001). Rousseau (1712-1778). Ideology and the development of sociological theory (7th ed., pp. 17-27). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Zou, S., Musavi, F., Notari, E., Rios, J., Trouern-Trend, J., and Fang, C. (2008). Donor deferral and resulting donor loss at the American Red Cross blood services, 2001 through 2006. *Transfusion*, *48*, 2531-2539.

ABSTRACT

CHARITABLE GIVING: MOTIVATIONS, DETERRENTS AND CONSEQUENCES

by

JENNIFER M. LAWSON

May 2013

Advisor: Dr. Mary Cay Sengstock

Major: Sociology

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Charitable giving is portrayed as the most beneficial activity one can engage in because it has been suggested to result in benefit for all participants. This study has shown that charitable giving can be a costly activity for participants. In addition, it has suggested that the concept of charitable giving may be evolving as respondents did not define the activity simply as the allocation of resources to nonprofit organizations. The definition of charitable giving influences not only motives for participation but it influences an individual's decision to cease involvement. This qualitative study will discuss how 16 residents of Wayne County Michigan define charitable giving, as well as explain their motives for participation, reasons for cessation and positive and negative consequences of charitable giving. In addition, implications for future studies and practice will be discussed.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Jennifer Lawson received her bachelor's degree and master's degree from Michigan State University. She received her doctorate from Wayne State University in May 2013.