

Giving Money and Time to International Organizations: Evidence from Canadian

Surveys

by Yunqing Liang

(4298316)

**Major Paper presented to the
Department of Economics of the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the M.A. Degree
Supervisor: Professor Rose Anne Devlin**

ECO 6999

Ottawa, Ontario

December 2011

Contents

ABSTRACT	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY.....	10
3.1 Dataset.....	10
3.2 Multinomial logistic model and OLS model.....	13
3.3 Bivariate probit model.....	15
4. RESULTS.....	17
4.1 Multinomial logistic regression results.....	17
4.2 OLS regression results.....	20
4.3 Bivariate probit regression results.....	21
4.4 Interdependence of donations and volunteering.....	26
4.5 The effect of time on giving.....	26
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	27
TABLES.....	30
REFERENCES.....	53

Abstract

This paper uses the surveys of giving, volunteering and participating for the years 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2007 to examine individual determinants of giving and volunteering to international organizations. It finds that income, education, gender, country of birth, age, marital status, religiosity, health conditions and life satisfaction are important factors that influence the decision to give time and money to international organizations. In addition, the decisions to give money and time to international organizations are shown to be complementary to each other.

1. Introduction

As table 1 shows, if we look at the data from the Canadian surveys of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP) for the years 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2007,¹ the total amount given to charities by all donors has increased from \$4.4 billion to \$10 billion (a 127% increase) in the ten year period. Moreover, the average total amount of money donated has increased from \$239 to \$437 (an 82.8% increase) from 1997 to 2007.

In this paper, we are particularly interested in giving to international organizations – defined by Statistics Canada as including those organizations aimed at promoting development in developing countries, providing emergency humanitarian relief and improving understanding between people with different cultural and historical backgrounds². From table 1 we see that the international donors, (who give to both international organizations and domestic organizations), their total amount given by, (the amount they gave to both international organizations and domestic organizations), has grown from \$674 million to \$2,455 million, a 264% increase, which is a much higher growth rate than the 127% increase in all donors' total amount donated. The international donors' amount of donation to international organizations only has grown from \$111 million to \$549 million (a 394% increase). We can see quite clearly that the increase in total donations to international charities only has outstripped the increase in overall gifts by a significant margin: 394% versus 127%. Moreover, the average amount of money given to international organizations only by international donors has grown by 117%, from \$118 to \$256, compared to the 82.8% increase in the average total amount donated by all donors.

Finally, looking at the percentage of CSGVP participants who give to international

¹ In 1997 and 2000, the survey was known as the National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating: in this paper, we refer to the data set across all four years as the CSGVP to simplify the text.

² Definition of international organization obtained from: Appendix 1 Glossary of terms, in "Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating" (online; Statistic Canada, 2007), in *Statistic Canada* website, at <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/71-542-x/2009001/app-ann/app-ann1-eng.htm> (accessed Nov. 25, 2011)

organizations, we observed that for 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2007, respectively, 6.9%, 7.2%, 8.05% and 10.35% of the total participants were international donors, representing a steady growth in the participation rate of international giving over time.

Table 1 CSGVP Donations and Average Donations 1997-2007

	1997	2000	2004	2007
Total amount of donations by all individuals who give to charities (billion \$)	4.44b	4.94b	8.88b	9.98b
Average amount of donations by all individuals who give to charities (\$)	239	259	400	437
Total amount of donations by international donors to both international organizations and domestic organizations (million \$)	674.76m	798.50m	1,789.85m	2,455.48m
Average amount of donations by international donors to both international organizations and domestic organizations	690.9	660	1050	1174
Total amount of donations by international donors to international organizations only (million \$)	111.88m	167.15m	322.76	549.74m
Average amount of donations by international donors to international organizations only (\$)	118	138	199	256

Source: Calculated by the author from the data in the surveys.

Although the literature has examined the factors that influence giving and volunteering in general (e.g., Brown and Lankford, 1992; Jackson et al., 1995; Andreoni and Scholz, 1998; Yen, 2002; Brown, 2005; Gittell and Tebaldi, 2006; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008), very few studies have focused specifically on international giving and international volunteering. In addition, among the studies examining the correlation between giving and volunteering, no research has examined the interdependence between international giving and international volunteering.

It seems important to take a more detailed look at the factors influencing whether or not someone engages in international philanthropy – as it is clear that individuals are increasingly engaged in giving to international charities and it is equally clear that there is a continued need for support in certain less-fortunate countries abroad. It also seems important to look at the decision to volunteer for international agencies to see whether this is related to

giving money as well. The literature has shown that giving and volunteering are decisions that are taken jointly, and indeed are largely complementary activities (e.g., Brown and Lankford, 1992; Apinunmahakul, Barham, Devin, 2009). No one has looked at whether this is the case for international philanthropy in particular.

The awareness of beneficiaries' needs was determined to be an important mechanism that drives charitable giving. (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011) For example, an increase in the media coverage of disasters and awareness of the situations of disaster victims are believed to promote donors' giving to charities (Brown and Minty, 2008). An interesting question to pose is whether changes in the number of disasters in different years, lead to differences in international giving?

This paper thus has two main tasks: first, to examine individual determinants of the decision to give to or to volunteer with international organizations using four years of data from the CSGVP, and second, to examine the interdependence between international giving and international volunteering. We also will comment on whether the number of serious disasters in a given year seems to have had an effect on decisions to give internationally.

2. Literature Review

Individual characteristics, including income, education, gender, country of birth, age, marital status, household size, and religiosity are the factors that are mostly examined by researchers. Many researchers have found a significant and positive effect of income on private giving (Brown and Lankford, 1992; Yen, 2002; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). In Gittell and Tebaldi's (2006) research on factors influencing charitable giving in the US, they pointed out that personal income is a key determinant influencing giving. In Kitchen and Dalton's (1990) study of determinants of charitable donations in Canada, family income is a significant and positive determinant for Canadian donors. However, Andreoni and Scholz

(1998) have pointed out that income does not have a direct effect on giving; it is interdependent with other individual characteristics, for instance, education and age. According to Jackson et al.'s (1995) examination, income was shown to have an insignificant effect on volunteering.

Education is another characteristic that has been shown to have significant and positive effects on private giving in many studies (e.g., Brown, 2005; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). Researchers have also observed that higher education leads to more volunteering (e.g., Brown and Lankford, 1992; Jackson et al., 1995).

Males and females are found to behave differently when it comes to private philanthropy (e.g., Brown and Lankford, 1992; Andreoni et al., 2003; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008; Rajan, Pink and Dow, 2009). Ronney, Mesch, Chin and Steinberg (2005) have determined that single females are more likely to be donors than single males. Although Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009) illustrated that males donate less than females both domestically and internationally, Jackson et al. (2005) pointed out that males are more likely to donate to secular charities. Many have also shown that females are more likely to volunteer than males (Vaillancourt and Payette, 1986; Brown and Lankford, 1992; Mesch, Ronney, Chin and Steinberg, 2002).

Apinunmahakul and Devlin (2008) in their research on social networks and private philanthropy using the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating have found that compared to Canadian-born individuals, non-Canadian-born individuals not only give less money but also volunteer less time to charities. Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009) in their study of the determinants of international giving, using the NSGVP 2000, found that non-Canadian-born individuals are more likely than Canadian-born individuals to donate internationally.

Although age was generally found to be positively related to giving (Kitchen, 1990;

Brown and Lankford, 1992; Yen, 2002; Carroll et al., 2005; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008), the relationship is often found to be non-linear. Gittell and Tebaldi (2006) for instance observe a “U-shape” in age’s relationship to giving. Using US data, Gittell and Tebaldi pointed out that individuals who were in the middle age group were shown to give relatively less when compared to individuals in other age groups. However, Jackson et al. (1995) found a linear relationship between age and giving to secular charities.

Age was also demonstrated to be significantly linked to volunteering (Jackson et al., 1995; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). However, in contrast to the positive relationship between age and giving, Apinunmahakul and Devlin (2008) observed that age is negatively related to volunteering. Jackson et al. (1995)’s findings illustrated that individuals in the middle age group volunteer more compared to those in other age groups.

Married individuals are found to be more likely to be donors than unmarried individuals (e.g., Carroll et al., 2005; Brown and Ferris, 2007). Apinunmahakul and Devlin (2008) have observed that married females are more likely than single females to be both a donor and volunteer. However, they did not find any statistical differences in the giving behaviour of married males and single males.

Many researchers have illustrated a significant link between household size and giving (e.g., Brown and Lankford, 1992; Mitrut and Nordblom, 2010; Cappellari, Ghinetti and Turati, 2011). However, in Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009)’s study, household size is found to be an insignificant determinant to both international giving and domestic giving. Jackson et al. (1995) also found that household size was not a significant determinant of volunteering.

Religiosity has been found to be an important determinant of individual giving: religious givers give more than non-religious givers (Jackson et al., 1995; Yen, 2002; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). However, Gittell and Tebaldi (2006) has pointed out that not all religious affiliations give equally. Researchers have also found

that religiosity is significantly and positively related to volunteering (Jackson et al., 1995; Wilson and Musick, 1997; Brown and Ferris, 2007).

Although a reasonably large literature exists on the determinants of giving and volunteering in general, there are only few papers focusing specifically on international giving and volunteering. Ribar and Wilhelm's (1995) work on charitable contributions to international relief and development in the US found that, although effects are different across states, in general, education, age, religiosity and government policies were determined to be important factors that affect the donations to international relief and development organizations.

In the papers studying the individual determinants of international giving, the study that is the closest to our study is Rajan, Pink and Dow's (2009). In their research, the NSGVP 2000 data set was used. A categorical variable, (with three categories of international donor, domestic donor and non-giver), was generated as dependent variable. The category of international donors represents the individuals who gave both to international and domestic organizations; while domestic donor category represents the individuals who give to domestic organizations only. The independent variables include two groups of variables: socio-demographic and personality characteristic. They employed the maximum likelihood multinomial logistic regression method and Ordinary Least Square regression method to examine the choice of which type of giver to be and the amount of money given, respectively.

Rajan, Pink and Dow (RPD) show that income, age and education have a significant and positive influence on both international and domestic giving; males and not married individuals were less likely than females and married individuals to donate either internationally or domestically. In addition, their findings illustrated that Canadian-born individuals were less likely to donate internationally but more domestically. Religiosity, whether to volunteer to charity or not, electoral participants, frequency of socialization with

extended family, and life satisfaction were all shown to have significant and positive effect on both international and domestic donations. Health conditions were illustrated to be insignificantly linked to the likelihood of being both an international donor and a domestic donor.

Giving and volunteering have been shown to be correlated with each other (Brown and Lankford, 1992; Freeman, 1997; Duncan, 1999). Brown and Lankford (1992)'s research on the interdependence between individuals' charitable cash donations and time volunteered demonstrates that giving is significantly related to volunteering. They pointed out that cash giving and time volunteering are gross complements to each other (1992, p344). Marcuello and Salas (2000) in their study of money and time donations, using Spanish data, show that time volunteered and money donated are complements. Apinunmahakul, Barham and Devlin's (2009) findings also support Brown and Lankford's (1992) conclusion that money and time giving are complements. However, not all studies find the relationship to be complementary. Freeman (1997) and Duncan (1999) find the opposite: Freeman found money giving and time volunteering to be substitutes for each other, a finding that was supported by Duncan (1999). Finally, Gittell and Tebaldi (2006) states that volunteering enhances household's donations to charities – suggesting that time and money are substitutes to each other.

According Bekkers and Wiepking (2011)'s study on the mechanisms that drive charitable giving, the “awareness of need” (2011, p. 929) is one of the important factors that promotes giving to charities. For example, knowledge of the number of people affected in a disaster tends to promote an individual's donation to charities.

Brown and Minty (2008) in their study of media coverage and charitable giving after the 2004 tsunami, point out that an increase in the media reporting of the disaster, lead to growth in donations. However, Eckel, Grossman and Milano (2007) in their experimental

research about charitable giving and hurricane Katrina, point out that the effect of the disaster only influenced short run giving (eight months after hurricane Katrina); in the long run (fifteen months after hurricane Katrina), it appears that private giving returned to pre-disaster levels (2007, p.405).

3. Data and Methodology

3.1 Dataset

The Government of Canada has conducted surveys on participating, giving and volunteering in 1997, 2000, 2004, 2007 and 2010 – with the latter having yet to be released. The National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) was conducted in 1997 and 2000; and the Canadian Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP) in 2004, 2007 and 2010. We are using the four available years in our empirical study. The NSGVP and CSGVP surveys were conducted by several departments of the Canadian federal government, and aimed at collecting national data on volunteering, charitable giving and civic behavior.³ All individuals aged 15 years and older were targeted, excluding full-time residents of institutions.⁴

In 1997 there were 18,031 observations on individuals giving, volunteering and participating, which was reduced to 13,946 after dropping those individuals for whom information was missing. The entire sample in 2000 was 14,724, which fell to 10,781 after dropping those with missing values. In 2004 and 2007, the entire sample sizes were 20,832

^{3&4} Description of the NSGVP obtained from: National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP), *Statistic Canada*, at

<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SurvId=4430&SurvVer=1&SDDS=4430&Instald=16024&InstaVer=2&ang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2> (accessed Nov. 25, 2011)

⁵ Across all four surveys, 2,735 individuals refused to answer or skipped the questions regarding education; 2,542 skipped or did not answer the question regarding whether he/she was Canadian born; 269 individuals did not report their gender; 18,772 individuals refused to answer or skipped the question regarding religiosity; 2,065 observations were dropped because of missing information on health; finally, 2,383 observations were missing on life satisfaction. The total number of dropped individuals is less than the sum of these dropped observations because some people failed to respond to more than one question.

and 20,510 respectively, which reduced to 15,261 and 14,893. The aggregate sample size for all four years was therefore 74,367. After dropping the missing values, the restricted sample for four years was 54,881.⁵

The choice of which variables to include in the regression analyses is based primarily upon Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009)'s study. The variables used in the regression models are defined in table 2. Notice that in table 2 there are eight different dependent variables: four of them correspond to the dependent variables used by RPD, with the remaining four being used for additional analyses (as detailed below).

Table 3 provides information on the average values of the independent variables used in the analysis, by survey year and by three different groups: those who give to both international and domestic organizations; those who give only to domestic organizations; and, those who do not give at all. Table 3a provides all of this information for the restricted sample used in this paper whereas table 3b provides information for the entire sample. The means of the variables across the two samples are remarkably similar, except for the amount of donations.

The average amount of money donated is higher in the restricted sample in comparison to the entire sample: for instance in 1997, individuals who give to both international and domestic organizations give an average of \$755 in the restricted sample as compared to \$691 in the full sample; and the average amount given to domestic organizations is \$630 for the restricted sample as opposed to \$573 in the entire sample. In other words, the restricted sample is overstating donations. Apart from the question on amount of donation, the other means are very comparable. Overall, the restricted sample seems to be a reasonable representation of the entire sample; we will run our models based on the restricted sample.

Looking at the observation numbers in the restricted model, in 1997, 1,004

individuals gave to both international and national organizations, 11,373 gave to only domestic organizations, and 1,569 did not give at all. By 2007, these numbers had increased to: 1,542, 12,064, and 1,287. As mentioned in the introduction, it is interesting to observe the large increase in individuals giving to both international and national organizations, which is much larger than the increase of domestic-only givers.

(Table 3 here)

Looking at the averages in our restricted sample, table 3a shows that they display some variation across time and across giving groups. So, for instance, in 1997, 87% of individuals giving to international and domestic groups were Canadian born, a number which drops to 81% in 2004 and 2007: clearly immigrants are relatively more inclined to give internationally than are native-born Canadians. Non-givers tend to be less healthy, on average, than are givers. Those who give to charity tend to be more satisfied with their life than non-givers. Proportionately more women give to international charities than do men, with 36% of these givers being male in 1997 and 37% male in 2007.

Very religious individuals seem to give more to both international organizations and domestic organizations: 66% and 52% of those who give both internationally and domestically and those who give only domestically, respectively, are very religious in 1997, and 59% and 43% respectively in 2007. Large proportions of non-givers were not religious: in 1997, 32% of the non-givers were not religious, and in 2007 the proportion of not religious non givers increased to 54%.

On average it seems that higher educated individuals tend to be more likely to donate to international organizations. In 1997, 26% of international donors were individuals with a university degree, which rose to 38% in 2007. Individuals with higher incomes seem less likely to be non-givers: in 1997, 24% of non-givers were in the \$20,000-\$40,000 income group, while only 2% of non-givers were in the \$100,000 and more income group; in 2007,

26% of non-givers were in the \$20,000-\$40,000 income groups, compared to 11% of the non-givers in the \$10,000 and over income group.

In this empirical study, we set up three main types of models: a multinomial logistic model and an Ordinary Least Squares model, following along the lines of Rajan, Pink and Dow, 2009, and a bivariate probit model. The construction of the models and the variables used will be described in detail in the following sub-sections.

3.2 Multinomial logistic model and OLS model

As mentioned in the literature review section, Rajan, Pink and Dow's research is the closest to our study. They employ the NSGVP 2000 survey. We begin, therefore, by copying the technique and employing mostly⁶ the same variables as Rajan, Pink and Dow but using all four surveys to investigate the extent to which their results are stable over time.

Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009) use a maximum likelihood multinomial logistic regression to examine the choice of an individual to be in one of three categories: 1) a donor who gives both internationally and domestically; 2) a donor who gives only domestically; 3) a non-donor. We could not replicate exactly the analysis of Rajan, Pink and Dow as there were a few differences in the data collected across the four surveys. The question "do you consider yourself to be... (Very religious, somewhat religious, not very religious, not at all religious)" was not in the CSGVP 2004 and CSGVP 2007, but was used by Rajan, Pink and Dow to capture religiosity. Instead, we selected the question "In the past 12 months, other than on special occasions (such as weddings, funerals or baptisms), how often have you attended religious services or meetings?" (Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP) Public Use Microdata File (MAIN)).⁷ We treated the individuals who answer "At least once a week" or "At least once a month" as *very religious*, individuals who

⁶ Some questions were not asked in subsequent years; this is clarified in the ensuing discussion.

⁷ Questionnaire(s) and reporting guide(s), Detailed information for 2007, Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, *Statcan*, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4430&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2> (accessed Nov. 25, 2011)

answered “At least 3 or 4 times a year” and “Only once or twice a year” as *somewhat religious*, and individuals who answered “not at all” as *not religious*.

For each survey year, we generated binary year variables to capture any year specific effects. One of the factors that may vary from year to year and affect individuals’ gifts to organizations operating internationally is the extent to which disasters occurred overseas. To this end, we collected information on the number of large disasters, defined as those with 500 or more or 1,000 or more fatalities, over the period 1997 to 2007 (as listed in table 4).⁸ As you can see, there is a considerable amount of variation across the years in the numbers of such disasters.

(Table 4 here)

The four survey years of data were pooled together. Dummy variables for each year were added to the regression. We also tested the restriction that the estimated coefficients were the same across variables across time by interacting each year with all of the independent variables – the unrestricted regression. We dropped the interactive variables that did not have a statistically significant estimated coefficient, and tested the restriction that these dropped variables did not jointly contribute to explaining the variation in the equation. Seven groups of interactive variables were found to have different signs or significance levels: Canadian born, male, marital status, age, province, religiosity and life satisfaction. Therefore, interactive terms between survey year and these seven groups of variables were included in the regression results presented in this paper. The results are compared to those of Rajan, Pink and Dow.

We used a likelihood-ratio test to determine which of the unrestricted model (with interactive terms for all independent variables) and the restricted model (with seven groups of interactive terms) is the correct one. The p-value of the likelihood ratio test is 0.058, which is

⁸ EM-DAT, Search Details Disaster List, (Search Detail: All Countries; Year 1997, 2000, 2004, 2007; Disaster types: Drought; Earthquake, Extreme temperature; Flood; Mass movement wet; Mass movement dry; Storm; Volcano; Wildfire), Published by SuperAdminEMDAT, <http://www.emdat.be/disaster-list> (accessed Nov.25, 2011)

larger than 0.05, indicating that the restricted model is the correct model compared to the unrestricted model.

Rajan, Pink and Dow also employed an Ordinary Least Squares regression method, for three regressions with three different dependent variables: the logarithm of the total amount of money donated; the logarithm of the total amount of money donated to only international organizations; the fraction of total donations going to international organizations only. Here, we have created the same dependent variables and also employ an OLS model using the same independent variables as used in the multinomial logistic model.

For the OLS models with each of the three dependent variables, we tested the likelihood-ratio of the unrestricted model (with interactive terms for all the independent variables) and the restricted model (with interactive terms for seven groups of independent variables). The p-value for the likelihood-ratio test of the OLS model with **logTotAmt** is 0.051, which is larger than 0.05 and indicates that the restricted model is the correct one. The restricted model is also the correct model for the OLS regression of **logIntlAmt**, where the likelihood-ratio test's p-value is 0.727. The p-value for the likelihood-ratio test of the OLS model with **fraction** is 0.029, which is rejected at 5% level, however not rejected at 1% level. Therefore, at 1% level, the restricted model is the correct model for the OLS regression with **fraction** as the dependent variable.

In the OLS method, for the models with dependent variables of **logTotAmt**, **logIntlAmt** and **fraction**, there were 49555, 4518 and 4518 observations respectively. Individuals who donated zero dollars to domestic or international charities are not included in the regressions.

3.3 Bivariate probit model

Up to now, the two econometric techniques employed have come from the desire to “replicate” (although not exactly because of data issues) the work of Rajan, Pink and Dow

(2009). However, there is reason to believe that their approach may have missed an important additional factor that has been discussed in the literature on private philanthropy. In particular, Brown and Lankford (1992), Freeman (1997), Duncan (1999) and Apinunmahakul, Barham and Devlin (2009) all demonstrated that gifts of money and time may be linked in an important way. The decision as to whether or not to give money may depend upon the decision as to whether or not to volunteer. While Brown and Lankford (1992) have looked at these two decisions jointly for the decisions to volunteer and/or give to all charities, we propose to look specifically at the decisions of whether or not to volunteer or give to international charities. To this end, we employ a bivariate probit framework (discussed below) and run two different models. The first looks at the joint decisions of whether or not to give and volunteer to charity in general, and hence is comparable to the work of Brown and Lankford (1992). However, unlike Brown and Lankford, the data set employed here is significantly larger. The second model looks directly at these decisions in the international context. Therefore, four binary variables were created as our dependent variables as described in table 2.

In examining binary dependent variables, the logit model and probit model are usually chosen for analysis. Compared to the logit model, which follows the logistic distribution, the probit model follows the standard normal distribution. (Greene, 2007). The bivariate probit model is an extension of the probit model, and is constructed with two equations that are seemingly unrelated, but the disturbances of the equations are correlated. The correlation coefficient across the two disturbances is calculated and the test is whether or not it is equal to zero (Greene, 2007, p.817).

As before, all four survey years were pooled together. Different groups of interactive variables were added to the pooled models. For the bivariate probit model with **intldonor** and **intlvol**, the interactive terms of provincial variables were found to be statistically significant;

therefore, the provincial variables are interacted with the year indicators and included in the bivariate probit specification. For the bivariate probit model with **giver** and **volunteer**, eight groups were found to be statistically significant: Canadian-born, health conditions, religiosity, marital status, education, age, province and household income. Therefore, the eight groups of variables are interacted with the year indicators and added to the bivariate probit model of **giver** and **volunteer**.

For the bivariate probit model with **giver** and **volunteer**, the p-value of the likelihood ratio test is 0.0752, which indicated that the restricted model is the correct model. For the bivariate probit model with **intldonor** and **intlvol**, the p-value of likelihood-ratio test of the unrestricted model and the restricted model is 0.1052, indicating that the restricted model is the correct model.

Following Greene (2007), our two-equation bivariate probit models can be written as:

$$y^*_1 = \mathbf{X}'\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \varepsilon_1, y_1 = 1 \text{ if gave to charity, } 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$y^*_2 = \mathbf{X}'\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + \varepsilon_2, y_2 = 1 \text{ if volunteer, } 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$E(\varepsilon_1 | \mathbf{X}) = E(\varepsilon_2 | \mathbf{X}) = 0$$

$$\text{Var}(\varepsilon_1 | \mathbf{X}) = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_2 | \mathbf{X}) = 1$$

$$\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 | \mathbf{X}) = \rho$$

We apply this model to giving and volunteering to charity in general, and to giving and volunteering to international and domestic organizations. Exactly the same explanatory variables are employed in each of the two bivariate probit models.

4. Results

We first discuss the multinomial logistic regression results and compare them to those of Rajan, Pink and Dow; we then report and discuss the OLS results and again compare them to Rajan, Pink and Dow's results. We will then look at the results from the bivariate probit

specification. The multinomial logistic results from RPD and those from the pooled-data sample of this paper are presented in table 5 and 6. The OLS results of RPD's model and our pooled-data model are shown in tables 7 and 8. Our bivariate probit model results are presented in tables 9 and 10.

4.1 Multinomial logistic regression results

The multinomial logistic result from RPD's paper is reproduced in our table 5 in order to facilitate the comparison, and our results using the pooled data set are provided in table 6. The sign and statistical significance of the estimated marginal effects on male, marital status, religiosity, and the fact that the individual is a volunteer, are the same when we compare our results to those of RPD. Male is shown to be insignificantly associated with the likelihood of being a domestic donor, but significantly linked to the likelihood of being an international donor and non-giver. Males are less likely than females to be international donors, but more likely to be non-givers. Marital status is shown to have significant effect on the likelihood of being a domestic donor as well as being a non-giver. Married individuals are more likely than not married individuals to be domestic donors, and less likely to be non-giver. Not married individuals in the 2007 survey are less likely to be non-givers relative to the not married participants in all other survey years. Religiosity is significantly linked to giving: individuals who are more religious are more likely to be international donors or domestic donors, and less likely to be non-givers. Not religious individuals in the 2004 and 2007 surveys are less likely to be non-givers compared to the not religious participants in all other years. Whether or not the individual was a volunteer is also associated with giving internationally and domestically, and renders the individuals less likely to be a non-giver.

Using all four years of survey data, however, some small differences are found in the effects of educational level and health conditions on giving when compared to RPD's results. Both our model and RPD's model found education to be important: an individual with a

higher education level is more likely to be an international donor and less likely to be a non-giver. There are a few differences in the effect of education across the two models: whereas both approaches find that the higher the level of education the higher the likelihood that the individual will become an international donor, the marginal impact of a university degree in RPD's model is 0.054 as compared to 0.079 in ours. Furthermore, while the impact of educational level on domestic giving only is always statistically significant in RPD's model, it is only those with a university degree who are statistically different than others when the data sets are pooled. There were no significant relationships shown between health conditions and giving in RPD's model. However, in our model, poor health is illustrated to be significantly linked to an individual's likelihood of being international donors or non-giver. Individuals in poor health are less likely to be international donor, and more likely to be non-giver.

Age and life satisfaction were shown to be insignificantly associated with the likelihood of being international donors in RPD's one-year model. However, these two groups of variables have a statistically significant effect on the likelihood of being an international donor in our four-year model: individuals in older age groups and those in the very young reference group are more likely to be international donors. Moreover, in the survey year 2000, the impact of being aged 55-64 is negative and statistically significant suggesting that in the survey year 2000 these individuals were less likely to become international donors relative to those in this age group in all other years; individuals aged 45-54 in 2007 are more likely to become international donors compare to individuals in the same age group in other years. The effect of age cohorts, therefore, seems to change over time.

More satisfied individuals are more likely to be international donors. It seems that somewhat satisfied and somewhat dissatisfied individuals in the survey year 2000 are more likely to become international donors relative to individuals in the same life satisfaction

groups in all other years. Household size did not change the likelihood being an international donor, domestic donor or non-giver in RPD's model. However, in our regression results, household size is associated with being a non-giver – the bigger the household size, the more likely that the individual will be a non-giver, *ceteris paribus*. Households with four or more members are less likely to be domestic-only donors, while only those with two members have a small, negative, impact on becoming an international donor.

Being Canadian-born is shown to have a significant and negative effect on the likelihood of being an international donors according to RPD, which is consistent with our regression results. We have also illustrated that Canadian-born individuals are significantly linked to the likelihood of being a domestic-only donor or a non-giver, which was not illustrated in RPD's results.

4.2 OLS regression results

Turning now to the OLS results presented in table 7 (reproduction of RPD's results) and table 8 (our pooled regression results) we see that the effects of household income, education, male and the fact that the individual is a volunteer are consistent with RPD's regression results. Household income and education are shown to be positively associated with the total amount donated and the amount donated to international organizations. Being male does not display any significant effect on any of the three dependent variables in both RPD's results and our results. An individual who is a volunteer is shown to give more in total.

In our model being Canadian-born is shown to have significant effects on the total amount donated and the fraction of total gifts that goes to international organizations, in contrast to RPD's findings. We observe that compared to non-Canadian-born individuals, those who are Canadian-born donate more in total but devote a lower fraction of these donations to international organizations. Looking at the effect of the interactive term between Canadian-born and the survey year 2000, we find that those participants seem to donate less

in total in comparison to the Canadian-born participants in all other years.

Age is shown to be significantly and positively related to the total amount of money donated and the fraction of money going to international causes in both RPD's OLS model and our OLS model. In our model, individuals in the older age group give a lower fraction of their donations to international organizations relative to those in younger groups, but a larger overall amount, a result which seems to make sense. In 2000, individuals in older age groups seem to give less in total than the same age groups of individuals in other survey years.

Marital status was not shown to be statistically significant in any of RPD's three OLS regressions; however, it does seem to affect total donations in our model. We observe that individuals who are widowed make larger total donations compared to other individuals. Single and widowed individuals, who participated in the 2004 and 2007 surveys, make larger total donations when compared to individuals with the same marital status who participated in all other years. Single and widowed individuals in the 2004 survey gave 0.134 and 0.214 more in $\log\text{TotAmt}$ respectively compared to their counterparts in all other years. Single and widowed individuals participated in the 2007 survey, gave 0.098 and 0.179 more in $\log\text{TotAmt}$ respectively relative to those individuals in all other years.

In both RPD's model and our model, religiosity is shown to have significant and positive influences on the amount of money going to international organizations and the total amount donated. However, RPD observed that somewhat religious individuals give more to international organizations than those who are not religious at all, while we find the opposite – those who are not religious at all give more to international organizations than those who are somewhat religious. The fact that our definitions of religiosity are different may account for this finding. Somewhat religious individuals in 2000 give more in total donations in comparison to the somewhat religious individuals in the other three years; somewhat religious individuals in 2007 give more in terms of amount given to international

organizations and in terms of the fraction devoted to international organizations, relative to somewhat religious individuals in other years.

Reported health is shown to have a statistically significant influence on the total amount donated in RPD's model. However, it does not seem to be important at all in our pooled sample. By contrast, in our model, those who are more satisfied with their life give more money in total relative to others, which was not illustrated by RPD's results.

4.3 Bivariate probit regression results

To look at the joint decisions of giving and volunteering, bivariate probit models were estimated. Table 9 presents the bivariate probit results for the decision to give to any charity and the decision to volunteer with any charity. Table 10 presents the bivariate probit findings when we restrict the analysis to those who either give and or volunteer with international (as well as domestic) organizations. There are four potential marginal effects: the impact of the independent variable on the probability of giving money, conditional on the individual having also decided to volunteer; the impact of the independent variable on the probability of giving money conditional on having decided to not volunteer; the impact of the independent variable on not giving money given than the individual decided to volunteer; and finally, the impact of the independent variable on not giving money when the individual has decided to not volunteer. All four marginal effects are presented. Additionally, we report the predicted probability of the reference individual for each of these four cases in order to determine the importance of the marginal effects.

According to table 9, we have found household income to be significantly linked to giving and volunteering, as also found in Brown and Lankford (1992), Yen, (2002) and Apinunmahakul and Devlin, (2008). For instance, individuals who have a household income of 20 to 40 thousand dollars, are 9% more likely than the reference individual with less than 20 thousand dollars, to give both time and money to charity. Our results are in contrast to

Jackson et al. (1995) who find that income has an insignificant effect on volunteering. However, if an individual gives only money but not time, it seems that only the highest income group exerts a significant and negative effect on giving. Individuals in higher income groups, who participated in the 2004 and 2007 surveys, are more likely to both give and volunteer compared to individuals with higher level of income in all other years.

The results of the model on the decision to give money and time to international and domestic organizations (table 10) show that income has a different influence on these decisions when compared to decisions to give or volunteer to any organization. Only individuals in the highest income bracket are statistically different from others when we look at the probability of giving to international organizations, conditional on also volunteering. However, while the marginal effect of individuals in the over 100 thousand household income group looks small, 0.001, the predicted probability for giving conditional on volunteering for the reference group is also small, hence being in a household income bracket of 100 thousand dollars or more increases the probability of being both an international donor and volunteer by 20%. In the international context, all but the lowest income bracket exerts a positive influence on giving conditional on not volunteering: although the group that is most likely to give is NOT those in the highest bracket, rather it is those in the 40-60 thousand dollar income group. Income is negatively associated with not giving and not volunteering.

Education is shown to be significantly linked to giving and volunteering in general, consistent with others in the literature (Brown, 2005; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). Individuals in higher education levels are more likely to both give and volunteer, however, less likely to only give (but not volunteer) or only volunteer (but not give). Education is also significantly and positively related to the giving to and volunteering in international organizations. Individuals with higher education levels are more likely to become givers only (but not volunteers) or volunteers only (but not givers).

Our results on giving and volunteering in an international context are consistent with other researchers' results on giving and volunteering in general.

Males are more likely to become givers only or volunteer only in our result, and less likely to do both. As many researchers have shown (e.g., Vaillancourt and Payette, 1986; Brown and Lankford, 1992; Ronney, Mesch, Chin and Steinberg, 2005) males are less likely to be donors and volunteers when compared to females; our results show males are less likely to do giving and volunteering jointly. In the model of international giving and volunteering, males are shown to be less likely to give or to volunteer to international organizations when compared to females. Therefore, it seems that our results in the international context are consistent with more general studies of the determinants of giving.

Canadian-born individuals are found to be more likely to both give and volunteer, but less likely to only give or to only volunteer. Apinunmahakul and Devlin (2008) found that non-Canadian-born individuals seem to give less money and less time when compared to Canadian-born individuals – which is consistent with our results from the pooled sample. However, we have also illustrated that Canadian-born individuals are less likely to give to or volunteer for international organizations. Although this result in an international context is in contrast to the work done on general giving, it is consistent with Rajan, Pink and Dow's (2009) study on international giving.

Age is shown to be significantly linked to giving and volunteering. Individuals in older age groups are more likely to be givers but less likely to be volunteers, consistent with findings in other studies (Kitchen, 1990; Brown and Lankford, 1992; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008). The individuals participating in the 2007 survey are more likely to give compared to the individuals in all other years. Age is also shown to have significant effects on all giving and volunteering in the international context. Individuals in the older age groups are more likely to give to international organizations. Individuals aged 25-34, 45-54, 55-64

and 64 over, act similarly when volunteering with international organizations; individuals in the age group of 35-44, seem to be least likely to volunteer to international organizations compared to individuals in other age groups. The observation that individuals in different age groups act similarly in international volunteering is inconsistent with Apinunmahakul and Devlin (2008)'s finding on age and volunteering in general, who have suggested as individuals in older age are less likely to volunteer.

Not married individuals are shown to be less likely to give, but more likely to be a volunteer. This is similar to the findings in Carroll (2005) and Brown and Ferris (2007) who have observed that married individuals are more likely to be donors. We found that single, widowed and separated participants in the 2007 survey, are less likely to give or volunteer compared to individuals with the same marital status in all other years. We have also demonstrated that an individual who is single or separated is more likely to both donate and volunteer to international organizations relative to married individuals, while widowed individuals are more likely to only donate to (but not volunteer with) international organizations.

We find that a larger household size seems to decrease an individual's likelihood to give but increase the individual's likelihood to volunteer. This is consistent with Brown and Lankford (1992) and others (Mitrut and Nordblom, 2010; Cappellari, Ghinetti and Turati, 2011) who find that household size is significantly linked to giving. However, in the international context (table 10), we have found that the effect of household size on giving and volunteering is extremely small.

According to table 9, it seems that individuals from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia are more likely to give and volunteer jointly, but less likely to only give, relative to those from other provinces. Individuals from Prince Edward Island and Quebec are less likely to both donate and volunteer, however, more likely to only donate money to

charities. Those from Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, who participated in the survey in 2000, are more likely to both give and volunteer relative to those individuals from these three provinces in all other years.

A religious individual is shown to be more likely to both give and volunteer, however, less likely to only give or only volunteer, relative to the less religious. While other researchers found that religious individuals tend to give more than non-religious givers (Jackson et al., 1995; Yen, 2002; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008), we found that religiosity is more positively related to joint giving and volunteering behaviour than doing either one separately. It seems that in the 2004 survey, participants who are somewhat religious are more likely to give or volunteer to charities compared to the somewhat religious individuals in all other years. Religiosity is shown to have significant and positive relationship with giving to and volunteering for international organizations. And being religious decreases an individual's likelihood to neither give nor volunteer in international organizations. The results in the international context are consistent with other findings in general (Jackson et al., 1995, Wilson and Musick, 1997; Yen, 2002; Brown and Ferris, 2007; Apinunmahakul and Devlin, 2008).

We have observed that there was no significant relationship between having very good and good health on both giving and volunteering. However, there are significant effects of fair and poor health conditions on giving and volunteering. Individuals in fair or poor health condition are less likely to give both time and money but more likely to give money only. This makes sense as one could imagine that individuals in poorer health would be less likely to get out of the house to volunteer. Individuals in poor health in the 2004 survey are even more likely to give to charities relative to similar individuals in the other surveys. In the international context, a similar pattern arises: good health does not seem to matter but bad health does.

The more satisfied that individuals are with their life, the more likely that they will both give money and time in general, but this does not seem to hold for giving and volunteering to international organizations. We found that it is those who are very dissatisfied with their life who are less likely to give to or volunteer for international organizations relative to all others.

Our findings in the international context are consistent with Ribar and Wilhelm's (1995) findings on donations to international relief and development organizations: education, age and religiosity are shown to have significant effects on an individual's likelihood to give to international organizations.

4.4 Interdependence of donations and volunteering

According to the regression results of the bivariate probit model with giving and volunteering reported in table 9, the estimated coefficient on rho (the correlation factor across the two error terms) is 0.3146 with a probability value of 0.000. The fact that this is statistically significant and greater than zero, suggests a complementary relationship between the likelihood of being a giver of money and a volunteer, consistent with the findings of Brown and Lankford (1992) and Apinunmahakul, Barham and Devlin (2009)

In the regression results of the bivariate probit model of international donors and volunteers, table 10, the estimated coefficient on rho is very similar, 0.3396 and statistically significant. The decisions to give time and money to international organizations also appear to be complementary to each other.

4.5 The effect of time on giving

It is interesting to look at how giving behavior changes over time. While we only have four surveys, we can use this information to see if there are some patterns emerging on donating behavior over the ten year period of our study. One question of interest to this study

was whether or not individuals responded to overseas disasters by deciding to give to international causes. To this end, we examined the number of disasters with at least 500 and at least 1000 fatalities over the four years of this study. These numbers are reported in table 4. According to table 4, we observe that in the year 2000 there were no disasters with more than 1000 fatalities. Therefore, we would like to have a look at whether or not Canadian donor's giving behaviour in 2000 was different from that of other survey years. We also wanted to know whether the larger the number of serious disasters in a year, the more likely an individual would be an international giver. Unfortunately, these data were not very suitable for use with the four surveys – it was not possible to include the number of disasters every year in the data set as they would be too correlated with year dummy variables. We were hoping to look at the estimated coefficients on the year dummy variables to see whether we could interpret the results in light of the disaster information contained in table 4, but this was not a very successful exercise.

In the bivariate probit model of giving and volunteering, the time dummy variables were statistically significant only for the probability of giving conditional on not volunteering (and for the year 2000 in the giving and volunteering marginal effect). But, the effect of the year 2000 was positive relative to 1997, whereas the years 2004 and 2007 were negative relative to the year 1997. Looking at international giving, we find that only the year 2007 is statistically different than the other years. However, with no disasters with over 1000 fatalities in 2000, we expected that that year (2000) might be different than other years, but this was not the case.

5. Conclusion

This empirical study has examined the individual determinants of giving and volunteering to all charities and especially to international organizations using four surveys:

NSGVP 1997, NSGVP 2000, CSGVP 2004 and CSGVP 2007. We first followed the work of Rajan, Pink and Dow (2009) who used the NSGVP 2000, and then we extended this work. A few differences were discussed between RPD's findings based on one survey year and our work based on four surveys: for instance, individuals in older age groups seem to make larger donations to international organizations; individuals who are most satisfied with their life are more likely to be international donors. In the former case, we may be picking up a cohort effect – over the ten year period, individuals have aged and continue to be generous to international organizations if they started off that way. Why our results on life satisfaction are different than those of RPD's is not clear – at the least they suggest that the effect of life satisfaction on giving is not very robust.

In addition to replicating RPD's study, we also recognized that the decision to give time and money may not be independent of each other. To this end, we estimated bivariate probits for these two decisions – for giving and volunteering in general, and for giving to and volunteering for international organizations. By and large, our results were consistent with the few studies that have taken into account the jointness of these decisions for the general case. We are the first, as far as we know, to look specifically at the international context, and these results were reasonably comparable to the general case as well. There were a handful of differences in the behaviour of general giving and that of giving and volunteering for international causes.

However, some individual characteristics are shown to have different influences on the decisions to give to or volunteer for any charitable organization versus international ones. For instance, Canadian-born individuals are less likely than non-Canadian-born individuals to be international donors or international volunteers.

We have confirmed that the likelihood of being a giver and the likelihood of being a volunteer are complements, even when we look only at these decisions in the context of

international organizations: when individuals decide to give money to an international organization they are more likely to decide to donate their time as well.

In this paper, we failed to find evidence of a relationship between the number of overseas disasters and individuals' giving behaviour. Clearly, the data were not very good for this purpose. A better data set is needed in order to explore better this topic.

Tables

Table 2: Variable Definitions

Dependent Variable	Definitions
donation	1=international donor (donated both internationally and domestically), 2=domestic donor (donated domestic only), 3=non-giver
logTotAmt logIntlAmt fraction	Log(total amount donated) Log(amt. donated to international organization) (amt. donated to international organization) / (total amount donated)
Intldonor Intlvol giver volunteer	1=donated both to international org. and domestic org. 0=donated to domestic org. only 1=volunteered in both to international and domestic org. 0=volunteered in domestic org. only 1=individuals who give; 0=individuals who do not give 1=individuals who volunteer; 0=individuals who do not volunteer
Independent Variable	Definitions
Canadian-born	1= born in Canada, 0=otherwise
Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor	1=excellent in health 0=otherwise reference group 1= very good in health, 0= otherwise 1= good in health, 0=otherwise 1=Fair in health, 0=otherwise 1= Poor in health, 0=otherwise
Very satisfied Somewhat satisfied Somewhat dissatisfied Very dissatisfied	1= very satisfied in life, 0=otherwise reference group 1=somewhat satisfied in life, 0=otherwise 1=somewhat dissatisfied in life, 0=otherwise 1=very dissatisfied in life, 0=otherwise
Very religious Somewhat religious Not religious	1=attend religious service or meeting: at least once a week or at least once a month, 0=otherwise reference group 1= if attend religious service or meeting: at least 3 or 4 times a year or only once or twice a year, 0=otherwise 1= if never attend religious service or meeting, 0=otherwise
female male	1=female, 0=otherwise reference group 1=male, 0=otherwise
married single widow separated	1=married, 0=otherwise reference group 1=single, 0=otherwise 1=widow, 0=otherwise 1= separated, 0= otherwise
lessHS highschool posths postsecdip unidegree	1=less than high school, 0=otherwise reference group 1=high school as highest completed education, 0= otherwise 1=some post high school education, 0= otherwise 1=post secondary diploma, 0= otherwise 1=university degree, 0= otherwise
age1524 age2534 age3544 age4554 age5564 age64over	1=age 15-24, 0=otherwise reference group 1=age 25-34, 0= otherwise 1= age 35-44, 0= otherwise 1=age 45-54, 0= otherwise 1=age55-64, 0= otherwise 1=age 65 and over, 0= otherwise
ON NFLD	1=Ontario, 0=otherwise reference group 1=New Foundland , 0= otherwise

Table 2 (Continued)

PEI	1=PEI, 0= otherwise
NS	1=Nova Scotia, 0= otherwise
NB	1= New Brunswick, 0= otherwise
QC	1=Quebec, 0= otherwise
MB	1=Manitoba, 0= otherwise
SK	1=Saskatchewan, 0= otherwise
AB	1=Alberta, 0= otherwise
BC	1=British Columbia, 0= otherwise
hhinc20less	1=household income < 20000, 0= otherwise reference group
hhinc2040	1=household income 20000-40000, 0= otherwise
hhinc4060	1=household income 40000-60000, 0= otherwise
hhinc60100	1=household income 60000-100000, 0= otherwise
hhinc100ver	1=household income over 100000, 0= otherwise
y1997	1=year 1997, 0=otherwise reference group
y2000	1=year 2000, 0=otherwise
y2004	1=year 2004, 0=otherwise
y2007	1=year 2007, 0=otherwise

Table 3
a. Mean of Dependent Variables and Independent Variables in the Restricted Sample (after dropping missing values)

Dependent Variable	1997			2000			2004			2007		
	Intl. Donor Mean (1004 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (11373 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (1569 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (744 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (8828 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (1209 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (1228 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (12772 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (1542 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (12064 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (1287 obs)	
Dependent Variable												
Tot. amt. Donated	755.14	298.46	.	871.85	328.71	.	1239.44	449.08	1326.96	500.91	.	
Tot. amt. Donated Intl.	125.15	.	.	161.46	.	.	223.50	.	300.59	.	.	
Tot. Amt. Donated Domestically	629.99	298.46	.	710.39	328.71	.	1015.94	449.08	1026.37	500.91	.	
(amt. Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated)	0.24	.	.	0.27	.	.	0.28	.	0.31	.	.	
Volunteer with charities	0.78	0.66	0.34	0.77	0.61	0.27	0.78	0.67	0.78	0.68	0.39	
Independent Variable												
Country of Birth: Canadian-born	0.87	0.90	0.89	0.86	0.90	0.89	0.81	0.88	0.81	0.87	0.82	
Health condition:												
Excellent	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.23	0.18	0.27	0.25	0.30	0.25	0.23	
Very Good	0.36	0.34	0.30	0.36	0.31	0.29	0.38	0.33	0.35	0.34	0.28	
Good	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.24	0.29	0.26	0.23	0.27	0.25	0.26	0.27	
Fair	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.12	0.13	0.18	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.14	
Poor	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.08	
Life Satisfaction: Very Satisfied	0.61	0.49	0.34	0.55	0.51	0.35	0.62	0.57	0.64	0.56	0.40	
Somewhat Satisfied	0.37	0.45	0.54	0.40	0.43	0.54	0.34	0.39	0.33	0.40	0.50	
Somewhat Dissatisfied	0.02	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.07	
Very Dissatisfied	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	
Religiosity: Very Religious	0.66	0.52	0.27	0.67	0.52	0.33	0.61	0.46	0.59	0.43	0.20	
Somewhat Religious	0.21	0.32	0.41	0.23	0.30	0.34	0.21	0.27	0.24	0.27	0.26	
Not Religious	0.13	0.16	0.32	0.10	0.18	0.33	0.18	0.27	0.20	0.30	0.54	
Gender: Male	0.36	0.40	0.48	0.37	0.40	0.47	0.38	0.40	0.37	0.59	0.49	
Marital Status: Married	0.60	0.60	0.34	0.64	0.64	0.41	0.60	0.60	0.62	0.61	0.40	
Single	0.22	0.20	0.45	0.17	0.18	0.35	0.22	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.39	
Widow	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.06	
Separated	0.11	0.10	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.14	
Household Size: 1	0.24	0.23	0.29	0.21	0.21	0.28	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.28	

Table 3 (Continued)

2	0.36	0.36	0.28	0.35	0.35	0.29	0.37	0.36	0.28	0.35	0.38	0.30
3	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.18	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.16
4	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16
5+	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.10
Education:												
Less than HS	0.18	0.28	0.47	0.16	0.24	0.46	0.11	0.17	0.36	0.09	0.15	0.34
High School	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.18	0.16	0.13	0.17	0.20	0.11	0.16	0.21
Some Post sec.	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07
Post sec. Diploma	0.33	0.33	0.21	0.33	0.33	0.20	0.34	0.38	0.27	0.36	0.39	0.28
Uni Degree	0.26	0.14	0.06	0.29	0.17	0.09	0.37	0.22	0.10	0.38	0.23	0.11
Age:												
15-24	0.08	0.09	0.31	0.09	0.09	0.22	0.10	0.10	0.29	0.08	0.08	0.23
25-34	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.12	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.15	0.17	0.12	0.12	0.15
35-44	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.22	0.24	0.16	0.18	0.22	0.15	0.18	0.19	0.17
45-54	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.19	0.18	0.13	0.21	0.19	0.14	0.20	0.21	0.17
55-64	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.16	0.14	0.12	0.18	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.19	0.15
64+	0.19	0.19	0.15	0.22	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.18	0.13	0.20	0.20	0.14
Province												
NFLD	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04
PEI	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.03
NS	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.06
NB	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.05
QC	0.17	0.20	0.36	0.13	0.18	0.32	0.18	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.20	0.27
ON	0.29	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.30	0.23	0.20	0.13	0.22	0.18	0.19
MB	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.14	0.08	0.05	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.06
SK	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07
AB	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.07
BC	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.10	0.17	0.17	0.11	0.15
HHIncome:												
<20000	0.17	0.23	0.49	0.12	0.15	0.33	0.09	0.14	0.35	0.07	0.11	0.28
20000-40000	0.27	0.29	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.19	0.25	0.26	0.18	0.21	0.26
40000-60000	0.25	0.23	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.19	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.21	0.17
60000-100000	0.22	0.19	0.09	0.27	0.24	0.12	0.27	0.25	0.15	0.27	0.26	0.18
100000+	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.12	0.10	0.05	0.23	0.15	0.07	0.26	0.21	0.11

Table 3 (Continued)

b. Mean of Dependent Variables and Independent Variables in the Entire Sample

Dependent Variable	1997				2000				2004				2007	
	Intl. Donor Mean (1206 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (14410 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (2685 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (890 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (11273 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (1883 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (1520 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (16401 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (2190 obs)	Intl. Donor Mean (2026 obs)	Dom. Donor Mean (15808 obs)	Non-Giver Mean (2124 obs)		
Dependent Variable														
Tot. amt. Donated	690.9	259	.	660	289	.	1050	429	.	1174	454	.		
Tot. amt. Donated Intl.	117.7	.	.	138	.	.	199	.	.	256	.	.		
Total amt. Donated to Dom. Org.	573.2	259	.	522	289	.	851	429	.	918	454	.		
(amt. Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated)	0.24	.	.	0.29	.	.	0.29	.	.	0.34	.	.		
Volunteer to charities	0.65	0.77	0.32	0.75	0.60	0.25	0.75	0.65	0.37	0.77	0.67	0.41		
Independent Variable														
Country of Birth: Canadian-born	0.86	0.90	0.88	0.85	0.90	0.89	0.81	0.87	0.84	0.80	0.87	0.82		
Health Condition:														
Excellent	0.28	0.26	0.24	0.27	0.24	0.18	0.28	0.26	0.23	0.31	0.26	0.23		
Very Good	0.36	0.34	0.30	0.35	0.32	0.31	0.38	0.34	0.29	0.35	0.34	0.27		
Good	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.28	0.27	0.23	0.26	0.27	0.24	0.25	0.28		
Fair	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.14		
Poor	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.08		
Life Satisfaction: Very Satisfied	0.59	0.49	0.33	0.51	0.56	0.34	0.61	0.56	0.41	0.63	0.55	0.42		
Somewhat Satisfied	0.37	0.45	0.53	0.43	0.39	0.55	0.35	0.39	0.49	0.34	0.41	0.49		
Somewhat Dissatisfied	0.03	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.09	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.03	0.07		
Very Dissatisfied	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02		
Religiosity: Very Religious	0.66	0.52	0.26	0.67	0.51	0.32	0.61	0.46	0.25	0.59	0.43	0.19		
Somewhat Religious	0.21	0.31	0.40	0.23	0.31	0.35	0.21	0.26	0.25	0.21	0.27	0.25		
Not Religious	0.13	0.17	0.31	0.10	0.18	0.33	0.18	0.27	0.50	0.20	0.30	0.55		
Gender: Male	0.36	0.42	0.52	0.38	0.43	0.50	0.38	0.41	0.52	0.38	0.43	0.52		
Marital Status: Married	0.63	0.62	0.33	0.65	0.62	0.41	0.58	0.59	0.34	0.61	0.59	0.39		
Single	0.20	0.20	0.45	0.18	0.20	0.37	0.25	0.22	0.47	0.21	0.21	0.42		
Widow	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06		
Separated	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.13		

Table 3 (Continued)

Household Size:	1	0.22	0.21	0.27	0.22	0.2	0.27	0.27	0.25	0.32	0.26	0.25	0.28
	2	0.33	0.32	0.27	0.35	0.35	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.28	0.36	0.37	0.30
	3	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.13	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.17
	4	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.16
	5+	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.09
Education:	Less than high school	0.18	0.26	0.45	0.15	0.23	0.43	0.10	0.16	0.34	0.08	0.14	0.30
	High School	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.17	0.22	0.10	0.16	0.21
	Some Post sec.	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.08
	Post sec. Diploma	0.32	0.32	0.21	0.32	0.33	0.21	0.32	0.37	0.24	0.34	0.38	0.28
	Uni Degree	0.28	0.16	0.06	0.31	0.17	0.09	0.39	0.23	0.12	0.42	0.25	0.13
Age:	15-24	0.11	0.10	0.29	0.09	0.1	0.23	0.1	0.11	0.29	0.07	0.09	0.25
	25-34	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.13	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.16	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.16
	35-44	0.24	0.25	0.16	0.21	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.22	0.16	0.19	0.19	0.17
	45-54	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.21	0.19	0.14	0.20	0.19	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.15
	55-64	0.14	0.12	0.09	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.21	0.18	0.13
	64+	0.18	0.17	0.14	0.21	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.17	0.14	0.19	0.19	0.14
Province:	NFLD	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.03
	PEI	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.03
	NS	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.06
	NB	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.04
	QC	0.15	0.17	0.25	0.14	0.15	0.23	0.17	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.19	0.22
	ON	0.29	0.31	0.27	0.27	0.31	0.32	0.23	0.20	0.13	0.23	0.19	0.18
	MB	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.06
	SK	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07
	AB	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.09
	BC	0.10	0.07	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.22	0.20	0.14	0.21
Household income:	less than 20000	0.17	0.23	0.49	0.11	0.14	0.31	0.15	0.15	0.33	0.07	0.1	0.25
	20000-40000	0.26	0.28	0.25	0.24	0.27	0.30	0.20	0.24	0.26	0.18	0.21	0.25
	40000-60000	0.25	0.23	0.15	0.24	0.24	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.17	0.21	0.20	0.18
	60000-100000	0.23	0.20	0.09	0.28	0.25	0.14	0.27	0.25	0.16	0.27	0.27	0.19
	100000+	0.09	0.06	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.05	0.23	0.16	0.08	0.27	0.22	0.13

Table 4
Disaster Numbers in 1997, 2000, 2004 & 2007

	1997	2000	2004	2007
500-1000Fatalities	1	3	4	3
More than 1000 Fatalities	5	0	7	3

Source: EM-DAT, Search Details Disaster List, (Search Detail: All Countries; Year 1997, 2000, 2004, 2007; Disaster types: Drought; Earthquake, Extreme temperature; Flood; Mass movement wet; Mass movement dry; Storm; Volcano; Wildfire), Published by SuperAdminEMDAT, <http://www.emdat.be/disaster-list> (accessed Nov.25, 2011)

Table 5
 RPDs Maximum Likelihood Multinomial Logistic regression results (reproduced from RPD,
 2009, 426-427)

Dependent Variable= 1=international and domestic donor; 2=domestic donor; 3=non-giver

	Int'l donor	Dom. Donor	Non-Giver
	Marginal effect	Marginal effect	Marginal effect
hhinc2040	0.009**	0.057**	-0.065**
hhinc4060	0.02**	0.062**	-0.082**
hhinc60100	0.021**	0.102**	-0.123**
hhinc100over	0.037**	0.077**	-0.113**
highschool	0.028**	0.029**	-0.057**
posths	0.042**	-0.006**	-0.035**
postsecdip	0.038**	0.022**	-0.06**
unidegree	0.054**	-0.01**	-0.045**
male	-0.011*	-0.038**	0.049**
Canadian-born	-0.017*	0.023	-0.006
age2534	-0.003	0.015**	-0.012**
age3544	-0.012	0.077**	-0.066**
age4554	-0.007	0.038**	-0.031**
age5564	0.016	0.026**	-0.042**
age64over	0.014	0.006**	-0.02**
single	0.000	-0.06*	0.06**
widow	0.013	-0.019	0.006
separated	-0.004	-0.08**	0.084**
hhs2	0.003	-0.029	0.026
hhs3	0.014	-0.040	0.026
hhs4	0.015	-0.058	0.042
hhs5over	0.012	-0.061	0.049
NFLD	0.002	0.062**	-0.064**
PEI	0.003	0.073**	-0.076**
NS	0.028*	0.019	-0.047**
NB	0.008	-0.007	-0.001
QC	0.004	-0.035	0.031
AB	0.014	0.015	-0.029
MB	0.043*	0.005	-0.047**
SK	0.020	0.014	-0.034*
BC	0.039**	-0.054*	0.015
Somewhat religious	-0.032**	0.019**	0.013**
Not religious	-0.023**	-0.039**	0.061**
Volunteer	0.022**	0.085**	-0.107**
Electoral participation	0.018**	0.065**	-0.082**
Pol. Dev. Week	-0.006**	-0.091**	0.097**
Pol.Dev.Month	-0.003**	-0.005**	0.008**
Pol.Dev.Never	0.006**	-0.124**	0.118**
Fam. Soc. Week	0.009**	-0.024**	0.014**
Fam. Soc. Month	0.003**	-0.002**	-0.001**
Fam.Soc.Never	-0.026**	-0.103**	0.129**
Financial Insecurity	-0.006	0.024	-0.018
VeryGoodHealth	0.001	-0.049	0.048
GoodHealth	-0.005	0.010	-0.005
FairHealth	-0.008	0.010	-0.002
PoorHealth	-0.018	0.003	0.015
LifeSomewhat Sat.	0.003	-0.042**	0.039**

Table 5 (Continued)

Life Somewhat.Dissat.	0.011	-0.028**	0.017**
LifeVeryDissat.	-0.028	0.011**	0.016**

Note: *p<.05. **p<.01

Table 6
Pooled Data, Maximum Likelihood Multinomial Logistic results
Dependent Variable=1=international donor; 2=domestic donor; 3=non-giver
(Interactive year variables added to regression)
(No. of observations: 54881)

	Intl. Donor		Dom.Donor		Non-giver	
	mar.eff.	P-value	mar.eff.	P-value	mar.eff.	P-value
hhinc2040	0.016**	0.000	0.015**	0.001	-0.031**	0.000
hhinc4060	0.030**	0.000	0.010	0.071	-0.039**	0.000
hhinc60100	0.031**	0.000	0.019**	0.001	-0.051**	0.000
hhinc100over	0.045**	0.000	0.004	0.539	-0.050**	0.000
highschool	0.016**	0.001	0.001	0.409	-0.020**	0.000
post HS	0.033**	0.000	-0.009	0.214	-0.024**	0.000
postsecdip	0.032**	0.000	0.003	0.507	-0.035**	0.000
unidegree	0.079**	0.000	-0.042**	0.000	-0.037**	0.000
male	-0.147**	0.001	-0.008	0.145	0.023**	0.000
Canadian-born	-0.016*	0.023	0.042**	0.000	-0.026**	0.000
age2534	-0.017*	0.016	0.048**	0.000	-0.031**	0.000
age3544	-0.014*	0.047	0.054**	0.000	-0.040**	0.000
age4554	-0.015*	0.048	0.051**	0.000	-0.036**	0.000
age5564	0.009	0.339	0.030**	0.003	-0.039**	0.000
age64over	0.008	0.415	0.040**	0.000	-0.048**	0.000
single	-0.008	0.226	-0.048**	0.000	0.056**	0.000
widow	-0.007	0.427	-0.033**	0.010	0.039**	0.000
separated	0.001	0.933	-0.048**	0.000	0.047**	0.000
hhSize 2	-0.008*	0.033	-0.003	0.571	0.011**	0.000
hhSize 3	-0.008	0.071	-0.010	0.058	0.018**	0.000
hhSize 4	-0.008	0.083	-0.018**	0.002	0.026**	0.000
hhSize 5+	-0.004	0.385	-0.032**	0.000	0.036**	0.000
NFLD	0.024	0.084	-0.005	0.742	-0.019**	0.001
PEI	0.004	0.758	-0.001	0.944	-0.003	0.737
NS	0.007	0.480	0.004	0.701	-0.011	0.058
NB	0.007	0.471	-0.005	0.644	-0.002	0.772
QC	0.006	0.435	-0.029	0.001	0.023**	0.000
MB	0.013	0.193	-0.006	0.593	-0.007	0.284
SK	0.000	0.992	0.010	0.350	-0.010	0.109
AB	0.014	0.153	-0.008	0.481	-0.006	0.366
BC	0.020	0.061	-0.039**	0.003	0.019	0.032
somewhat religious	-0.033**	0.000	-0.004	0.509	0.037**	0.000
not religious	-0.029**	0.000	-0.033**	0.000	0.062**	0.000
volunteer	0.026**	0.000	0.034**	0.000	-0.060**	0.000
very good health	0.004	0.122	-0.001	0.809	-0.003	0.129
Good health	0.002	0.422	0.007	0.071	-0.004	0.071
Fair health	-0.006	0.163	0.004	0.448	0.002	0.545
Poor health	-0.013*	0.037	-0.007	0.392	0.020**	0.000
somewhat satisfied	-0.014**	0.002	0.007	0.194	0.007*	0.043

Table 6 (Continued)

somewhat dissatisfied	-0.032**	0.000	0.015	0.168	0.017*	0.022
very dissatisfied	-0.024	0.308	-0.010	0.725	0.034	0.066
Canadian-born 2000	-0.011	0.171	-0.011	0.325	0.022**	0.006
male 2000	0.001	0.841	0.0001	0.985	-0.002	0.730
single 2000	0.002	0.867	0.011	0.320	-0.012**	0.008
widow 2000	0.004	0.760	0.018	0.210	-0.023**	0.000
separated 2000	-0.011	0.330	0.018	0.138	-0.008	0.234
age2534 2000	-0.017	0.061	0.002	0.882	0.015	0.093
age3544 2000	-0.015	0.091	0.003	0.789	0.012	0.188
age4554 2000	-0.005	0.662	-0.003	0.838	0.007	0.419
age5564 2000	-0.020*	0.027	0.002	0.855	0.017	0.118
age64over 2000	-0.008	0.479	-0.028	0.082	0.035**	0.006
NFLD 2000	-0.011	0.465	0.023	0.178	-0.013	0.204
PEI 2000	-0.0002	0.992	0.017	0.448	-0.017	0.129
NS 2000	0.017	0.291	0.001	0.939	-0.018*	0.011
NB 2000	0.003	0.840	-0.008	0.671	0.004	0.667
QC 2000	0.008	0.495	-0.003	0.800	-0.005	0.392
AB 2000	0.006	0.687	0.012	0.432	-0.180*	0.020
MB 2000	0.041*	0.026	-0.027	0.161	-0.014	0.073
SK 2000	0.012	0.442	0.002	0.926	-0.013	0.102
BC 2000	0.020	0.245	-0.008	0.665	-0.012	0.140
somewhat religious 2000	0.005	0.547	0.007	0.458	-0.012**	0.005
not religious 2000	-0.020*	0.019	0.026**	0.009	-0.006	0.283
somewhat satisfied 2000	0.018*	0.031	-0.023*	0.017	0.005	0.387
somewhat dissatisfied 2000	0.092*	0.015	-0.091*	0.013	-0.001	0.501
very dissatisfied 2000	-0.017	0.664	0.026	0.520	-0.009	0.525
Canadian-born 2004	-0.007	0.329	0.011	0.251	0.003	0.569
male 2004	0.001	0.930	-0.008	0.311	0.007	0.146
single 2004	0.025*	0.015	-0.009	0.392	-0.016**	0.000
widow 2004	-0.011	0.300	0.019	0.143	-0.009	0.325
separated 2004	-0.005	0.607	0.016	0.161	-0.011	0.074
age2534 2004	-0.012	0.175	-0.0001	0.996	0.012	0.140
age3544 2004	-0.008	0.350	0.015	0.159	-0.007	0.302
age4554 2004	0.019	0.120	-0.004	0.754	-0.015*	0.017
age5564 2004	-0.002	0.819	0.016	0.178	-0.013*	0.043
age64over 2004	0.023	0.076	-0.004	0.777	-0.019**	0.001
NFLD 2004	-0.038**	0.000	0.039**	0.004	-0.001	0.923
PEI 2004	-0.023	0.057	0.034*	0.036	-0.011	0.330
NS 2004	-0.013	0.206	0.007	0.637	0.006	0.598
NB 2004	-0.024**	0.009	0.014	0.305	0.009	0.412
QC 2004	0.019	0.103	-0.026	0.055	0.006	0.392
AB 2004	-0.026**	0.001	-0.046*	0.029	0.072**	0.000
MB 2004	-0.0001	0.992	-0.021	0.213	0.020	0.115
SK 2004	-0.011	0.292	-0.063**	0.004	0.074**	0.000
BC 2004	-0.009	0.378	-0.030	0.067	0.039**	0.006
somewhat religious 2004	0.003	0.710	0.012	0.156	-0.015**	0.001

Table 6 (Continued)

not religious 2004	-0.012	0.102	0.011	0.251	0.002	0.756
somewhat satisfied 2004	0.008	0.250	-0.010	0.205	0.002	0.627
somewhat dissatisfied 2004	0.627*	0.046	-0.052	0.092	-0.011	0.166
very dissatisfied 2004	0.071	0.333	-0.067	0.348	-0.004	0.802
Canadian-born 2007	0.003	0.698	-0.009	0.352	0.006	0.348
male 2007	-0.001	0.862	0.002	0.818	-0.001	0.890
single 2007	0.024*	0.018	-0.004	0.736	-0.020**	0.000
widow 2007	0.018	0.205	0.007	0.644	-0.024**	0.000
separated 2007	-0.005	0.614	0.023*	0.030	-0.018**	0.000
age2534 2007	0.023	0.074	-0.040**	0.007	0.017	0.059
age3544 2007	0.015	0.159	-0.033*	0.015	0.018	0.055
age4554 2007	0.029*	0.028	-0.025	0.081	-0.004	0.632
age5564 2007	0.015	0.184	-0.011	0.412	-0.004	0.566
age64over 2007	0.013	0.260	-0.006	0.635	-0.007	0.368
NFLD 2007	-0.046**	0.000	0.053**	0.000	-0.007	0.487
PEI 2007	-0.019	0.109	0.294	0.064	-0.010	0.353
NS 2007	-0.018	0.051	0.014	0.322	0.004	0.690
NB 2007	-0.031**	0.000	0.048**	0.000	-0.017*	0.023
QC 2007	-0.017*	0.017	0.030*	0.001	-0.012*	0.018
AB 2007	0.001	0.948	-0.021	0.211	0.020	0.136
MB 2007	-0.005	0.620	0.007	0.645	-0.001	0.899
SK 2007	-0.016	0.097	-0.015	0.389	0.031*	0.040
BC 2007	-0.002	0.842	-0.010	0.478	0.012	0.245
somewhat religious 2007	-0.0003	0.963	-0.003	0.768	0.003	0.622
not religious 2007	-0.012	0.096	-0.005	0.608	0.017*	0.017
somewhat satisfied 2007	0.006	0.373	-0.008	0.284	0.003	0.594
somewhat dissatisfied 2007	0.033	0.201	-0.046	0.085	0.013	0.258
very dissatisfied 2007	-0.017	0.625	0.017	0.651	0.0001	0.993
Log likelihood = -28205.632						
Note: *p<.05. **p<.01						

Table 7

RPD's OLS results (reproduced from RPD, 2009, 429-431)
 (Dependent variables: Logarithm of total amount given (**log Tot.Amt.**); logarithm of amount given to both international and domestic organizations (**log Int'l Amt.**); and, the fraction of the total amount given to only international organizations. (**Amt Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated**))

	log Tot.Amt.	log Int'l Amt.	Fraction (amt. Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated)
	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
hhinc2040	0.385**	0.253**	-0.101
hhinc4060	0.593**	0.165**	-0.014
hhinc60100	0.934**	0.194**	-0.108
hhinc100over	1.370**	1.003**	-0.083
highschool	0.178**	0.719*	0.15*
posths	0.341**	0.152*	0.079*
postsecdip	0.321**	0.833*	0.056*
unidegree	0.708**	0.938*	0.079*
male	0.038	0.245	-0.011
Canadian-born	-0.074	0.127	0.011
age2534	0.404**	0.130	-0.149**
age3544	0.569**	0.396	-0.152**
age4554	0.675**	0.272	-0.242**
age5564	0.864**	0.425	-0.098**
age64over	1.111**	0.593	-0.105**
Single	0.078	-0.139	-0.033
widow	0.363**	0.282	-0.001
Separated	0.008	0.833**	0.169**
hhs2	-0.341**	0.065	0.051
hhs3	-0.395**	-0.146	0.036
hhs4	-0.399**	-0.338	0.054
hhs5over	-0.38**	-0.297	0.090
NFLD	-0.299**	-1.048*	0.034
PEI	0.196	-0.931*	-0.006
NS	-0.148*	-0.784*	-0.091
NB	-0.103	-0.638	-0.064
QC	-0.577**	-1.199**	-0.026
AB	0.033	-0.013	0.114
MB	0.204**	0.308	0.087
SK	-0.034	-0.676*	-0.012
BC	-0.023	0.022	0.013
Somewhat religious	-0.697**	-0.583**	0.017
Not religious	-1.028**	-0.847**	0.057
Volunteer	0.522**	0.003	-0.167**
Electoral participation	0.141*	0.160	-0.104
Pol. Dev. Week	-0.21**	-0.015	0.043
Pol.Dev.Month	-0.114**	-0.564	-0.073
Pol.Dev.Never	-0.154**	0.482	0.038
Fam. Soc. Week	-0.004*	0.064	-0.033
Fam. Soc. Month	-0.028*	0.479	0.021
Fam.Soc.Never	-0.395*	0.274	-0.094
Financial Insecurity	-0.107*	-0.333*	-0.022
VeryGoodHealth	0.046*	0.210	-0.006

Table 7 (Continued)

GoodHealth	-0.102*	-0.119	0.028
FairHealth	0.024*	0.207	-0.096
PoorHealth	-0.235*	-0.139	-0.010
LifeSomewhat Sat.	-0.074	-0.302	0.050
Life Somewhat.Dissat.	-0.170	0.726	0.308
LifeVeryDissat.	0.189	-0.082	0.053
Constant	2.940**	3.827**	2.864**

Note: * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 8

Pooled data OLS results

(Dependent variables: Logarithm of total amount given (**log Tot.Amt.**); logarithm of amount given to both international and domestic organizations (**log Int'l Amt.**); and, the fraction of the total amount given to only international organizations. (**Amt Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated**))

(Interactive year variables added to regression)

	log Tot. Amt. (No. of Obs: 49555)		log. Int'l Amt. (No. of Obs: 4518)		Fraction (amt. Donated to int'l org. / tot. amt. donated) (No. of Obs: 4518)	
	Coefficient	P> z	Coefficient	P> z	Coefficient	P> z
hhinc2040	0.406**	0.000	0.294**	0.002	-0.027	0.088
hhinc4060	0.654**	0.000	0.263**	0.007	-0.050**	0.003
hhinc60100	0.851**	0.000	0.443**	0.000	-0.056**	0.001
hhinc100over	1.298**	0.000	0.863**	0.000	-0.059**	0.002
highschool	0.265**	0.000	0.214*	0.028	0.002	0.907
post HS	0.360**	0.000	0.397**	0.001	0.018	0.344
postsec dip	0.391**	0.000	0.321**	0.000	0.009	0.533
unidegree	0.720**	0.000	0.423**	0.000	-0.026	0.081
male	0.042	0.082	0.040	0.703	0.006	0.755
Canadian-born	0.093**	0.009	-0.192	0.165	-0.049*	0.039
age2534	0.536**	0.000	0.320	0.085	-0.089**	0.005
age3544	0.858**	0.000	0.581**	0.001	-0.136**	0.000
age4554	1.063**	0.000	0.736**	0.000	-0.126**	0.000
age5564	1.206**	0.000	0.641**	0.001	-0.142**	0.000
age64over	1.505**	0.000	0.901**	0.000	-0.159**	0.000
single	-0.098**	0.006	0.096	0.530	0.003	0.902
widow	0.096*	0.054	-0.177	0.410	-0.014	0.700
separated	-0.084*	0.054	0.288	0.131	0.095**	0.003
hhs 2	-0.269**	0.000	-0.315**	0.000	-0.0002	0.989
hhs 3	-0.315**	0.000	-0.447**	0.000	-0.008	0.634
hhs 4	-0.394**	0.000	-0.625**	0.000	-0.026	0.152
hhs 5+	-0.314**	0.000	-0.373**	0.002	0.034	0.096
NFLD	-0.340**	0.000	-1.431**	0.000	-0.101*	0.016
PEI	-0.106	0.125	-0.448	0.134	-0.002	0.976
NS	-0.179**	0.000	-0.597**	0.004	-0.037	0.294
NB	-0.265**	0.000	-1.036**	0.000	-0.057	0.118
QC	-0.694**	0.000	-0.891**	0.000	0.009	0.742
MB	0.115*	0.017	-0.184	0.351	-0.048	0.149
SK	0.082	0.081	-0.250	0.225	-0.035	0.323
AB	0.188**	0.000	0.012	0.951	0.001	0.982
BC	0.019	0.716	0.007	0.974	-0.018	0.602

Table 8 (Continued)

somewhat religious	-0.889**	0.000	-0.762**	0.000	0.033	0.127
not religious	-1.107**	0.000	-0.588**	0.000	0.094**	0.001
volunteer	0.428**	0.000	0.096	0.116	-0.075**	0.000
very good	-0.003	0.868	-0.023	0.704	0.002	0.833
good	-0.026	0.133	-0.079	0.257	-0.009	0.443
fair	-0.051*	0.025	-0.074	0.446	-0.018	0.263
poor	-0.086*	0.018	-0.414	0.015	-0.068	0.019
somewhat satisfied	-0.176**	0.000	-0.060	0.274	0.020	0.283
somewhat dissatisfied	-0.295**	0.000	-0.115	0.726	0.008	0.888
very dissatisfied	-0.229	0.093	-1.930*	0.016	-0.163	0.229
Canadian-born 2000	-0.117*	0.023	0.302	0.145	0.047	0.178
male 2000	0.037	0.314	-0.004	0.979	-0.022	0.429
single 2000	0.082	0.105	-0.262	0.240	-0.074	0.051
widow 2000	0.155*	0.029	-0.088	0.771	-0.024	0.646
separated 2000	0.066	0.296	-0.021	0.941	-0.054	0.269
age2534 2000	0.004	0.954	0.069	0.803	-0.052	0.270
age3544 2000	-0.157**	0.007	-0.169	0.490	-0.006	0.885
age4554 2000	-0.195**	0.002	-0.286	0.265	-0.031	0.478
age5564 2000	-0.215**	0.001	-0.017	0.952	0.027	0.558
age64over 2000	-0.295**	0.000	0.091	0.735	0.041	0.371
NFLD 2000	0.027	0.761	-0.164	0.683	0.061	0.371
PEI 2000	0.239*	0.020	0.250	0.587	-0.004	0.956
NS 2000	0.062	0.384	-0.176	0.567	-0.021	0.690
NB 2000	0.121	0.112	0.512	0.133	0.026	0.653
QC 2000	0.022	0.688	-0.211	0.399	0.031	0.468
AB 2000	-0.016	0.830	-0.152	0.613	-0.023	0.656
MB 2000	0.133	0.063	0.312	0.263	0.096	0.069
SK 2000	-0.034	0.618	-0.155	0.607	-0.004	0.942
BC 2000	0.176*	0.034	0.457	0.148	0.021	0.697
somewhat religious 2000	0.115**	0.005	0.310	0.106	0.008	0.801
not religious 2000	0.143**	0.005	0.406	0.124	0.068	0.129
somewhat satisfied 2000	0.001	0.969	-0.164	0.319	-0.008	0.762
somewhat dissatisfied 2000	0.064	0.459	0.192	0.655	0.180*	0.013
very dissatisfied 2000	0.234	0.214	1.628	0.186	0.137	0.513
Canadian-born 2004	0.006	0.901	0.146	0.402	-0.014	0.646
male 2004	-0.021	0.523	0.005	0.970	-0.005	0.848
single 2004	0.134**	0.002	-0.121	0.513	-0.001	0.988
widow 2004	0.214**	0.001	0.199	0.478	0.004	0.826
separated 2004	0.064	0.252	-0.226	0.351	-0.075	0.068
age2534 2004	0.122*	0.028	0.284	0.227	0.040	0.317
age3544 2004	0.083	0.116	0.182	0.402	0.060	0.103
age4554 2004	0.111*	0.047	0.238	0.280	0.030	0.427

Table 8 (Continued)

age5564 2004	0.181**	0.002	0.496*	0.033	0.025	0.526
age64over 2004	0.150*	0.012	-0.078	0.736	-0.060	0.130
NFLD 2004	0.163*	0.028	0.710*	0.037	0.071	0.217
PEI 2004	0.003	0.969	0.235	0.545	-0.014	0.832
NS 2004	0.101	0.119	-0.037	0.894	-0.003	0.952
NB 2004	0.099	0.139	0.741*	0.013	0.068	0.181
QC 2004	0.052	0.311	0.212	0.348	0.036	0.329
AB 2004	-0.139*	0.035	0.131	0.632	0.016	0.732
MB 2004	-0.051	0.434	0.430	0.099	0.084	0.057
SK 2004	-0.171**	0.009	0.092	0.743	0.011	0.825
BC 2004	-0.016	0.816	0.273	0.277	0.083	0.052
somewhat religious 2004	0.033	0.387	0.311	0.071	0.026	0.376
not religious 2004	-0.026	0.556	0.014	0.946	0.002	0.948
somewhat satisfied 2004	0.015	0.659	0.041	0.775	0.021	0.403
somewhat dissatisfied 2004	-0.077	0.348	0.404	0.335	0.048	0.502
very dissatisfied 2004	-0.135	0.455	1.804	0.051	0.193	0.219
Canadian-born 2007	-0.019	0.668	0.148	0.380	0.037	0.189
male 2007	0.030	0.366	0.230	0.087	0.044	0.055
single 2007	0.098*	0.029	-0.004	0.980	0.041	0.176
widow 2007	0.179**	0.006	0.303	0.241	0.017	0.698
separated 2007	0.058	0.302	-0.264	0.256	-0.054	0.169
age2534 2007	0.182**	0.002	0.496*	0.028	0.047	0.217
age3544 2007	0.114*	0.037	0.245	0.239	0.020	0.580
age4554 2007	0.211**	0.000	0.254	0.235	-0.031	0.389
age5564 2007	0.141*	0.015	0.299	0.171	-0.040	0.278
age64over 2007	0.140*	0.019	-0.047	0.836	-0.054	0.165
NFLD 2007	-0.048	0.525	0.761*	0.023	0.116*	0.041
PEI 2007	-0.030	0.734	0.254	0.485	0.006	0.929
NS 2007	-0.057	0.387	0.506	0.059	0.086	0.058
NB 2007	0.002	0.982	0.620*	0.038	0.039	0.446
QC 2007	0.171**	0.001	0.337	0.104	-0.014	0.692
AB 2007	-0.085	0.204	0.402	0.101	0.018	0.674
MB 2007	-0.103	0.130	0.288	0.257	0.037	0.397
SK 2007	-0.200**	0.004	0.082	0.762	-0.008	0.859
BC 2007	0.103	0.122	0.268	0.262	0.054	0.183
somewhat religious 2007	-0.018	0.644	0.446**	0.007	0.078**	0.005
not religious 2007	-0.015	0.735	0.138	0.474	0.039	0.234
somewhat satisfied 2007	0.020	0.546	-0.080	0.560	-0.007	0.769
somewhat dissatisfied 2007	0.136	0.116	0.108	0.800	0.021	0.771
very dissatisfied 2007	-0.167	0.367	1.445	0.177	0.078	0.666
constant	3.523**	0.000	3.288**	0.000	0.489**	0.000

Table 8 (Continued)

	Adj R-squared = 0.3696	Adj R-squared = 0.2072	Adj R-squared = 0.1291
--	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Note: *p<.05. **p<.01

Table 9
 Bivariate probit regression marginal effects
 (Dependent variable: give to any charity (**giver**) and volunteer with any charity (**volunteer**)
 (No. of observations: 54881)

	y=Pr (giver=1, volunteer=1)		y=Pr (giver=1, volunteer=0)		y=Pr (giver=0, volunteer=1)		y=Pr (giver=0, volunteer=0)	
Predicted probability	0.604		0.299		0.033		0.064	
Reference Individual	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z
hhinc2040	0.055**	0.000	-0.013	0.219	-0.017**	0.000	-0.025**	0.000
hhinc4060	0.063**	0.000	-0.014	0.264	-0.021**	0.000	-0.029**	0.000
hhinc60100	0.073**	0.000	-0.011	0.448	-0.026**	0.000	-0.037**	0.000
hhinc100over	0.111**	0.000	-0.053**	0.008	-0.023**	0.000	-0.035**	0.000
highschool	0.090**	0.000	-0.070**	0.000	-0.004	0.068	-0.015**	0.000
posths	0.143**	0.000	-0.113**	0.000	-0.008**	0.002	-0.023**	0.000
postsecdip	0.136**	0.000	-0.098**	0.000	-0.010**	0.000	-0.028**	0.000
unidegree	0.245**	0.000	-0.196**	0.000	-0.012**	0.000	-0.037**	0.000
male	-0.049**	0.000	0.019**	0.000	0.011**	0.000	0.019**	0.000
Canadian-born	0.145**	0.000	-0.105**	0.000	-0.006	0.064	-0.034**	0.000
age2534	-0.045*	0.015	0.083**	0.000	-0.020**	0.000	-0.019**	0.000
age3444	0.032	0.068	0.017	0.311	-0.022**	0.000	-0.028**	0.000
age4554	0.032	0.095	0.013	0.489	-0.020**	0.000	-0.025**	0.000
age5564	0.034	0.097	0.014	0.469	-0.021**	0.000	-0.027**	0.000
age64over	-0.040	0.058	0.095**	0.000	-0.026**	0.000	-0.028**	0.000
single	-0.017	0.211	-0.485**	0.000	0.026**	0.000	0.032**	0.000
widow	-0.038*	0.030	-0.007	0.655	0.006**	0.000	0.026**	0.000
separated	-0.020	0.190	-0.032*	0.024	0.011**	0.000	0.026**	0.000
hhSize 2	-0.001	0.190	-0.012	0.099	0.006**	0.000	0.006**	0.001
hhSize 3	0.001	0.908	-0.022**	0.006	0.011**	0.000	0.010**	0.000
hhSize 4	0.623	0.928	-0.087**	0.000	0.018**	0.000	0.005*	0.027
hhSize 5	0.082**	0.000	-0.113**	0.000	0.026**	0.000	0.005	0.053
NFLD	-0.028	0.192	0.049	0.019	-0.011**	0.000	-0.010*	0.042
PEI	-0.077**	0.003	0.075**	0.003	-0.004	0.357	0.006	0.410
NS	0.035*	0.037	-0.022	0.164	-0.004	0.216	-0.009*	0.025
NB	-0.026	0.153	0.025	0.143	-0.002	0.678	0.002	0.672
QC	-0.141**	0.000	0.100**	0.000	0.007**	0.007	0.033**	0.000
MB	0.056**	0.001	-0.045**	0.005	-0.002	0.620	-0.009**	0.023
SK	0.116**	0.000	-0.099**	0.000	-0.002	0.687	-0.016**	0.000
AB	0.081**	0.000	-0.069**	0.000	-0.001	0.862	-0.011**	0.004
BC	0.052*	0.005	-0.070**	0.000	0.014**	0.008	0.004	0.442
somewhat religious	-0.183**	0.000	0.127**	0.000	0.011**	0.000	0.045**	0.000
not religious	-0.257**	0.000	0.165**	0.000	0.017**	0.000	0.075**	0.000
very good health	0.008	0.447	-0.002	0.847	-0.003	0.259	-0.004**	0.000

Table 9 (Continued)

good health	-0.011	0.379	0.018	0.118	-0.004	0.070	-0.003	0.177
fair health	-0.063**	0.000	0.059**	0.000	-0.002	0.413	0.007	0.323
poor health	-0.090**	0.001	0.070**	0.005	0.002	0.661	0.018	0.132
somewhat satisfied	-0.066**	0.000	0.051**	0.000	0.003*	0.013	0.012**	0.000
somewhat dissatisfied	-0.109**	0.000	0.077**	0.000	0.005*	0.022	0.026**	0.000
very dissatisfied	-0.144**	0.000	0.094**	0.000	0.009*	0.049	0.041**	0.000
hhinc2040 2000	0.001	0.998	-0.013	0.464	0.006	0.126	0.006	0.211
hhinc4060 2000	0.010	0.634	-0.020	0.300	0.006	0.221	0.004	0.452
hhinc60100 2000	0.031	0.158	-0.033	0.113	0.003	0.550	-0.002	0.785
hhinc100over 2000	-0.011	0.734	0.008	0.779	0.001	0.960	0.002	0.831
highschool 2000	0.013	0.496	0.007	0.726	-0.009**	0.002	-0.011**	0.003
posths 2000	0.002	0.936	0.001	0.979	-0.001	0.807	-0.001	0.805
postsecdip 2000	0.027	0.110	-0.011	0.491	-0.006*	0.034	-0.010**	0.006
unidegree 2000	-0.010	0.664	0.002	0.927	0.003	0.555	0.005	0.479
Canadian-born 2000	-0.039	0.064	0.014	0.479	0.009	0.072	0.016*	0.016
age2534 2000	-0.030	0.297	0.012	0.642	0.006	0.313	0.011	0.165
age3444 2000	-0.033	0.236	0.021	0.417	0.003	0.566	0.008	0.260
age4554 2000	0.011	0.708	-0.015	0.577	0.003	0.629	0.001	0.857
age5564 2000	0.015	0.621	-0.026	0.342	0.007	0.320	0.004	0.580
age64over 2000	0.020	0.506	-0.046	0.083	0.016	0.062	0.011	0.224
single 2000	0.005	0.795	0.012	0.538	-0.008**	0.007	-0.009*	0.019
widow 2000	0.002	0.947	0.021	0.385	-0.011**	0.001	-0.012*	0.010
separated 2000	0.029	0.185	-0.022	0.289	-0.002	0.699	-0.005	0.257
NFLD2000	0.061*	0.039	-0.044	0.112	-0.005	0.448	-0.012	0.060
PEI2000	0.146**	0.000	-0.118**	0.000	-0.007	0.262	-0.021**	0.000
NS2000	0.044	0.076	-0.020	0.410	-0.010*	0.016	-0.150**	0.002
NB2000	0.028	0.284	-0.032	0.189	0.004	0.510	-0.001	0.980
QC2000	0.086**	0.000	-0.075**	0.000	0.001	0.916	-0.011**	0.001
AB2000	0.054*	0.037	-0.032	0.201	-0.008	0.075	-0.014**	0.005
MB2000	0.075**	0.002	-0.053*	0.021	-0.007	0.135	-0.015**	0.001
SK2000	0.059*	0.014	-0.042	0.071	-0.005	0.248	-0.012*	0.013
BC2000	-0.002	0.935	0.017	0.544	-0.007	0.106	-0.008	0.216
somewhat religious 2000	0.196	0.173	-0.005	0.722	-0.006*	0.019	-0.009**	0.006
not religious 2000	0.005	0.776	0.003	0.873	-0.003	0.273	-0.004	0.286
very good health 2000	-0.025	0.155	0.004	0.814	0.008	0.062	0.012*	0.026
good health 2000	-0.016	0.381	0.009	0.588	0.002	0.611	0.005	0.384
fair health 2000	-0.021	0.354	0.015	0.480	0.001	0.788	0.005	0.475
poor health 2000	-0.060	0.101	0.031	0.366	0.009	0.292	0.020	0.090
hhinc2040 2004	0.2150	0.207	-0.019	0.250	-0.0002	0.999	-0.003	0.456
hhinc4060 2004	0.456*	0.014	-0.037*	0.036	-0.001	0.703	-0.007	0.074
hhinc60100 2004	0.063**	0.001	-0.055**	0.003	0.001	0.974	-0.008	0.066
hhinc100over 2004	0.060*	0.024	-0.046	0.066	-0.003	0.599	-0.010	0.084
highschool 2004	-0.011	0.563	0.023	0.199	-0.007*	0.029	-0.006	0.166
posths 2004	-0.010	0.675	0.025	0.297	-0.007*	0.048	-0.007	0.190

Table 9 (Continued)

postsec dip 2004	0.006	0.692	0.004	0.809	-0.005	0.128	-0.006	0.140
unidegree 2004	-0.014	0.518	0.023	0.263	-0.005	0.189	-0.004	0.475
Canadian-born 2004	-0.030	0.107	0.029	0.099	-0.002	0.646	0.002	0.619
age2534 2004	-0.078**	0.002	0.050*	0.039	0.007	0.215	0.021*	0.011
age3444 2004	-0.057*	0.027	0.055*	0.025	-0.003	0.476	0.005	0.469
age4554 2004	-0.089**	0.001	0.097**	0.000	-0.009*	0.017	0.001	0.865
age5564 2004	-0.071*	0.014	0.080**	0.004	-0.009*	0.032	-0.001	0.051
age64over 2004	-0.012	0.663	0.033	0.227	-0.010**	0.007	-0.010	0.068
single 2004	0.015	0.388	0.003	0.856	-0.008**	0.004	-0.010**	0.003
widow 2004	0.011	0.626	0.004	0.870	-0.007	0.114	-0.009	0.113
separated 2004	0.054**	0.005	-0.036*	0.048	-0.006	0.116	-0.012**	0.002
NFLD2004	-0.006	0.827	0.007	0.798	-0.001	0.907	0.0001	0.993
PEI2004	0.053	0.078	-0.039	0.178	-0.004	0.542	-0.011	0.134
NS2004	-0.044	0.082	0.339	0.160	0.001	0.803	0.008	0.314
NB2004	-0.035	0.166	0.023	0.336	0.003	0.614	0.009	0.286
QC2004	0.004	0.843	-0.009	0.599	0.030	0.494	0.002	0.640
AB2004	-0.118**	0.000	0.025	0.324	0.033**	0.002	0.061**	0.000
MB2004	-0.013	0.612	-0.014	0.532	0.013	0.099	0.014	0.106
SK2004	-0.085**	0.001	-0.002	0.918	0.036**	0.001	0.052**	0.000
BC2004	-0.073**	0.004	0.021	0.371	0.019*	0.017	0.033**	0.001
somewhat religious 2004	0.030*	0.029	-0.012	0.362	-0.007**	0.006	-0.011**	0.000
not religious 2004	0.013	0.379	-0.014	0.316	0.001	0.664	-0.0004	0.905
very good health 2004	-0.026	0.109	0.028	0.067	-0.003	0.380	0.001	0.886
good health 2004	-0.027	0.056	0.021	0.183	0.001	0.831	0.005	0.321
fair health 2004	-0.042**	0.000	0.041	0.054	-0.002	0.589	0.004	0.560
poor health 2004	-0.130*	0.029	0.127**	0.000	-0.007	0.126	0.010	0.338
hhinc2040 2007	0.030	0.088	-0.027	0.105	0.001	0.892	-0.004	0.361
hhinc4060 2007	0.056**	0.003	-0.044*	0.015	-0.002	0.521	-0.010**	0.018
hhinc60100 2007	0.075**	0.000	-0.066**	0.000	0.001	0.919	-0.010*	0.031
hhinc100over 2007	0.086**	0.001	-0.065**	0.008	-0.006	0.226	-0.016**	0.002
highschool 2007	-0.012	0.530	0.022	0.246	-0.005	0.096	-0.004	0.347
posths 2007	-0.021	0.417	0.031	0.214	-0.006	0.144	-0.004	0.510
postsec dip 2007	0.024	0.147	-0.007	0.667	-0.007*	0.013	-0.010**	0.003
unidegree 2007	-0.021	0.332	0.036	0.090	-0.008*	0.024	-0.006	0.214
Canadian-born 2007	0.005	0.775	-0.007	0.693	0.001	0.769	0.0004	0.931
age2534 2007	-0.139**	0.000	0.106**	0.000	0.003	0.547	0.030**	0.003
age3444 2007	-0.114**	0.000	0.090**	0.001	0.002	0.743	0.022*	0.016
age4554 2007	-0.113**	0.000	0.115**	0.000	-0.008*	0.041	0.006	0.405
age5564 2007	-0.141**	0.000	0.146**	0.000	-0.011**	0.003	0.005	0.491
age64over 2007	-0.049**	0.000	0.065*	0.024	-0.010**	0.008	-0.006	0.337
single 2007	-0.024	0.191	0.053**	0.003	-0.014**	0.000	-0.143**	0.000
widow 2007	0.003	0.911	0.029	0.206	-0.015**	0.000	-0.175**	0.000
separated 2007	0.019	0.355	0.006	0.769	-0.011**	0.000	-0.014**	0.000
NFLD2007	0.018	0.510	-0.007	0.783	-0.004	0.460	-0.007	0.331

Table 9 (Continued)

PE12007	0.102**	0.000	-0.083**	0.002	-0.004	0.579	-0.015**	0.007
NS2007	0.037	0.127	-0.034	0.137	0.001	0.861	-0.004	0.510
NB2007	0.029	0.250	-0.005	0.842	-0.010**	0.009	-0.014**	0.004
QC2007	0.063**	0.000	-0.042**	0.009	-0.007*	0.019	-0.014**	0.000
AB2007	-0.073**	0.006	0.050	0.051	0.005	0.432	0.018	0.060
MB2007	0.023	0.352	-0.016	0.509	-0.002	0.677	-0.005	0.391
SK2007	-0.034	0.199	0.001	0.970	0.014	0.082	0.019*	0.043
BC2007	-0.018	0.476	0.007	0.756	0.004	0.497	0.007	0.353
somewhat religious 2007	0.022	0.127	-0.020	0.140	0.001	0.861	-0.002	0.516
not religious 2007	-0.038*	0.014	0.021	0.155	0.005	0.141	0.012*	0.016
very good health 2007	-0.014	0.391	0.014	0.344	-0.001	0.699	0.001	0.888
good health 2007	-0.025	0.147	0.020	0.210	0.001	0.922	0.004	0.405
fair health 2007	-0.015	0.484	0.011	0.582	0.001	0.866	0.003	0.610
poor health 2007	-0.079*	0.025	0.061	0.070	0.002	0.755	0.016	0.153
y2000	-0.105*	0.010	0.099*	0.011	-0.005	0.508	0.011	0.342
y2004	0.064	0.063	-0.068*	0.034	0.007	0.378	-0.003	0.753
y2007	0.038	0.283	-0.074*	0.024	0.022*	0.023	0.013	0.179
Log likelihood = -45503.782								
Likelihood-ratio test of rho=0: chi(2)=900.504, Prob>chi2=0.000								
Rho: coefficient: 0.3146, standard error: 0.0099								

Table 10
 Bivariate probit regression marginal effect and p-value (Dependent variables: give to both international and domestic organizations (**intldonor**) and volunteer to both international and domestic organizations (**intlvol**))
 (No. of observations: 32681)

	y=Pr (intldonor=1, intlvol=1)		y=Pr (intldonor=1, intlvol=0)		y=Pr (intldonor=0, intlvol=1)		y=Pr (intldonor=0, intlvol=0)	
Predicted probability Reference Individual	0.005		0.090		0.010		0.894	
	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z
hhinc2040	0.001	0.522	0.011	0.052	0.0003	0.886	-0.011	0.060
hhinc4060	0.0001	0.819	0.270 **	0.000	-0.002	0.101	-0.025 **	0.000
hhinc60100	0.001	0.242	0.030**	0.000	-0.001	0.378	-0.029**	0.000
hhinc100over	0.001**	0.007	0.043**	0.000	-0.001	0.969	-0.043**	0.000
highschool	-0.0004	0.056	0.007	0.661	-0.001 *	0.028	-0.006	0.805
post HS	0.002	0.057	0.027*	0.012	0.003	0.301	-0.032**	0.004
postsec dip	0.001	0.491	0.030**	0.000	-0.001**	0.006	-0.029**	0.000
unidegree	0.006**	0.000	0.079**	0.000	0.005*	0.040	-0.091**	0.000
male	-0.001**	0.001	-0.017**	0.000	-0.002*	0.045	0.020**	0.000
Canadian-born	-0.003**	0.000	-0.025**	0.000	-0.005**	0.000	0.033**	0.000
age2534	-0.002**	0.000	-0.024	0.580	-0.003**	0.000	0.029	0.105
age3544	0.003**	0.000	-0.022	0.961	-0.006**	0.000	0.030	0.060
age4554	-0.001	0.080	-0.001**	0.004	-0.002**	0.001	0.005*	0.044
age5564	-0.001	0.288	0.016**	0.000	-0.003**	0.000	-0.013**	0.000
age64over	-0.001	0.064	0.020**	0.000	-0.003**	0.000	-0.016**	0.001
single	0.0020**	0.000	0.010	0.095	0.004**	0.000	-0.016	0.468
widow	-0.0002	0.515	0.002*	0.046	-0.001	0.973	-0.001**	0.051
separated	0.001*	0.030	-0.007*	0.012	0.004**	0.003	0.001	0.377
hhSize 2	0.0002	0.077	0.011	0.091	0.001	0.258	0.010*	0.037
hhSize 3	0.0003	0.073	-0.009**	0.000	0.002	0.697	0.007**	0.000
hhSize 4	-0.0003**	0.000	-0.005**	0.004	-0.0004**	0.002	0.005**	0.000
hhSize 5+	0.001	0.116	-0.0002	0.260	0.001	0.254	-0.001	0.129
NFLD	-0.002**	0.000	0.038	0.782	-0.005**	0.000	-0.030	0.616
PEI	-0.001	0.084	-0.007	0.198	-0.001	0.235	0.009	0.103
NS	-0.002**	0.000	0.015	0.617	-0.004**	0.000	-0.009	0.160
NB	-0.0003*	0.021	0.003	0.235	-0.001	0.058	-0.001	0.085
QC	0.006	0.142	0.006**	0.002	0.014**	0.011	-0.026	0.066
MB	0.003	0.877	0.007	0.404	0.006	0.872	-0.015	0.448
SK	0.001	0.176	-0.001	0.063	0.003	0.543	-0.003*	0.041
AB	-0.0003 *	0.025	0.020	0.772	-0.002**	0.011	-0.018	0.718
BC	0.002	0.855	0.026	0.295	0.001	0.547	-0.029	0.392
somewhat religious	-0.002**	0.000	-0.045**	0.000	-0.0003	0.204	0.049**	0.000
not religious	-0.002**	0.000	-0.052**	0.000	-0.001	0.701	0.055**	0.000
very good health	-0.0001	0.112	0.006	0.701	-0.001	0.074	-0.005	0.770

Table 10 (Continued)

Good health	-0.0001	0.194	-0.004*	0.024	0.0002	0.676	0.004*	0.018
Fair health	-0.001**	0.000	-0.013**	0.000	-0.002	0.056	0.016**	0.000
Poor health	-0.001	0.165	-0.016*	0.005	0.0001	0.836	0.016**	0.005
somewhat satisfied	-0.0004	0.977	-0.008	0.560	-0.0003	0.996	0.008**	0.000
somewhat dissatisfied	-0.001	0.975	-0.008	0.694	-0.002	0.979	0.012	0.703
very dissatisfied	-0.004**	0.000	-0.015	0.043	-0.007**	0.000	0.026**	0.003
NFLD 2000	-0.001	0.913	-0.007	0.415	-0.001	0.809	0.008	0.610
PEI 2000	0.001	0.732	0.006	0.825	0.001	0.698	-0.008	0.998
NS 2000	0.001	0.700	0.018	0.729	-0.0002	0.766	-0.019	0.616
NB 2000	-0.0004	0.994	0.021	0.743	-0.002	0.944	-0.019	0.868
QC 2000	-0.003**	0.000	0.016	0.611	-0.006**	0.000	-0.008	0.882
AB 2000	-0.0004	0.964	0.023	0.820	-0.002	0.915	-0.011	0.868
MB 2000	-0.001	0.787	0.017*	0.035	-0.005	0.177	-0.056	0.063
SK 2000	-0.001	0.816	-0.060	0.716	-0.003	0.699	-0.019	0.810
BC 2000	0.002	0.280	0.020	0.777	0.003	0.328	-0.025	0.426
NFLD 2004	-0.002	0.489	-0.060**	0.000	-0.001	0.847	0.063**	0.002
PEI 2004	-0.002	0.256	-0.024	0.755	-0.004	0.286	0.030	0.550
NS 2004	-0.001	0.636	-0.020	0.787	-0.002	0.688	0.023	0.653
NB 2004	-0.001	0.841	-0.027	0.247	-0.0004	0.878	0.029	0.302
QC 2004	-0.002	0.145	0.025**	0.002	-0.005**	0.000	-0.018**	0.008
AB 2004	-0.001	0.844	-0.029	0.234	-0.001	0.590	0.032	0.291
MB 2004	0.0003	0.435	0.008	0.242	0.0001	0.699	-0.009	0.196
SK 2004	-0.002	0.297	-0.009	0.618	-0.004	0.174	0.014	0.871
BC 2004	-0.0004	0.834	-0.008	0.804	-0.001	0.898	0.008	0.770
NFLD 2007	-0.002	0.371	-0.067**	0.001	0.005	0.285	0.064	0.728
PEI 2007	-0.001	0.336	-0.020	0.351	-0.002	0.470	0.022	0.192
NS 2007	-0.001	0.158	-0.029	0.611	-0.0001	0.227	0.030	0.146
NB 2007	-0.003	0.947	-0.031	0.683	-0.005	0.951	0.039	0.707
QC 2007	-0.003	0.165	-0.022	0.070	-0.005	0.496	0.029*	0.045
AB 2007	0.0002*	0.036	-0.005*	0.027	0.001	0.111	0.004**	0.001
MB 2007	-0.001	0.051	-0.002*	0.029	-0.002	0.170	0.006**	0.006
SK 2007	-0.002	0.172	-0.025	0.271	-0.003	0.296	0.030	0.121
BC 2007	-0.0004*	0.039	-0.001*	0.020	-0.001	0.133	0.003**	0.002
y2000	0.0004	0.498	-0.018	0.544	0.003	0.359	0.015	0.797
y2004	0.001	0.405	0.004	0.130	0.001	0.159	-0.006	0.334
y2007	0.006**	0.000	0.030**	0.000	0.010**	0.000	-0.046**	0.000
Log likelihood = -12886.757								
Likelihood-ratio test of rho=0: chi(2)=182.957, Prob>chi2=0.000								
Rho: coefficient: 0.3396, standard error: 0.0236								

References

- Andreoni, J., and J.K. Scholz, 1998. *An econometric analysis of charitable giving with interdependent preferences*. *Economic Inquiry* XXXVI, 410-428.
- Andreoni, J., E. Brown, and S. Rischall, 2003. *Charitable giving by married couples: who decides and why does it matter?* *The Journal of Human Resources* 38 (1), 111-133.
- Apinunmahakul, A., R.A. Devlin, 2008. *Social networks and private philanthropy*. *Journal of Public Economics* 92, 309-328.
- Apinunmahakul, A., V. Barham, and R.A. Devlin, 2009. *Charitable giving, volunteering, and the paid labor market*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(1), 77-94.
- Bekkers, R., and P. Wiepking, 2011. *A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(5), 924-973.
- Brown, E., 2005. *College, social capital, and charitable giving*. In: Brooks, Arther (Ed.), *Gifts of Time and Money in America's Communities*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, pp. 185-205.
- Brown, E., and J.M. Ferris, 2007. *Social capital and philanthropy: an analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36(1), 85-99.
- Brown, E., and H. Lankford, 1992. *Gifts of money and gifts of time*. *Journal of Public Economics* 47, 321-341.
- Brown, P., and J.H. Minty, 2008. *Media coverage and charitable giving after the 2004 tsunami*. *Southern Economic Journal* 75(1), 9-25.
- Cappellari, L., P. Ghinetti, and G. Turati, 2011. *On time and money donations*. *The Journal of*

- Social-Economics 40, 853-867.
- Carroll, J., S. McCarthy, and C. Newman, 2005. *An econometric analysis of charitable donations in the republic of Ireland*. *The Economic and Social Review* 36(3), 229-249.
- Duncan, B., 1999. *Modeling charitable contributions of time and money*. *Journal of Public Economics* 72, 213—242.
- Eckel, C., P. Grossman, and A. Milano, 2007. *Is more information always better? An experimental study of charitable giving and hurricane Katrina*. *Southern Economic Journal* 74(2), 388-411.
- Freeman, R.B., 1997. *Working for notion: the supply of volunteer labor*. *Journal of Labor Economics* 15(1), S140-S166.
- Gittell, R., and E. Tebaldi, 2006. *Charitable giving: factors influencing giving in U.S. States*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35(4), 721-736.
- Greene, W.H., 2007. *Econometric Analysis, Sixth edition*. Prentice Hall Publisher, New Jersey.
- Jackson, E.F., M.D. Bachmeier, J.R. Wood, and E.A. Craft, 1995. *Volunteering and charitable giving: do religious and associational ties promote helping behaviour?* *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 24(1), 59-78.
- Kitchen, H., and R. Dalton, 1990. *Determinants of charitable donations by families in Canada: a regional analysis*. *Applied Economics* 22, 285-299.
- Marcuello, C., and V. Salas, 2000. *Money and time donations to Spanish non governmental organizations for development aid*. *Investigaciones Economicas* XXIV(1), 51-73.
- Mesch, D.J., P.M. Ronney, W. Chin, and K.S. Steinberg, 2002. *Race and gender differences in philanthropy: Indiana as a test case*. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* 37, 65-77.
- Mitrut, A., K. Nordblom, 2010. *Social norms and gift behaviour: theory and evidence from*

- Romania. *European Economic Review* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.euroecorev.2010.03.002.
- Rajan, S.S., G.H. Pink, and W.H. Dow, 2009. *Sociodemographic and personality characteristics of Canadian donor contributing to international charity*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(3), 413-440.
- Ribar, D.C., and M.O. Wilhelm, 1995. *Charitable contributions to international relief and development*. *National Tax Journal* 48(2), 229-44.
- Ronney, P.M., D.J. Mesch, W. Chin, and K.S. Steinberg, 2005. *The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the US*. *Economics Letters* 86, 173-180.
- Vaillancourt, F., and M. Payette, 1986. *The supply of volunteer work: the case of Canada*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 15 (4), 45-56.
- Wilson, J., and M. Musick, 1997. *Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work*. *American Sociological Review* 62(5), 694-713.
- Yen, S., 2002. *An econometric analysis of household donations in the USA*. *Applied Economics Letters* 9, 837-841.