

**Making Philanthropy Work:
Social Capital and Human Capital as Predictors of Household Giving**

**Eleanor Brown
Department of Economics
Pomona College
425 N. College Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711
ebrown@pomona.edu**

December 2001

This draft has been prepared for presentation at the ASSA meetings, Atlanta, January 4-6, 2002. Comments welcomed.

I. *Introduction.*

Studies based on survey data suggest that charitable giving increases with education. Controlling for income, education has a positive effect on giving in studies using the Consumer Expenditure Survey (Bradley, Holden, and McClelland 1999, Brooks 2001, Reece and Zieschang 1985), and the Giving and Volunteering data collected by Independent Sector (Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall 2001,). In this paper, I review some possible reasons for this observed positive association, and go on to test whether some of the effect attributed to education is due to correlated and typically omitted social capital variables. The results show that including measures of social capital reduces but does not eliminate the effect college on levels of charitable giving.

There are several hypotheses that suggest themselves as potential explanations for the observed positive effect of education on charitable giving, controlling for income:

1. *Education shapes tastes, conveys charity-enhancing information, and moves individuals upwards in a social hierarchy that includes philanthropy-related obligations.* By enhancing the individual's understanding of and status in the world, education engages persons in a larger world, and that engagement brings a willingness to undertake actions for the collective good, including personal philanthropy.
2. *Education is correlated with the price of giving.* Surveys do not typically have good data on households' marginal tax rates and itemization status. Itemizers have lower tax prices of giving, and education may pick up a price effect.

3. *Education reduces income risk.* Education is general human capital, much of it flexible in its application to the workplace. Reduced income risk increases charitable giving by reducing a need for precautionary saving.
4. *Education is correlated with wealth.* Wealth is typically not measured in data sets that include education. It may be that education is positively correlated with wealth, and individuals have a positive propensity to give from wealth. The omitted variable leads to a positive education effect.
5. *Education is correlated with social capital.* Persons who find it optimal to invest in education also find it advantageous to invest in social capital, and personal giving increases with social embeddedness.

The first of these effects is a pure education effect on giving: something about education makes people more generous. Education can involve investment in learning to get consumption value from “the finer things in life,” such as symphonic music and museum-quality art, many of which are provided by philanthropy-supported institutions. It may convey information about situations to which individuals may wish to donate some of their resources. It may confer on them social and economic status that enhances a “warm glow” from giving because giving is expected of persons with privileged status.

The other effects are specification problems that might attribute to education the effects of omitted variables. Tax prices can be estimated in survey data from information on home ownership, state of residence, marital status, numbers of adults over 65 and children, and household income. Where this has been done (see for example Andreoni et al), education remains significant. The third and fourth effects deal with unmeasured dimensions of permanent

income. Bradley et al use current consumption to proxy for permanent income, and still find strong education effects, suggesting that education's relationship to lifetime income does not fully explain education's effect on giving.

The fifth possibility forms the subject of this paper. Using data from the Social Capital Community Benchmark survey, I compare the estimated effect of education on levels of giving with and without controls for levels of social capital. Section II contains a description of the data. In section III, the effect of education on personal giving is estimated, using typically available demographic controls. I then examine the relationship between giving and social capital; this work is presented in section IV. In section V, the effects of education on giving are re-estimated, controlling for social capital. Concluding remarks are in section VI.

II. *The Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey*¹

The Social Capital Community Benchmark (SCCB) survey is the result of a partnership among Robert Putnam of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, the Ford Foundation, and 33 community foundations across the United States.² The survey was specifically designed to measure the levels of various kinds of social capital within a community. The measures of social capital are constructed based on the patterns of individual attitudes, behavior and activities in a community as revealed in the survey.

The interviews elicited information on individual characteristics (education, age, income, length of time in residence in the community), a variety of behaviors and activities (giving, volunteering, church attendance, voting and other forms of political participation), attitudes, and

¹ This section of the paper draws heavily from Brown and Ferris, "Social Capital in Los Angeles: Findings from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey," working paper, July 2001.

² Additional details on the Social Capital Community Benchmark survey are available at: www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey.

perceptions about the local community. This questionnaire was designed to make possible the creation of several indicators of social capital, including social trust, associational involvement, faith-based engagement, diversity of friendships, and political participation.

The survey, conducted by phone interview, includes a representative national sample of 3003 individuals and more than 26,000 individuals from 40 communities around the country. The list of participating communities can be found in Appendix One. Participation was determined largely by the availability of funding. Although the full SCCB is not designed to be representative of the country, it covers a wide variety of communities. It includes such large cities as Los Angeles and Chicago, smaller cities such as Yakima and Kalamazoo, and rural areas in South Dakota and eastern Tennessee. Interviews were conducted in English or, at the respondent's request, in Spanish. There is no guarantee that the results based on this sample are nationally representative.

Like many surveys, the SCCB survey is richer in demographic data than it is in economic data. Educational attainment is measured in seven categories, from less than a high school diploma or GED to a professional or graduate degree. There are data on marital status, age of respondent, and numbers of children and adults in the household. There is no wage information, although the survey asks employment status and, for those employed, average weekly hours of work. Household income is recorded in six ranges, from "\$20,000 or less" to "\$100,000 or more." There is no information on tax itemization status, although homeownership is queried.

The questions on charitable giving ask about household contributions of "money, property or other assets" for charitable purposes in the past twelve months. Respondents were queried separately about their giving to "all religious causes, including your local religious

congregation,” and “to all non-religious charities, organizations, or causes.” Responses were coded in six categories ranging from “none” to “more than \$5,000.”

Before discussing the social capital variables included in the survey, I use the demographic data frequently available in surveys to estimate the effect of education on the level of personal giving.

III. *Educational attainment and levels of personal giving*

Table One shows tobit regressions for three measures of personal giving as a function of typically available variables. The dependent variable in columns 1-3 is annual household total giving, religious giving, and non-religious giving, respectively. The income variable is annual household income. Education is entered in the form of two nonoverlapping dummy variables, one for having some education beyond high school, and one for having at least a four-year college degree. Church attendance is measured in days per year. Age is measured in years, and marital status is a dummy variable equal to one if the respondent is married.

As has been found in other data, education has a substantial and statistically significant effect on giving. Giving to nonreligious causes increases by \$198 if the respondent has attended some college, and by \$411 if the respondent has completed at least a four-year college degree. Education also has a positive effect on giving to religious causes, but there is little difference between the effects of some college (\$182) and a college degree (\$214).³ When the two kinds of giving are combined and treated as a total giving variable, the effect of a college degree is again much stronger than college attendance, but both are important: a degree increases giving by \$671, and some college by \$361. Other variables in the estimating equations are generally

³ One hypothesis explaining the relationship between giving and college is that persons who have attended college respond to fundraising solicitations from their alma mater. The substantial positive effect of college education on giving to religious causes suggests that this is not a complete explanation of the link between college and giving.

significant. Religious attendance has a large impact on religious and total giving, but little impact on giving to nonreligious causes.

While the disparate impact of education on secular as opposed to religious giving suggests that something other than tax price and mismeasured income effects are being picked up by the education variable, one must wonder to what extent omitted factors are correlated with educational attainment. Perhaps people who are inclined to engage the world are the same people who want to go to college? If so, including other measures of secular engagement should reduce the estimated impact of education on charitable giving. With this possibility in mind, I turn to the social capital measures available in the SCCB survey.

IV. Social Capital and Personal Giving

Putnam (2000) argues that the relationship between social capital and personal philanthropy is a causal one. As he puts it, “[S]ocial networks provide the channels through which we recruit one another for good deeds, and social networks foster norms of reciprocity that encourage attention to others’ welfare. Thus, ... volunteering and philanthropy and even spontaneous ‘helping’ are all strongly predicted by civic engagement.” (p. 117) Independent Sector’s 1996 Giving and Volunteering survey included questions on group membership and on voting behavior, and IS reports (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996) that each variable is highly correlated with the likelihood that a household makes a charitable contribution. Putnam presents similar evidence of correlation between measures of engagement and measures of philanthropy. If education and social engagement are alternative routes to a sense of obligation to others, and if levels of human capital and social capital acquisition are positively correlated, then there is good reason to hypothesize that omitting social capital variables from giving equations will lead to overestimates of the effects of education on giving.

What do we expect to be the observed relationships between social capital and education? Glaeser, Laibson and Sacerdote (2000) develop a rational-choice model of social capital acquisition, and find evidence that people who invest in human capital also invest in social capital. In particular, membership in groups is positively associated with educational attainment, with the exception of a negative relationship between labor union membership and education. Putnam and Helliwell (1999) find that higher average levels of education in a community are associated with higher average levels of social trust. While Putnam and Helliwell argue causality from education to trust (“increases in average education levels improve trust and do not reduce participation levels”), Goldin and Katz (1999) find social capital to be an important explanatory variable in charting the spread of universal secondary schooling in the US.

The arguments in Glaeser et al suggest that the underlying factors that encourage more schooling also encourage greater investment in human capital. One technique whose results can be interpreted in terms of underlying latent variables is factor analysis. Before turning to regressions that re-estimate the effect of education on giving, controlling for measures of social capital, I describe one way of organizing measures of social capital into indexes, and use factor analysis to shed some light on the relationships among the various dimensions of social capital, education, and giving.

In the SCCB data, responses to clusters of questions are formulated as indexes of social capital. For example, the answers to six questions about trusting people in various contexts are combined to form a Social Trust index. Theoretical understanding of social capital informed the work of Putnam’s team as they created these indexes. Preliminary index formulations were then tested against the data to see whether the constituent questions elicited answers that showed high

levels of correlation. If the items did not seem to form a well-defined index, the preliminary index was replaced by a reformulation that made theoretical sense and better fit the data.

Three of the originally proposed indexes were reconfigured in this process. An index of civic participation was reconceptualized as two indexes, one measuring activist (“protest”) political involvement and the other electoral participation. Indexes on faith-based social capital and community leadership were also reworked. In the end, the Harvard team computed ten indexes they felt were the most meaningful indicators of various aspects of social capital. The indexes measure: social trust; interracial trust; electoral politics; protest politics; civic leadership; associational involvement; informal socializing; diversity of friendships; giving and volunteering; and faith-based engagement. In the work presented here, I exclude the giving and volunteering to avoid redundancy and I otherwise adopt the Harvard team’s preferred indexes, with one exception. The redefined index for faith-based engagement contains information on religion-focused giving, making it redundant with the measures of giving used in this study, whereas the alternative version does not.

The indexes are described in Appendix One. Most of them are constructed from information on current behaviors, and most of these—protest politics, civic leadership, associational involvement, informal socializing, diversity of friendships, and faith-based social capital—capture ways in which a person can be engaged in networks. The index measuring involvement in electoral politics is based on a mix of attitudinal and behavioral questions. The behaviors are not ones that engage the individual with others; they are whether the individual has registered to vote, voted in the most recent presidential election, and how frequently he or she reads a newspaper. It does not so much capture embeddedness in networks of social capital as it

serves as a diagnostic tool, measuring an outcome (informed participation in the democratic process) believed to result from networks of social capital.

The two indexes that measure trust are similarly outcome-oriented; trust, like voting, is held to be a result of engagement. Although one can imagine indexes of trust that are behavior-based, the measures in the SCCB are attitudinal. The survey asks, for example, how much a respondent trusts “people who work in the stores where you shop,” rather than a question about whether a lack of trust in some shopkeepers causes the respondent to shop less or to shop at a greater remove from home.

How, then, do these measures of social capital and its outcomes relate to each other, and to giving and education (measured here, for statistical reasons, as years of schooling)? Factor analysis is a technique that picks up association among variables without assuming that the relationships among them are causal. The idea is that there are underlying unobservable variables that explain the set of measured variables. For example, if racial trust, social trust, and electoral participation are all results of a certain unmeasured stock of social capital, they should appear in a factor analysis as all strongly related to the same component.

In the first factor analysis, I use total annual household contributions as the giving variable. Extracting five factors and allowing rotation shows some intelligible patterns among the social capital, education, and giving variables. The first component can be interpreted as engagement in the public sphere: it is dominated by number of formal group involvements, protest politics, and organizational activism. The second component is about trust: it is dominated by the racial trust and social trust indexes, and has a significant presence of the electoral politics variable, suggesting that trust and democratic participation both emerge from social capital, as argued by Putnam in his early work on social capital and civic participation in

Italy (Putnam 1993). The third component can be construed as religion-inspired activity; it is dominated by faith-based social capital and by total giving. Electoral politics and education dominate the fourth component, which we might think of as “intellectual engagement.” This is the other factor to which total giving is substantially related. The fifth component is about gregariousness in the private sphere: its greatest presences are informal socializing and diversity of friendships.

What does the factor analysis suggest about the interplay among dimensions of social capital, education, and giving? First, while average education levels may lead to a trustworthier environment and thereby foster trust, education and trust are not fostered by the same underlying forces. Education and trust do, however, seem to offer alternative routes to involvement in electoral politics (educated people read newspapers, trusting people believe in the value of voting). Second, neither public engagement nor personal gregariousness springs from the same forces as educational attainment or giving. Giving is associated with the factors underlying religious involvement and those underlying educational attainment.

The results are not very different when religious giving is substituted for total giving; religious giving is more closely aligned with faith-based activity and less closely with education, but these continue to be the components along which giving lies. Non-religious giving, however, yields somewhat different results. Looking at a four-factor extraction (the fifth eigenvalue is only .822), the second factor continues to be dominated by the trust variables, with a presence from electoral politics, and the last factor (now the fourth) is still dominated by informal socializing and diversity of friendships. The first factor continues to be dominated by formal group involvements, organizational activism, and protest politics; what is new is the presence of faith-based social capital along this factor. Giving loads most heavily along the third “intellectual

engagement” factor, as before. What is different is the presence of non-religious giving along the first factor, and the presence of the three public-engagement variables along the third factor. In short, the clearest result from a factor analysis including non-religious giving is that it is not explained by the factors underlying trust or informal socializing, and is most closely related to the factor that also looms largest in explaining educational attainment and participation in electoral politics.

Do we expect, then, that including social capital variables in regressions to explain levels of giving will change the contribution attributed to education? If political involvement were an important motivator for donations, one might expect the close relationship between education and electoral politics to cause some of the effect ordinarily attributed to education to shift to the electoral politics variable. The voluntary devotion of time to participation in the electoral process is a commitment to collective action, just as the voluntary transfer of monetary resources to charitable purposes reflects a commitment to social concerns beyond the giver’s immediate and narrowly construed self-interest. It is plausible that college education and the measures contained in the electoral politics index—reading newspapers, knowing the names of one’s senators—are highly correlated. The correlation between the electoral politics index and having any college education (degreed or not) is .31. Whether college “causes” electoral participation, or whether persons inclined to engage the world choose college and collective action, there is reason to expect that including electoral politics will reduce the direct impact of education on levels of charitable giving.

V. Estimating giving equations with demographic and social capital variables

The giving equations are re-estimated, with both demographic and social capital variables included as regressors. The results are reported in Table 2.

With a few exceptions, the social capital indexes have positive and statistically significant effects on charitable giving. The only significant and negative effect is estimated for the racial trust index. It is insignificant in the religious giving and total giving equations, and is significantly negative in the secular giving equation. Racial trust is an index constructed on avowed attitudes rather than reported behaviors; this result is hard for behavioral scientists to interpret, saying only that persons who say they trust members of other races give less money to nonreligious causes. One possibility is that religious persons voice acceptance of “all God’s children,” and religious persons give money to religious causes rather than secular ones. The protest politics index is significant only in the secular giving equation. Faith-based social capital does not significantly affect non-religious giving. It is interesting to note that the three indexes that have no significant impact on religious giving—formal involvement with non-religious groups, protest politics, and organizational activism—are the three indexes that clustered together in the factor analysis as “public engagement.”

To give a sense of the relative importance of the social capital variables in the giving equation, Table Three shows the estimated increase in giving associated with the mean level of each type of social capital.⁴ Not surprisingly, the biggest single impact is that of faith-based social capital on religious (and thereby on total) giving. A household with no religious social capital is estimated to give \$886 less than a household with the mean level of religious engagement. Faith-based social capital has no effect on secular giving; the greatest influence here comes from social trust, followed closely by participation in electoral politics. Electoral

⁴ Since not all of the indexes have a well-defined minimum possible value, the contribution of the mean level of each index is assessed relative to the lowest value of the index observed in the data set.

politics is also the second greatest influence on religious and on total giving; at just over \$200, the impact of electoral participation on nonreligious giving is comparable to the impact of a college degree. Social trust and diversity of friendships also have associated with them large positive effects on levels of giving.

Comparing the giving equations reported in Tables One and Two allows us to compare the estimated impact of educational attainment on charitable behavior with and without controls for social capital. These comparisons are set out in Table Four, which reports the estimated impacts of college education on charitable giving, under three sets of controls. The rows labeled “demographic controls only” correspond to the regressions presented in Table One. In order to highlight the importance of the electoral politics index, an intermediate set of calculations, “social capital minus electoral politics” controls for the other eight social capital indexes (derived from tobit regressions that omit electoral politics). The final set of rows, “social capital indexes” adds the effects attributable to electoral politics and corresponds to the regressions shown in Table Two.

Controlling for social capital stocks reduces the estimated effect of education on charitable giving. In the presence of the social capital indexes other than electoral politics, the estimated impact of educational attainment on household giving is roughly one half to three fifths its value when estimated without social capital controls. When the effect of participation in electoral politics is added, the estimated impacts of post-secondary education on giving lie between one third and one half their original estimates. The diminished effects are still substantial, however: a four-year college degree is associated with a \$205 increase in giving to non-religious causes.

VI. *Concluding Remarks*

There are many ways in which we might imagine post-secondary education to be positively related to personal giving. The *choice* to invest in education may appeal to persons who are generally engaged in the world around them. The *content* of that education may convey information about the world that leads people to adjust their spending habits. Its content may also allow people to invest in appreciating the output of charitably supported institutions in fields such as the arts and, obviously, higher education. The *fact* of a college education raises people in the social hierarchy, exposing them to more fundraising appeals and perhaps to elevated notions of civic and social obligation.

Direct involvement in civic and social networks may well provide an alternative route to increased giving. Engaged persons, like college alumni, will more frequently be asked to contribute; they will accumulate information about opportunities for giving. In economic parlance, persons embedded in networks of social capital have lower costs of giving. Literatures outside economics also stress that trust and cooperation spring from social and civic engagement, and that willing to give comes with trust and a belief in cooperative action.

The results reported here suggest that, as an empirical matter, both education and social capital are related to household giving. A college degree continues to predict substantially increased levels of non-religious and overall giving even after controlling for household income and the richness of the respondent's networks of social capital. The association between church attendance and household giving is by now well known, and the relationship continues to be a substantial one when a broader index of faith-based social capital is substituted for the attendance variable. Less well known are the other results emerging in this paper: habits of citizenry related to electoral politics are associated with substantially higher than average levels

of giving. These relationships, demonstrated elsewhere as simple correlations, are shown here to persist after controlling for other factors.

Human capital, as accumulated during post-secondary education, and social capital, as measured in several indexes offered as part of the Social Capital Community Benchmark survey, increase charitable giving. Possibilities for further research on the relationship between social capital and personal giving include unpacking the social capital indexes to explore the specific contributors to charitable action. Also, the relationships among forms of social capital and human capital have not been fully theorized. Education might lower the cost of competing for limited positions within civic networks, such as chair citizen committees, just as it might lower the cost of meeting a diverse group of friends. A complete understanding of the impact of education on personal philanthropy will include the impact of human capital accumulation on subsequent social capital accumulation, and include the impact of that social capital in the effect of education on charitable giving.

References

Andreoni, James, Eleanor Brown, and Isaac Rischall, 2001. "Charitable Giving by Married Couples: Who Decides, and Why Does It Matter?" manuscript.

Bradley, Ralph, Steven Holden, and Robert McClelland, 1999. "A Robust Estimation of the Effects of Taxation on Charitable Contributions," manuscript, February.

Brooks, Arthur, 2001. "Welfare Reciprocity and Private Charity," manuscript.

Brown, Eleanor, and James Ferris, 2001. "Social Capital in Los Angeles: Findings from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey," manuscript.

Glaeser, Edward, David Laibson, and Bruce Sacerdote, 2000. "The Economic Approach to Social Capital," NBER working paper 7728 (June).

Goldin, Claudia, and Lawrence Katz, 1999. "Human Capital and Social Capital: The Rise of Secondary Schooling in America, 1910-1940," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 24:4 (Spring), 683-723.

Helliwell, John, and Robert Putnam, 1999. "Education and Social Capital," NBER working paper 7121 (May).

Hodgkinson, Virginia, and Murray Weitzman, 1996. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*, Independent Sector.

Putnam, Robert, 2000. *Bowling Alone*. Simon & Schuster.

_____, 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* Princeton University Press.

Reece, William, and Kimberly Zieschang, 1985. "Consistent Estimation of the impact of Tax Deductibility on the Level of Charitable Contributions," *Econometrica* vol. 53, 217-293.

Table One

**The Effects of Education and Other Demographic Variables on Household Giving,
Giving to Religious Causes, and Giving to Non-Religious Causes**

Estimation technique: Tobit

| | Total Annual Giving | Dependent Variable Religious Giving | Secular Giving |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|----------------|
| Constant | -2484.368*** | -2251.341*** | -1548.466*** |
| Income | .027*** | .015*** | .0163*** |
| Some college | 427.700*** | 264.486*** | 285.901*** |
| College graduate | 796.478*** | 311.007*** | 591.917*** |
| Married | 147.467*** | 202.903*** | 2.781 |
| Kids under 18 | 30.933** | 45.067*** | 1.312 |
| Church attendance | 35.725*** | 43.350*** | 1.804*** |
| Age | 26.154*** | 16.906*** | 16.318*** |
| Age squared | -0.082 | -0.048 | -0.056 |
| # censored obs. | 3433 | 6998 | 6997 |
| # uncensored obs | 18362 | 15235 | 15589 |
| Pr > chi square | .000 | .000 | .000 |

*** significant at the .001 level

** significant at the .01 level

* significant at the .05 level

Table Two

The Effects of Education, Demographic Variables and Social Capital on Household Giving, Gifts to Religious Causes, and Gifts to Non-Religious Causes

Estimation technique: Tobit

| | Total Annual Giving | <i>Dependent Variable</i> | |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | | Religious Giving | Secular Giving |
| Constant | -1392.99*** | -901.39*** | -1516.34*** |
| Income | .023*** | .013*** | .013*** |
| Some college | 159.18*** | 108.90*** | 99.51*** |
| College graduate | 398.32*** | 106.42*** | 294.97*** |
| Married | 161.82*** | 193.51*** | 20.71 |
| Kids under 18 | 11.64 | 30.23** | -5.33 |
| Age | 9.14 | 5.83 | 5.69 |
| Age squared | 0.031 | 0.030 | .006*** |
| SK: racial trust | -44.68 | 24.72 | -48.95** |
| SK: diversity | 47.74*** | 23.66*** | 39.19*** |
| SK: group involv. | 28.27*** | -12.24 | 52.53*** |
| SK: faith-based | 1010.94*** | 1320.40*** | -23.53 |
| SK: schmooze | 81.25*** | 61.78*** | 42.59** |
| SK: protest politics | 17.64 | -15.60 | 20.58** |
| SK: electoral politics | 141.71*** | 98.03*** | 98.23*** |
| SK: org. activism | 128.61*** | 28.53 | 100.04*** |
| SK: social trust | 129.49*** | 62.89** | 121.52*** |
| # censored obs | 2929 | 5937 | 5908 |
| # uncensored obs | 15758 | 13093 | 13402 |
| Pr > chi sq. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

*** significant at the .001 level

** significant at the .01 level

* significant at the .05 level

Table Three

**The Impact of Social Capital on Total Annual Household Giving, Giving to Religious Causes,
and Giving to Non-Religious Causes**

| <i>An increase from the minimum observed value to the mean of the index....:</i> | <i>increases the level of giving by:</i> | | |
|--|--|------------------|----------------------|
| | total giving | religious giving | non-religious giving |
| Racial Trust | \$ -79 | \$ 36 | \$ -71 |
| Diversity of Friendships | 253 | 102 | 171 |
| Formal Group Involvement | 75 | -26 | 114 |
| Faith-based Social Capital | 886 | 944 | -16 |
| Informal Social Interactions | 66 | 41 | 29 |
| Protest Politics | 17 | -12 | 16 |
| Electoral Politics | 366 | 206 | 209 |
| Organizational Activism | 104 | 19 | 67 |
| Social Trust | 282 | 112 | 217 |

Table Four

**Estimated Effects of Post-Secondary Education on Household Giving
Under Three Sets of Control Variables**

| | <i>Increase in giving if respondent has:</i> | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| | Some college | 4-yr college degree |
| <i>Total annual giving, controlling for:</i> | | |
| Demographic variables | 361 | 671 |
| Social capital indexes excluding electoral politics | 180 | 405 |
| Social capital indexes | 134 | 336 |
| <i>Giving to religious causes, controlling for:</i> | | |
| Demographic variables | 181 | 213 |
| Social capital indexes excluding electoral politics | 101 | 111 |
| Social capital indexes | 75 | 73 |
| <i>Giving to non-religious causes, controlling for:</i> | | |
| Demographic variables | 197 | 409 |
| Social capital indexes excluding electoral politics | 94 | 244 |
| Social capital indexes | 69 | 205 |

Appendix One

Indexes of Social Capital in the SCCB Data⁵

Social Trust. Six questions go into the social trust index. One is the question on general trust, “Would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” The other five are about trusting people encountered in specific community-based contexts. Respondents were asked whether they trust “a lot, some, only a little, or not at all” the “people in your neighborhood;” “people you work with;” “people at your place of worship;” “people who work in the stores where you shop;” and “the police in your local community.” The questions were weighted equally and scores were standardized by subtracting the mean and then dividing by the standard deviation of the national sample for each question.

Racial Trust. Respondents are asked whether they trust “a lot, some, only a little, or not at all” people in each of four racial/ethnic categories, and the responses to categories other than the respondent’s are equally weighted in computing an index of racial trust.

Diversity of Friendships. This index counts how many of eleven types of friends the respondent says are represented in the set of people that includes “everyone that you would count as a PERSONAL FRIEND, not just your closest friends.” The eleven categories cover people who: own their own business; are manual workers; have been on welfare; own a vacation home; have a different religious orientation (not Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, depending on the respondent’s affiliation, or who is very religious, if the respondent gave “no religion” as an affiliation); are white; are Latino or Hispanic; are Asian; are black /African American; are gay or lesbian; and those who can be described as community leaders.

Formal Group Involvement. This counts the number of kinds of groups the respondent has been involved with in the 12 months prior to the interview. Two versions of this index are calculated, varying in whether they include an item asking about taking part in “any sort of activity with people at your church or place of worship other than attending services.” The 18 questions included in both versions of the index cover the following kinds of groups: an organization affiliated with religion other than a place of worship; an adult sports or outdoor activity club or league; youth organizations such as scouts or youth sports leagues; a parents organization or other school support group; a veteran’s group; a neighborhood association; organizations for seniors; a service-providing charity organization; a labor union; a professional or trade association; service clubs or fraternal (sorrorical) associations; ethnic, nationality, or civil rights groups; a literary or fine arts group; other hobby or pastime (e.g. investing, gardening) societies; support groups and self-help groups for persons with specific problems; groups that meet only over the Internet; and other clubs or organizations. To avoid duplication of items incorporated into the faith-based social capital index, we use the Formal Group Involvement index that excludes the question on activities with people from the respondent’s place of worship.

Faith-Based Social Capital. Four items are used for the construction of this index. They are whether or not the respondent is a member of a local religious community; frequency of attendance at religious services, measured in five ranges from at least every week to less than a

⁵ This material is taken from Brown and Ferris (2001).

few times per year; whether or not the respondent had participated in an activity other than services with people from his or her local religious community in the past 12 months; and whether the respondent was involved with a religious group other than his or her congregation. An alternative index is available that also includes charitable contributions to religious causes, standardized by the national mean and standard deviation; and number of times volunteered, also standardized by the national sample's mean and standard deviation.

Organizational Activism. This score builds on four items. The first of these is the version of the Formal Group Involvement index (described above) that does not include church-based activities. Also included is the number of times in the past twelve months the respondent attended a club meeting, and the number of times he or she attended any meeting at which school or town affairs were discussed. The fourth item asks whether the respondent has served as an officer or served on a committee of any local club or organization. The index value is described in the code book as consisting of “the factor score resulting from a principal components analysis” of these four variables.

Informal Social Interactions. This index is based on the answers to five questions about socializing over the past twelve months. Respondents are asked how many times they played cards or board games with others, visited with relatives, entertained friends at home, socialized with friends in public places, and socialized with coworkers outside of work. Their scores on each question are standardized by the national mean and standard deviation. The index is the mean value of the standardized scores.

Giving and Volunteering. Respondents were asked two questions about charitable contributions and a longer series of questions about volunteer activities. Contributions of “money, property or other assets for a wide variety of charitable purposes” in the past twelve months were queried first for religious causes and then for all “non-religious charities, organizations, or causes.” Responses were coded into six ranges, from “none” to “more than \$5,000.” Volunteering was defined as “any unpaid work you’ve done to help people besides your family and friends or people you work with.” The first question asked how many times in the past month the respondent had volunteered. If the respondent indicated a positive amount of volunteering, a series of six questions asked if any of the volunteering was for a specific cause. The six areas of volunteer activity queried are: for one’s place of worship; for health care or fighting particular diseases; for school or other youth-centered programs; to help the poor or the elderly; for the arts or other cultural organizations; for any neighborhood or civic group. The number of volunteer activities is converted to a monthly measure, and the index is computed as the average of the scores on the two contributions questions, number of times volunteered monthly, and, for each of the activity areas, dummy variables indicating whether the individual volunteered.

Electoral Politics. This index is based on five questions relating to interest in and involvement in electoral politics. Two yes-or-no questions are whether the respondent is registered to vote and whether he or she voted in the most recent (1996) presidential election. One question asks how many days last week the respondent read a newspaper; this is divided by seven to produce an answer that can range from zero to one. The respondent is asked to name the two senators from her state; partial credit is given for getting close to a correct name, and again the scores are standardized so that getting both correct confers one point and neither even approximately

correct confers zero points. The fifth question asks whether the respondent is “not at all interested,” “only slightly interested,” “somewhat interested,” or “very interested” in politics and national affairs. The answers are scaled to range from zero to one. The index is then the average of these five scores.

Activist (or “Protest”) Politics. This measures issue-related involvement in politics beyond general electoral participation, with all questions referring to the previous twelve-month period. Respondents are asked whether they have signed a petition; attended a political meeting or rally; and whether they have participated in demonstrations, boycotts, or marches. Three further questions ask about involvement with politically active groups such as labor unions; ethnic, nationality or civil rights groups; and other public interest or political action groups or party committees. A seventh question asked whether any group in which the respondent was involved had taken any local action for social or political reform. The index is calculated as the mean of the answers to these questions.

Appendix Two

Descriptive Statistics for the Data

| <i>Giving and Demographic Variables</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>number of observations</i> | |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Total annual household giving | \$1,408 | 24,447 | |
| Giving to religious causes | 893 | 25,034 | |
| Giving to non-religious (secular) causes | 502 | 25,512 | |
| Annual household income | 49,651 | 25,054 | |
| Proportion of sample married | 0.515 | 19,019 | |
| Days of religious attendance per year | 24.00 | 28,812 | |
| Number of children at home under 18 | 0.768 | 29,104 | |
| Age | 44.8 | 28,524 | |
| Age Squared | 2,282.1 | 28,524 | |
| | | | |
| <i>Social Capital Indexes</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>minimum</i> | <i># obs</i> |
| Interracial trust | 2.087 | 0 | 24,136 |
| Diversity of Friendships | 6.276 | 0 | 29,233 |
| Formal Group Involvements | 3.145 | 0 | 29,233 |
| Faith-Based Social Capital | -.071 | -1.10 | 28,956 |
| Informal Socializing | -.002 | -.972 | 29,178 |
| Protest Politics | 1.125 | 0 | 29,226 |
| Electoral Politics | 3.058 | 0 | 29,225 |
| Organizational Activism | .067 | -.893 | 29,076 |
| Social Trust | .034 | -2.544 | 29,103 |