



WARD RESEARCH
I N C O R P O R A T E D

A Report On Charitable Giving In Hawaii



Prepared for:
Hawaii Community Foundation
August 2009

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	5
Methodology	7
Charitable Giving in Hawaii.....	11
Figure 1: Giving and Non-Giving Households (2009)	12
Figure 2: Method of Giving (2009).....	13
Figure 3: Primary Method of Giving (2009).....	14
Figure 4: Primary Method of Giving (Tracking)	15
Figure 5: Methods of Giving (2009).....	16
Figure 6: Methods of Giving (Tracking).....	17
Figure 7: Hawaii vs. US Mainland	18
Figure 8: Mean and Median Giving For Households	19
Figure 9: Hawaii Households (2009 Adjusted By CPI)	20
Identifying Those Who Give	21
Figure 10: Giving By County (2009).....	22
Figure 11: Giving Cash vs. Goods By County (2009).....	23
Figure 12: Giving By Length of Residency (2009)	24
Figure 13: Giving By Length of Residency (Tracking)	25
Figure 14: Giving Cash vs. Goods By Length of Residency (2009)	26
Figure 15: Giving By Household Size (2009).....	27
Figure 16: Giving By Household Size (Tracking).....	28
Figure 17: Giving Cash vs. Goods By Household Size (2009).....	29
Figure 18: Giving By Ethnicity (2009).....	30
Figure 19: Giving By Ethnicity (Tracking).....	31
Figure 20: Giving Cash vs. Goods By Ethnicity (2009).....	32
Figure 21: Giving By Age (2009).....	33
Figure 22: Giving By Age (Tracking)	34
Figure 23: Giving Cash vs. Goods By Age (2009)	35
Figure 24: Giving By Household Income (2009)	36
Figure 25: Giving By Household Income (Tracking)	37
Figure 26: Giving Cash vs. Goods By Household Income (2009)	38
Figure 27: Giving By Home Ownership (2009)	39
Figure 28: Giving By Resident Status (2009).....	40
Figure 29: Giving By Marital Status (2009)	41
Figure 30: Contributions From Children (2009)	42
Figure 31: Giving By Educational Background (2009).....	43
Figure 32: Giving By Religion (2009)	44
Figure 33: Giving By Religion (Tracking)	45

Table of Contents (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
Identifying Those Who Give (Selected Charts Adjusted By Consumer Price Index)	46
Figure 34: Giving By County (2009 Adjusted By CPI)	48
Figure 35: Giving By Length of Residence (2009 Adjusted By CPI)	49
Figure 36: Giving By Household Size (2009 Adjusted By CPI).....	50
Figure 37: Giving By Ethnicity (2009 Adjusted By CPI)	51
Figure 38: Giving By Age (2009 Adjusted By CPI)	52
Figure 39: Giving By Household Income (2009 Adjusted By CPI).....	53
Figure 40: Giving By Religion (2009 Adjusted By CPI).....	54
Aspects of Charitable Giving	55
Figure 41: Amount of Planned/Budgeted Giving (2009)	56
Figure 42: Amount of Planned/Budgeted Giving (Tracking)	57
Figure 43: Mechanisms For Giving – Top Responses (2009)	58
Figure 44: Mechanisms For Giving – Other Responses (2009).....	59
Mechanisms of Giving: Fundraisers.....	60
Motivations for Giving	62
Figure 45: Common Reasons For Giving – Top Responses (2009).....	63
Figure 46: Common Reasons For Giving – Other Responses (2009)	64
Figure 47: “Big Reasons For Giving – Top Responses (2009).....	65
Figure 48: “Big” Reasons For Giving – Other Responses (2009).....	66
Figure 49: Stopped Giving To Organization In Past Few Years and Why (2009)	67
Figure 50: Seasonal Patterns of Charitable Giving (2009)	68
Figure 51: Timing of Charitable Giving (Tracking).....	69
Figure 52: Anticipated Giving in 2010 (2009).....	70
Figure 53: Type of Organization By Anticipated Giving (2009).....	71
Figure 54: Estate Planning (2009)	73
Figure 55: Gone To Website To Research (2009)	74
Figure 56: Giving By Website Research (2009)	77
Recipients of Charitable Giving	78
Figure 57: Giving Locally (2009)	79
Figure 58: Giving Locally (Tracking)	80
Figure 59: Giving Locally By Resident Status (2009)	81
Figure 60: Giving Locally By Type of Resident (2009)	82
Figure 61: Giving Locally By Ethnicity (2009).....	83

Table of Contents (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
Share of Charitable Donations.....	84
Figure 62: Top Five Recipients of Charitable Giving (Tracking).....	85
Figure 63: Additional Recipients of Charitable Giving (Tracking).....	86
Figure 64: Organizations’ Share of Donations and Contributions (2009).....	87
Figure 65: Organizations’ Share of Goods Donated (2009).....	88
Figure 66: Share of Goods (Tracking).....	89
Figure 67: Organizations’ Share of Monetary Donations (2009).....	90
Figure 68: Share of Monetary Donations (Tracking).....	91
Figure 69: Average Total Donation By Category (2009).....	92
Figure 70: Organizations Donated To By Ethnicity (2009).....	93
Figure 71: Giving To Religious vs. Secular Organizations (2009).....	94
Figure 72: Giving To Religious vs. Secular Organizations (Tracking).....	95
 Volunteer Profiles	 96
Figure 73: Volunteering (2009).....	98
Figure 74: Anticipated Volunteering (2009).....	99
Figure 75: Volunteering By Island (2009).....	100
Figure 76: Volunteering By Length of Residency (2009).....	101
Figure 77: Volunteering By Age (2009).....	102
Figure 78: Volunteering By Level of Education (2009).....	103
Figure 79: Volunteering By Household Income (2009).....	104
Figure 80: Volunteering By Religious Affiliation (2009).....	105
Figure 81: Volunteering By Gender (2009).....	106
Figure 82: Charitable Giving Among Volunteers and Non-Volunteers (2009).....	107
 Appendix	
Detailed Findings	
Sample Questionnaire	

Introduction

This report summarizes the primary findings from the Hawaii Giving Study, 2009. Commissioned by the Hawaii Community Foundation, the Study utilizes both primary and secondary data to provide a comprehensive look at patterns of charitable giving and volunteerism in the State of Hawaii.

The Hawaii Giving Study, 2009 examines who gives to charitable organizations, how much they give, to which types of organizations they give, and the motivations behind their giving. Collectively, those factors are referred to as “giving patterns” --- a term used throughout this report.

The Hawaii Giving Study, 2009 introduces a new mixed-method methodology combining a telephone survey with online, web-based primary data collection. This mixed-method methodology allows contact with those no longer with landlines (estimated at 20% of all households) and offsets possible skews linked to a landline telephone-only methodology (older, less mobile residents); thus allowing for better representation of the entire community.

The new mixed-method methodology also allowed for more flexibility with data analysis, allowing for tracking against past data (by using the landline telephone-only sample) *and* adapting to changing environment (by using the combined telephone-online sample). Upon further review, there were only minimal differences when comparing data from the telephone-only sample (weighted by age and island) to that for the mixed method data (weighted by household characteristics regarding landline, internet, and cell phone and island). There were slight errata that could be expected (e.g. mixed-method more likely than phone only to have contributed online via Paypal, etc., due to the inclusion of the online sample) but distributions for key questions such as giving profile and volunteerism were virtually the same.

Introduction (cont.)

The Hawaii Giving Study, 2009 tracks giving patterns against the benchmark Hawaii Giving Study conducted in 1998 and a subsequent study conducted in 2001. The tracking data shown throughout this report is based only on the 2009 mixed-method sample, which factors in both telephone and online methodologies and which may account for some slight differences when compared to a telephone only methodology. The reader also needs to keep in mind the relatively large gap in between the 2009 survey and the previous measure which was conducted 8 years ago (which will may also account for any large changes in giving behavior). [Note: It should be noted, that for several charts tracking charitable donations in dollar amounts, charts showing 2009 figures adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index were also included in this report.]

Methodology

The methodology employed for this study was a mixed-method methodology combining a telephone survey of n=513 tax-defined households throughout the State with an online survey of n=299 tax-defined households throughout the State. [Note: Throughout the study, a respondent's household is defined as the respondent and any other individuals who were included on the respondent's tax return for 2008. A single residence, therefore, may contain more than one tax-defined household.] Field dates for the telephone survey were July 11, 2009 to August 4, 2009, while the online survey ran from July 23, 2009 to August 5, 2009. Maximum sampling error for the combined sample of n=812 respondents is +/- 3.4%.

Interviews were planned such that a minimum of n=400 interviews would be conducted among Oahu residents and a minimum of n=400 interviews would be conducted among Neighbor Island residents. [Note: The final sample included n=406 surveys among Oahu residents and n=406 surveys among Neighbor Island residents.] Total data was later weighted to reflect current population estimates for Oahu (71%), Maui County (11%), the Big Island (13%), and Kauai (5%).

	Oahu	Maui County	Hawaii	Kauai
Unweighted Base	(406)	(147)	(186)	(73)
Unweighted %'s	50.0%	18.1%	22.9%	9.0%
Weighted Base	(571)	(90)	(109)	(39)
Weighted %'s	70.6%	11.1%	13.5%	4.9%

Methodology

As touched on in the Introduction, the mixed-method methodology allowed for greater contact with a younger sample of respondents. This was ensured by a quota of n=200 of the online surveys being conducted among a targeted 18 to 34 year old age segment; with the other n=100 distributed across the 35+ age range. [Note: The final sample included n=191 online respondents between 18 and 34 years of age and n=108 online respondents 35+ years of age.]

For the online, web-based portion of the study, Ward Research worked with eRewards, a national online managed panel, to survey Hawaii resident members of their panel. The online component was programmed by Ward Research, who also worked closely with e-Rewards in handling the email invitations and monitoring of age quotas for the online component. In addition, Ward Research used its own proprietary online panel, at www.thehawaiiipanel.com, to supplement the 18 to 34 year old age segment.

Given the mixed methodology employed for this study, the final sample of data was weighted by two attributes: 1) Island and 2) household description --- in terms of Internet access, landline, and cell phone. Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding whether they have Internet access (asked on telephone surveys; assumed for online surveys), have a landline (asked for online surveys; assumed for telephone surveys), and have a cell phone (asked for both surveys). It is estimated that 71% of Hawaii households have Internet access and 80% of Hawaii households have a landline. Given these two assumptions, our combined methodologies will reach an estimated 90% of the population.

Methodology (cont.)

Further calculations project the following distribution of households (based on all households in Hawaii):

- 54% of all households have Internet, have landline, have cell phone (reached by both telephone and online methodology);
 - 7% have Internet, have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by both methodologies);
 - 10% have Internet, do NOT have landline, have cell phone (reached by online survey);
 - <1% have Internet, do NOT have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by online survey);
 - 10% do NOT have Internet, have landline, have cell phone (reached by telephone survey); and
 - 9% do NOT have Internet, have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by telephone survey).
- = 90% of all households in Hawaii

Total percentages were then reallocated so that the 90% of all households reachable via the mixed-method methodology would now be considered the total population of respondents as shown below. The weighting of the final sample also assumed that these household proportions were consistent across all islands.

- 60% have Internet, have landline, have cell phone (reached by both telephone and online methodology);
 - 8% have Internet, have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by both methodologies);
 - 11% have Internet, do NOT have landline, have cell phone (reached by online survey);
 - <1% have Internet, do NOT have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by online survey);
 - 11% do NOT have Internet, have landline, have cell phone (reached by telephone survey); and
 - 10% do NOT have Internet, have landline, do NOT have cell phone (reached by telephone survey).
- = 100% of respondents

Methodology (cont.)

The survey respondents were asked about the amount and type of charitable giving done by all members of their tax-defined household during the past 12 months. This report presents the findings of the study as applied to the general population of tax-defined households in Hawaii.

The survey instrument utilized was the same survey instrument used in prior Hawaii Giving Studies, developed by the Hawaii Community Foundation.

Residents were screened to reflect the following characteristics:

- 18 years of age or older; and
- Could answer for everyone in household included on the household's 2008 Federal tax return.

All interviewing was conducted from the Ward Research Calling Center in the downtown Honolulu office. Interviews were conducted between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. on week nights and 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on weekends. The Calling Center is equipped with a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system which allows for the 100% monitoring of calls, through a combination of electronic and observational means. The 15-line CATI system tracks the disposition of each call made, enabling calculation of the penetration of volunteerism in the population overall.