



**SURVEY OF MINNESOTANS' CHARITABLE GIVING HABITS
AND PERCEPTIONS OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS**

**A SCIENTIFIC TELEPHONE SURVEY CONDUCTED FOR THE
CHARITY REVIEW COUNCIL
BY
ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY**

July 2007

RESEARCH TEAM

Charities Review Council

Rich Cowles, Executive Director

Helen Ng, Survey Project Manager & Marketing Communications Manager

www.SmartGivers.org

(651) 224-7030 (1-800-733-GIVE)

St. Cloud State University Social Science Research Institute College Of Social Sciences

Principal Investigators:

Dr. Stephen I. Frank

Dr. Steven C. Wagner

Dr. David H. Robinson

<http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>

Note: Drs. Frank, Wagner and Robinson are members of the Midwest Association of Public Opinion Research (M.A.P.O.R.) and the American Association of Public Opinion Research (A.A.P.O.R.) and subscribe to the code of ethics of the A.A.P.O.R.

I. Summary of Findings

This report was prepared for the Charities Review Council, St. Paul, Minnesota. The SCSU Survey was employed to conduct a scientific telephone survey of a minimum of 600 adult residents of the state of Minnesota. Households were selected by random digit dialing, a survey or selection method unique to telephone survey research. The total number of telephone numbers included in the sample is proportionate to the telephone population of the entire state.

Twenty one substantive questions and three demographic (age, ethnic classifications, income) were asked of the sample. Additionally, gender was generated by the interviewers as a way to randomize each household. This ensures a more representative sample of the sampled population. The interview system also generated respondent frequencies by county and area code.

A total of 606 Minnesota adults were interviewed. We obtained a cooperation rate of 83 percent. The margin of error of the survey is approximately plus or minus 3.9 percent at the 95 percent of confidence level. The final sample was weighted for gender. As is characteristic of survey research, final demographics are often slightly higher or lower than known characteristics of the general population. Interviewing was conducted between June 18 and June 27.

The remainder of this report is divided into seven distinct parts. Part II details the history and purpose of the St. Cloud State University Survey. Part III details the personnel of the Survey. This includes the University faculty who directed the survey and the University students who trained the interviewers, supervised interviewing and maintained the interviewing system. Part IV details the methodology of the survey. Part V displays the respondent frequency and percent of responses for each question. Part VI shows the respondent frequency and percent responses for the demographic questions and Part VII is the questionnaire. As is characteristic of telephone respondents, anywhere from 10 to 20 percent of respondents refuse to answer these questions. These refused “responses” are not included in the tables. Nor are they included in the substantive question tables. This is standard practice. Don’t know responses, however, are included and often inform us about the quality of data collection. For example, we found that 12 percent of the respondents told us they don’t know “how good of a job charitable organizations do in running their programs and services.” Had we not received a smaller “don’t know” response rate, we would have questioned the quality of data. It seems normal, in other words, to find 10-12 percent of respondents answer *don’t know* for that kind of question.

The substantive questions seek respondent opinions about the job charitable organizations do running their programs, whether they spend money wisely, and how much confidence respondents have in charities. Correspondingly, we also inquired about the level of trust and ethical conduct of charities. Following up on those questions, we asked about how charities might be overseen and how charitable employees should be paid. As expected, we also inquired about donation habits and patterns. Interestingly, we asked several questions to compare how respondents view waste in business, government and charitable organizations. Several of the questions were adapted by a New York University study done by Paul Light.

Overall, the data (see Table 16) show that most adult Minnesotans donate something of value, whether it is money, time, property, stocks, to charities. Table 5 shows that more than three-fourths of Minnesotans donate money to organizations other than religious-based organizations and colleges and universities. In terms of annual gifts, Table 17 indicates most Minnesotans give between one and three percent of their annual incomes to charities. Five percent of adult Minnesotans report giving more than 10 percent of their annual gross income to charitable organizations. Table 18 shows the most important reason they do not give more is due to their personal financial situation. Of

those that do not give (Table 19), almost one-half reported they do not give is due to their financial situation. Donations tend to go to local-based charities (see Table 20) and are in response to the mission of the organization, the charity's impact on local communities, the financial health of the charity, percent of funds spent on programs and whether the charity has met standards of accountability (see Table 21).

A possible reason for the seemingly high level of giving among Minnesotans is that three-fourths of respondents believe charitable organizations are very good or somewhat good at running their programs. An additional reason is that about the same percent say charitable organizations are very good or somewhat good at spending money wisely. Thirdly, these respondents have either a great deal or fair amount of confidence in charitable organizations (see Tables 2, 3, 4). We found that Minnesotans tend to trust Minnesotan Charities more than national-based charities (Table 9) and three-fourths of our respondents either strongly agree or agree that charities in Minnesota are ethical (Table 10). At the same time, almost all respondents suggest charities should be overseen. Almost one-half noted oversight should be by charitable watchdog-type groups (Table 13).

A plurality (four of ten) of respondents are of the opinion that charity employees should be paid comparably to their for-profit organization counterparts, whereas about one-third said less but still a livable wage and 14 percent said such employees should be drawn to their work and paid no more than a stipend (Table 14). Additional findings that compare waste of financial resources of businesses, the federal government and charities are contained in Tables 6, 7 and 8.

II. History and Mission of the Survey

The SCSU Survey is an ongoing survey research extension of the Social Science Research Institute in the College of Social Sciences at St. Cloud State University. The SCSU Survey performs its research in the form of telephone interviews. Telephone surveys are but one of the many types of research employed by researchers to collect data randomly. The telephone survey is now the instrument of choice for a growing number of researchers.

Dr. Steve Frank began the SCSU Survey in 1980 conducting several omnibus surveys a year of central Minnesota adults in conjunction with his Political Science classes. The SCSU Survey conducts its statewide omnibus survey once a year. In addition to questions focusing on the research of the faculty directors, clients can buy into the survey or contract for specialized surveys.

Presently, the omnibus surveys have continued, but have shifted to a primarily statewide focus. The annual statewide survey is conducted once a year in the fall and focuses on statewide issues such as election races, current events, and other important issues that are present in the state of Minnesota. Additionally, the SCSU Survey conducts an annual spring survey of SCSU students on various issues such as campus safety, alcohol and drug use, race, etc. Lastly, the SCSU Survey conducts contract surveys for various public and private sector clients. The Survey provides a useful service for the people and institutions of the State of Minnesota by furnishing valid data on the opinions, behaviors, and characteristics of adult Minnesotans.

The primary mission of the SCSU Survey is to serve the academic community and various clients through its commitment to high quality survey research and to provide education and experiential opportunities to researchers and students. The directors of the SCSU Survey strive to assure that all SCSU students and faculty directors contribute to the research process, as all are essential in

making a research project successful. This success is measured by our ability to obtain high quality survey data that is timely, accurate, and reliable while maintaining an environment that promotes the professional and personal growth of each staff member. The survey procedures used by the SCSU Survey adhere to the highest quality academic standards. The SCSU Survey maintains the highest ethical standards in its procedures and methods. Both faculty and student directors demonstrate integrity and respect for dignity in all interactions with colleagues, clients, researchers, and survey participants.

III. Survey Staff

The Survey's faculty directors are Dr. Steve Frank (SCSU Professor of Political Science), Dr. Steven Wagner (SCSU Professor of Political Science) and Dr. David H. Robinson (SCSU Professor of Statistics). The faculty directors are members of the Midwest Association of Public Opinion Research (M.A.P.O.R.) and the American Association of Public Opinion Research (A.A.P.O.R.). The directors subscribe to the code of ethics of A.A.P.O.R.

A Stephen I. Frank

Dr. Frank holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science from Washington State University. Dr. Frank teaches courses in American Politics, Public Opinion and Research Methods at St. Cloud State University. Dr. Frank started the SCSU Survey in 1980, and since has played a major role in the development, administration and analysis of over 150 telephone surveys for local and state governments, school districts and a variety of nonprofit agencies. Dr. Frank has completed extensive postgraduate work in survey research at the University of Michigan. Dr. Frank coauthored with Dr. Wagner and published by Harcourt College, *"We Shocked the World!" A Case Study of Jesse Ventura's Election as Governor of Minnesota*. Revised Edition. Dr. Frank, with Dr. Steven Wagner, recently published "The Maverick Campaign and Election of Jesse Ventura" in *Campaigns and Elections*, edited by Robert Watson and Colton Campbell, Lynn Rienner Publishers. Dr. Frank's most recent publication is "New Directions in Public Opinion" in *Perspectives on Minnesota Government and Politics*, Fifth Edition. Dr. Frank is immediate past chairperson of the SCSU Department of Political Science and immediate past president of the Minnesota Political Science Association.

B. Steven C. Wagner

Dr. Wagner holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science and a Master of Public Administration from Northern Illinois University. Dr. Wagner earned his Bachelor of Science in Political Science from Illinois State University. Dr. Wagner teaches courses in American Politics and Public and Nonprofit Management at St. Cloud State University. Dr. Wagner joined the SCSU Survey in 1997. Before coming to SCSU, Dr. Wagner taught in Kansas where he engaged in community-based survey research and before that was staff researcher for the U.S. General Accounting Office. Dr. Wagner has written many papers on taxation, health care delivery and state politics and has published articles on voting behavior, federal funding of local services and organizational decision making. Dr. Wagner, with Dr. Frank, recently published two texts on Jesse Ventura's election as Minnesota's Governor and a book chapter on the campaign. Dr. Wagner currently serves as chairperson of the SCSU Department of Political Science.

C. David H. Robinson

Dr. Robinson holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Statistics and a Masters in Statistics from the University of Iowa. Dr. Robinson earned his Bachelor of Science in Mathematics from Henderson State University. At St. Cloud State University, Dr. Robinson teaches courses in survey planning and contingency tables, statistical methods for the social sciences, probability and computer simulation, and other statistical applications. Since coming to SCSU in 1985 and before that time, Dr. Robinson has served as statistical consultant for numerous statistical analyses of survey results. He has coauthored a book on computer simulation and analysis, and has published articles in the areas of nonparametric statistics, multivariate statistics, analysis of baseball statistics, and statistical analysis of computer network performance. Dr. Robinson is immediate past chairperson of the SCSU Department of Statistics and Computer Networking.

D. Student Personnel

SCSU students, Ms. Sara Lohrman and Mr. William Floersheim serve as senior student lab supervisors. Mr. Justin Rassier, also an SCSU student, provided technical support to ensure the interviewing software and all related hardware functioned.

Ms. Lohrman graduated from the university in May with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science. She has enrolled in William Mitchell Law School and will commence her legal studies this fall. Ms. Lohrman is from Willmar, Minnesota. Mr. Floersheim will be a senior this coming academic year. He is a Political Science and Social Studies Education major. He plans to complete his student teaching next spring and enter the job market next summer. Mr. Floersheim is from Little Falls, Minnesota. Mr. Rassier will be a junior this coming year. He is a Computer Science major. Mr. Rassier is from St. Joseph, Minnesota.

After training and screening, approximately 20 SCSU students completed the calling. Under the directorion of Drs. Frank, Wagner and Robinson, Ms. Lohrman and Mr. Floersheim trained all callers and supervised all interviewing. These students serve the SCSU Survey as student directors and, in addition to supervising the lab for the spring survey of SCSU students, perform similar functions for the fall omnibus survey and other client-centered surveys.

IV. Methodology

The SCSU Survey operates the CATI Lab in Stewart Hall 324. The CATI Lab, which stands for Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing Lab, is equipped with 13 interviewer stations that each includes a computer, a phone, and a headset. In addition to the interviewer stations, there is the Supervisor Station, which is used to monitor the survey while it is in progress. The SCSU Survey has its own server designated solely for the use of the SCSU Survey.

The SCSU Survey is licensed to use Sawtooth Software's Ci3 Questionnaire Authoring Version 4.1, a state-of-the-art windows-based computer-assisted interviewing package. This program allow us to develop virtually any type of questionnaire while at the same time programming edit and consistency checks and other quality control measures to insure the most valid data. Interviewing with Ci3 offers many advantages:

1. Complete control of what the interviewer sees;
2. Automatic skip or branch patterns based on previous answers, combinations of answers, or even mathematical computations performed on answers;
3. Randomization of response categories or question order;
4. Customized questionnaires using respondents' previous responses, and,
5. Incorporation of data from the sample directly into the sample database.

In addition, all interview stations are networked for complete, ongoing sample management. Sawtooth Software's Ci3 allows immediate data updating, ensuring maximum data integrity and allowing clients to get progress reports anytime. The Survey directors are able to review data for quality and consistency. Question answers are entered directly into the computer, thus keypunching is eliminated, which decreases human error and facilitates immediate data analysis. The calling system is programmed to store call record keeping automatically, allowing interviewers and supervisors to focus on the interviewing task. Callbacks are programmed through the computer network and made on a schedule. Each number is called up to 12 times. Interrupted surveys are easily completed. Persons who are willing to be interviewed can do so when it is convenient to them, improving the quality of their responses.

Several steps were taken to ensure that the telephone sample of adult Minnesotans was representative of the larger Minnesota population. The sample was constructed using random digit dialing (RDD) procedures. Random digit dialing makes available changed, new, and unlisted numbers. Drawing numbers from a telephone book may skip as many as 30 percent of the households. Within each household, the particular respondent was determined in a statistically unbiased fashion. This means that the selection process alternated between men and women and older and younger respondents 18 years of age and older. We allowed few substitutions. In order to reach hard-to-get respondents, we called each number up to 12 times over different days and times. We made appointments as necessary to interview the designated respondent at his/her convenience.

Calls were made at various times during the week: Monday through Thursday, 4:30 pm to 9:30 pm, June 18-21, Sunday June 24 from 3:30 pm to 9:30 pm and from Monday, June 25 to Wednesday June 27, 4:30 pm to 9:30 pm and on the afternoon of June 27 to maximize contacts and ensure equal opportunities to respond among various respondent demographic groups. Attempt to convert initial refusals commenced on June 20 and continued throughout the survey. The instrument was pre-tested on Thursday, June 14.

We obtained the sample from Survey Sampling of Fairfield, Connecticut. We have found Survey Sampling a particularly efficient sample production company. They generated a sample that is of very high quality because they:

- construct a comprehensive database of all telephone working blocks which actually represent residential telephones;
- obtain, update and cross check working block information from local telephone companies;
- confirm the estimated number of residential telephones with each working block, excluding sparsely populated working blocks (industry standard is to exclude those blocks with less than three known working residential telephones out of the 100 possible numbers);
- assign working blocks known to contain residential telephones to geographic areas based on zip code and most recent updates of census data;

- mark each working block for demographic targeting;
- check each (RDD and listed) number against a list of known business telephone numbers and generate new numbers as necessary; and,
- arrange the ending sample in a random order to eliminate potential calling order bias.

The calling system maintains full and detailed records, including the number of attempts made to each number and the disposition of each attempt. Almost all initial refusals were contacted and many were converted to completions. Thus, we were able to obtain an 83 percent cooperation rate for this survey. Conversion of initial refusals to completions is more time consuming and therefore more costly, but the results are more representative of the state's population.

The sample was drawn proportional to the state population. The sample was comprised of 4,600 phone numbers. After initial screening by SSI for known not working numbers and business numbers, the working sample consisted of 3,650 numbers, still about one-half of these are not working numbers. The phone numbers are organized into mini-samples of 200 numbers called replicates. It is our usual practice to release replicates as needed by the interviewers. Replicates were released to the interviewers on an as-needed basis. The completed sample consists of 606 interviews. In samples of 606 interviews, the sample error due to sampling and other random effects is approximately plus/minus 3.9 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. This means that if one were to have drawn 20 samples of the state's adult population and administered the same instrument, it would be expected that the overall findings would be in error by 3.9 percent only one time in twenty.

However, in all sample surveys there are other possible sources of error for which precise estimates cannot be calculated. These include interviewer and coder error, respondent misinterpretation, and analysis errors. When analysis is made of sub-samples such as gender the sample error may be larger.

Even though the demographics of the sample match known characteristics of the state 18-year and older population very well, as is characteristic of telephone surveys, either females or males are slightly over represented. We were able to complete the sample with 50 percent females and 50 percent males. Since the age 18 and over female Minnesota population is closer to 51 percent, we slightly weighted the sample to better align it to the population estimates. The weighted sample of males is 49 percent and of females is 51 percent. Weighting did not adjust the total sample size, as is often the case.

All other demographic characteristics (county breakdown, age, household income, area code) are almost an exact match to the state's adult population. One variable that is a bit skewed is ethnicity breakdown. Using a different ethnicity question than the one we normally use seemingly resulted in a somewhat unusual response distribution (see Table 24). An examination of questions by ethnic breakdown did not indicate much difference between the various categories.

The cooperation rate of the survey was 83 percent.¹ A cooperation rate of 83 percent is well above the average for professional marketing firms. Cooperation rate means that once we reached an eligible respondent, slightly over eight of ten respondents agreed to participate in the survey. .

¹ Cooperation rate is determined by dividing the completions by the sum of the completions and refusals.

The survey consists of 21 substantive questions and three demographic questions (age, ethnic classification, income) asked in the questionnaire, plus gender and three sample variables: county, area code and interview time.

As is usual practice, respondent answers of Refused are removed from the frequency tables. The percent of frequency responses are calculated based on the removal of the Refused responses. It is important to know that the data in Tables 16, 18, 21 and 22 show multiple responses. Respondents, instead of being asked to answer with a single response, were allowed to answer with multiple responses. For example, Table 16 shows responses for the question we asked about types of gifts. Of the 606 persons asked this question, 481 indicated Money, 293 indicated Time, and 20 indicated Stocks. It's possible the respondents who answered Stocks also answered all other response options, except for the I Don't Give category. Several questions allowed respondents to offer open ended responses—Other—in addition to the categorical responses. Those responses are listed at the base of the applicable tables.

Table 1: Calling Record	
Disposition Record	Frequency
Completed Calls	606
Not Working Numbers	820
Not Eligible – Respondent not available during the period of the study, language problems, hearing problems, illness, out of state.	114
Callbacks – Appointments made but contact could not be made with designated respondent.	810
Refusals – Attempt to re-contact and convert refusals to a completion was made for all refusals.	120
Answering Machine – Live contact could not be made even after 10 calls.	455
Business Phones	298
No Answers – Probable non-working numbers.	188
Fax/Modem	141
Busy	43
Call Blocking	24
Cell Phone	8
.Other-partially completed but not finished, miscellaneous	20
Total Calls Placed	3,650

V. Substantive Questions

The interview began with the following statement: The first set of questions concern your views about charitable organizations which include churches, conservation and wildlife organizations, most hospitals, private schools, youth organizations, and some welfare services.

Table 2: Running Programs and Services		
“Generally speaking, how good of a job would you say charitable organizations do in running their programs and services? Would you say they do a very good job, somewhat good, not too good, or not at all good in running their programs and services?”		
RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Very Good	115	19
Somewhat Good	365	61
Not too Good	35	6
Not at all Good	14	2
Don't Know	73	12
Total	602	100

Table 3: Spending Money Wisely		
“How good of a job do charitable organizations do in spending money wisely? Would you say they do a very good job, somewhat good, not too good, or not at all good in spending money wisely?”		
RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Very Good	81	13
Somewhat Good	355	59
Not too Good	75	12
Not at all Good	16	3
Don't Know	75	12
Total	602	100

**Table 4:
Confidence in Charitable Organizations**

“For you personally, how much confidence do you have in charitable organizations? Do you have a great deal of confidence, a fair amount of confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Great Deal of Confidence	90	15
Fair Amount of Confidence	346	57
Not too Much Confidence	117	19
No Confidence	34	6
Don't Know	16	3
Total	603	100

**Table 5:
Donated Money**

“In the last year, have you donated money to a charitable organization other than your church, synagogue, mosque or your college and university?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Yes	476	78
No	126	21
Don't Know	4	1
Total	606	100

**Table 6:
Money Wasted by Businesses**

**“In your opinion, how much money do you think private businesses waste today?
Would you say private businesses waste a great deal of money, a fair amount of
money, not too much money or none at all?”**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Great Deal	139	23
Fair Amount	272	45
Not too Much	115	19
None at all	15	3
Don't Know	63	10
Total	604	100

**Table 7:
Money Wasted by Federal Government**

**“In your opinion, how much money do you think federal government in
Washington DC wastes today? Would you say it wastes a great deal of money, a
fair amount of money, not too much money or none at all?”**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Great Deal	252	42
Fair Amount	224	37
Not too Much	78	13
None at all	14	2
Don't Know	37	6
Total	605	100

**Table 8:
Money Wasted by Charities**

“In your opinion, how much money do you think charitable organizations waste today? Would you say it wastes a great deal of money, a fair amount of money, not too much money or none at all?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Great Deal	75	12
Fair Amount	276	46
Not too Much	185	31
None at all	18	3
Don't Know	51	9
Total	605	100

**Table 9:
Trust of Charities**

“In general, how does your trust in Minnesota charities compare with your trust in national charities? Would you say you trust Minnesota charities more, do you trust national charities more, or would you say you trust Minnesota and national charities about the same?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Trust Minnesota Charities More	193	32
Trust National Charities More	65	11
Trust Both About the Same	306	51
Don't Know	36	6
Total	600	100

**Table 10:
Minnesota Charities and Ethics**

“For you personally, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that charities in Minnesota are ethical?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Strongly Agree	133	22
Agree	366	61
Disagree	41	7
Strongly Disagree	8	1
Don't Know	52	9
Total	600	100

**Table 11:
Trust and Giving**

“Does your general trust in charities influence your charitable giving?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Yes	500	83
No	83	14
Don't Know	16	3
Total	602	100

Respondents who answered No, Don't Know or Refused were skipped in the next question (see table 12) to the question contained in Table 13. This totaled 113 respondents.

**Table 12:
Influence of Trust on Giving Habits**

“Does it increase or decrease your giving?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Increases	369	75
Decreases	86	17
Don't Know	38	8
Total	493	100

Asked only of respondents who answered Yes to the question in Table 11.

**Table 13:
Oversight of Charities**

“Next, I'm going to read four statements that describe how some people think about charity oversight. Please tell me which one best describes how you personally think of charity oversight.”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Government should regulate charities more than it already does	96	16
Charity watchdog groups should play a larger role in reforming charities through consumer protection.	276	47
The most effective reform will come from self-regulation led by charitable sector leaders.	108	19
There is little need for reform.	46	8
Don't Know	60	10
Total	586	100

**Table 14:
Employee Pay**

“Thanks. Once again I'm going to read several statements that describe how some people think about charities. This time, the statements are about how employees of charities should get paid. Please tell me which one best describes how you personally think charity employees should get paid?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Employees of charities should receive wages comparable to for-profit employees.	249	42
Employees should be paid less than their for-profit counterparts but enough to make a living.	200	34
Employees be drawn to their work out of a commitment and paid no more than a stipend.	83	14
Don't Know	58	10
Total	590	100

**Table 15:
Government Funds and Donations**

“Many Minnesota nonprofit organizations get some of their funds from government agencies in the form of grants or fees for services. Thinking about your own giving, would you donate more, about the same amount, or less to an organization if you knew it received some of its funds from government agencies?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
More	63	10
About the Same	353	59
Less	135	23
Don't Know	45	8
Total	596	100

**Table 16:
Types of Gifts**

**“Thanks. Next I would like to ask you about what types of gifts, if any, you personally donate to charities. Do you give?”
(Answer Options Read; Multiple Responses Allowed)**

	RESPONSES		PERCENT OF CASES
	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	
I DON'T GIVE	22	2	4
Money	481	43	81
Time	293	26	50
Automobiles or Household goods	230	20	39
Property and real estate	21	2	4
Planned gifts such as wills and gift annuities	26	2	4
Stocks	20	2	3
Some other type gift	23	2	4
Don't Know	13	1	2
Total	1,128	100	191

Respondents who answered they Don't Give, Don't Know or Refused were skipped for the next two questions/Tables 17 and 18. This totaled 71 respondents for Table 17 and 55 respondents for Table 18.

Other Responses: Clothes; Clothing; Clothing; Food; Clothing; Clothing; Jewelry to raise money to by selling in auction; Goods; Mileage expenses; Computer; Advocating for them; Clothing; Books; Books.

**Table 17:
Amount of Annual Gifts**

“When you add up all your annual gifts, what percentage of your household gross income do you give annually to non-profit organizations or charities? Is it less than 1%, from 1% to 3%, from 4% to 5%, from 6% to 10%, or more than 10%?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Less Than 1%	204	38
From 1% to 3%	132	25
From 3% to 5%	75	14
From 5% to 10%	46	9
More than 10%	27	5
Don't Know	51	9
Total	535	100

Asked only of those respondents who answered they give something in the previous question (Table 16).

**Table 18:
What Prevents Respondent Giving More**

“What prevents you from giving more? Is it your financial situation, distrust that donations will be well spent, lack of knowledge about charities, lack of time to research charities, or some other reason?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Financial Situation	342	62
Distrust that Donations will be well Spent	82	15
Lack of Knowledge About Charities	39	7
Lack of Time to Research Charities	31	6
Some Other Reason	46	8
Don't Know	11	2
Total	551	100

Asked only of those respondents who answered they give something in the previous question (Table 17). These respondents (566) were skipped in the next question/Table 19.

Other Responses: Too many organizations; Don't like when they call on the phone and ask for money; How they solicit their funds; Choose not to give more; We give to charities that are within our religion and how they their charities; Greedy; Varies from charity to charity; Don't earn enough; Combination of reason; Giving as much as he can; No; I don't understand the question; Too much tax paid; Gives enough; Health issues (family has cancer, she'd give to cancer charities); Donated to grandchildren; Lack of time; Mix of all the above; Husband doesn't always agree on what charities to give to; Give enough; Too many requests; 5% is enough to give to charity; Personal; Medical cost; Don't think some organization use the money right.

**Table 19:
Why Respondent Doesn't Give**

“What prevents you from giving? Is it your financial situation, distrust that donations will be well spent, lack of knowledge about charities, lack of time to research charities, or you choose not to give?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Financial Situation	17	43
Distrust that Donations will be well Spent	8	20
Lack of Knowledge About Charities	3	8
Lack of Time to Research Charities	1	2
I Just Choose not to Give	7	17
Don't Know	4	10
Total	40	100

Asked only of those who answered they Don't Give, or Don't Know or Refused in question contained in Table 16. All respondents skipped to the demographic questions contained in Tables 23-25.

**Table 20:
Place of Donations**

“Do you tend to donate money primarily to charities that only support local communities in Minnesota, those charities that only support national causes or those that only support international causes?”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Local Communities	331	61
National Causes	98	18
International Causes	79	14
Don't Know	39	7
Total	548	100

Asked only of those respondents who answered they give to charities (Table 16) and the two follow up questions about giving (Tables 17, 18). These respondents were also asked all remaining questions.

**Table 21:
Factors Affecting Giving**

**“Thanks. What factors affect your giving decisions? Is it?”
(Answer Options Read; Multiple Responses Allowed)**

	RESPONSES		PERCENT OF CASES
	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	
Mission of the organization	278	33	51
How financially healthy the charity is	122	14	23
The percentage of funds spent on programs and services	120	14	22
Whether the charity has met standards of accountability	101	12	19
The charity's impact on communities	156	19	29
Other	32	4	6
Don't Know	34	4	6
Total	844	100	156

Other Responses: Personal reasons; What kind it is; I also have to believe in what they are doing; Personal interest; What her situation is financially; Recommendation from people I know; My heart; Friends; Research and Development of charities; Trust in organization and belief in the cause; Local impact; Something that influence me to help the charity, to see the result of my help; Things that apply to the person's direct life - people I know - things that would go to People who have certain special needs - diseases; Duty to share income and support Christian things.

**Table 22:
Information Sources about Charities**

**“Where do you get information about the charities before giving? Is it?”
(Answer Options Read; Multiple Responses Allowed)**

	RESPONSES		PERCENT OF CASES
	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	
Television	129	14	24
Radio	83	9	15
Newspaper	162	18	29
A charity's direct mail to you	158	17	29
A charity's e-mail to you	42	5	8
A charity's own website	74	8	14
Internet, but not the charity's website	144	16	26
Other	107	12	19
Don't Know	17	2	3
Total	916	100	167

Other Responses: More through personal knowledge; Given to them for a long time, doesn't remember; Through friends; From church; Medical field; Volunteered; Word of mouth; Church; Through work; Working with charities; Different businesses; Hearing from friends and family, church; Word of mouth; Personal interest; From own experience in life; Church; Through people; Church; Word of mouth, and employment; Own personal findings, IRS; Personal; Door to door; From people I know; Word of mouth; Directly from a person; Word of mouth; Local personal, friends; Interested in, know from some other people; In her company's catalogue; Word of mouth; In person; Firefighter; At church; From work; Talk to charity representative; Word of mouth; Fund raisers; Church; Personal contact; Church and health field; Herself and personal decision; From others; Christian program; Personal Contact; Word of mouth; American Heart Assoc; Word of mouth; Speaking with organization representative; The personal contact and connection; Magazines; Local volunteers, church; Volunteer; Church; Experiences being at a place and word of mouth; Recommendations of other people; Word of mouth; Personal knowledge; Experiences; Work; From friends; Word of mouth; Telephone; Word of mouth; Word of mouth; Personal; Word of mouth; Word of mouth; Word of mouth; From other sources; Word of mouth; Looking up consumer groups; At church; Friends; Word of mouth well known; Words of mouth; Word of mouth; Publications; Word of mouth; Other people; Neighbors; So many ways.

VI. Demographic Indicators

This section of the questionnaire began with the following statement: Thank you. The following demographic questions will help us determine if we are getting a random sample for statistical purposes.

Table 23: Gender		
“Gender was derived from the sampling process in each household.”		
RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Male	297	49
Female	309	51
Total	606	100

Table 24: Ethnic Classification		
“Which of the following best describes your ethnic classification?” (Response Categories Read as was Necessary)		
RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Asian	50	9
Black or African American	33	6
Caucasian or European	396	72
Hispanic/Latino	20	4
Native American	20	4
Other	22	4
Don't Know	8	1
Total	548	100

**Table 25:
Age**

**“What age group are you a member of? Are you?”
(Response Categories Read as was Necessary)**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
18-24	45	8
25-34	108	19
35-44	123	21
45-54	139	24
55-65	81	14
Over 65	77	13
Don't Know	5	1
Total	578	100

**Table 26:
Income**

**“Would you please tell me the range which best represents the total yearly income, before taxes, of all immediate family living in your household?”
(Response Categories Read as was Necessary)**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Under \$15,000	47	10
\$15,001-\$35,000	65	14
\$35,001 - \$50,000	85	18
\$50,001 - \$75,000	109	23
\$75,001 - \$ 100,000	77	16
\$100,001 - \$150,000	31	7
More than \$150,000	13	3
Don't Know	40	9
Total	467	100

**Table 27:
Area Code**

“Area Code was Imported from the Data Base”

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
218	82	13
320	83	14
507	92	15
612	42	7
651	114	19
763	120	20
952	74	12
Total	606	100