



TAKE 5. GIVE 5. SURVEY FINDINGS:

Guiding New Philanthropy
in Greater Philadelphia

February 2010

Presented by:



osirisgroup™

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... PAGE 1

INTRODUCTION..... PAGE 7

LITERATURE REVIEW..... PAGE 9

METHODOLOGY PAGE 16

STUDY FINDINGS..... PAGE 18

STUDY LIMITATIONS..... PAGE 33

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS PAGE 34

ENDNOTES..... PAGE 36



Executive Summary

The idea for Generocity started with a simple question: is there a way of encouraging ordinary folks throughout Greater Philadelphia to get more involved in their communities, increase their charitable giving, and devote more time to volunteer activities?

After some initial review of trends in the philanthropic world and beyond, we quickly saw that, yes, with a smart design based on rigorous research, it was possible to create something new that could really move the needle on these issues.

We believe that “something” is an online publication dedicated to telling the stories of individuals, charities, nonprofits, schools and businesses in the region who are working to improve our communities. Couple that with a unique set of online tools and resources to make it easier for nonprofits to fundraise online, and help businesses and individuals find and support these causes and groups, and you’ve got a perfect partnership between inspiration and action.

The basic, underlying assumption that drove our early planning process is that people could be compelled to act by relevant information and by reducing barriers to locating and supporting local causes. As we thought through this unique online destination, we aggressively researched environmental trends and similar initiatives across the Web. This research led to three important trends that have served as an important foundation for us: cause journalism, citizen philanthropy and ethical consumerism.

By November 2009, we decided we had a basic outline of what we were trying to do and how we wanted to do it. Our next logical step was to test whether our assumptions and program design would be understood, accepted and used by Greater Philadelphia.

The Incentive. We decided to launch an online survey called “Take 5. Give 5.” Our goal was to gather the market research we need to help refine our plans for Generocity, but we also wanted to approach the survey in a way that reinforced the idea that we were different, innovative, and committed to helping nonprofits throughout the region.

To help signal all this, we built an incentive into the survey design. The purpose was to both drive response and get respondents thinking about localized, online microgiving and the potential that new philanthropic thinking could have for the region. The “Take 5. Give 5.” incentive offered each person who took five minutes to complete the survey the ability to designate any registered nonprofit in the region to receive a \$5 donation from Generocity.

In the end, this simple act helped inject an additional \$25,000 into a nonprofit community desperate for resources. A small gesture, we know, but we hope the region sees it as just a hint of what Generocity could bring to the region.

Our Sample. The incentive played a part in the strong response to the survey, but anecdotally we were repeatedly told that it had only marginal influence when people were choosing whether or not to participate. Key to overall participation was information; once people knew about the survey and what we were trying to do, they were overwhelmingly willing to take part.

That is why the promotional support we received from the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania, WHY?, NBC 10 and the Philadelphia Inquirer was so pivotal to our efforts. This get-the-word-out effort helped us exceed our participation goals. We originally sought 4,000

people to take our survey, and figured it would take at least two months to reach that goal. Turns out, more than 5,000 responded within one month.

People from throughout the five-county region—representing a wide range of community roles, including parents/guardians, young professionals, nonprofit leaders, business executives, teachers, students and members of faith-based organizations—took the time to complete our survey. Our sample also included large subsamples of both men and women, major race/ethnic groups (African American, Asian American, Hispanic and white), a wide age range, and diverse household incomes and educational levels.

It is important to note here—and we freely acknowledge—the limitations of our sample: it was a self-selected, non-randomized group; limited to those with Internet access; and may represent the opinions of those with a predilection for giving.

Findings: Basic Values. With all this in mind, we are quite encouraged by our survey findings. Our respondents told us in unambiguous terms there is an underreporting of stories about ordinary people doing extraordinary things to improve the lives of others; that microgiving in Greater Philadelphia can be impactful; that the choices we make about what we buy and who we work for are motivated, in part, by our personal values.

Some highlights of specific responses help tell this story:

- Nine out of ten (92%) of respondents agreed that not enough is being written about ordinary people in Greater Philadelphia who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment.
- Even more (96%) agreed or strongly agreed that donating money to causes, charities and nonprofits—no matter how small the amount—can make a difference.
- Eight out ten (84%) reported that they would work for the company that is better known for its community involvement if given a choice between two comparable companies.
- Eight out of ten (81%) also said they would more likely buy a product that is tied to a cause, charity, or nonprofit over a similar product that is not. Most respondents regardless of their gender, race/ethnicity, or income share these four views.

Findings: Demand & Alternatives. We were also told there is a demand for the kinds of content and features Generocity will offer, and that there are currently no viable (or at least well-known) alternatives. These features included what we expect to be the backbone of Generocity's offerings: stories that inspire them to get more involved in their communities; a comprehensive directory of nonprofits; parent-friendly information that can be used to teach kids about the importance of giving back; and consumer information about what a company or product stands for.

A few specific examples:

- The majority of respondents (96%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a comprehensive and well-organized database of local causes, charities, and nonprofits, with a description of each, viewable by zip code and on a map.
- The majority of respondents (93%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a website that provides “how-to” information and advice from local experts on various topics about Greater Philadelphia's causes, charities, and nonprofits.

- The majority of respondents (92%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use compelling stories and photography about people in the region who are doing things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment.

Despite this apparent demand, there does not seem to be compelling existing alternatives. For instance, most respondents either do not know what website they'd visit (64%) or could not remember the domain name of the website they'd visit (10%) to read stories about people in the region who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment. And even for those who did list alternatives, there was no hint of a consensus. No single alternative came close to capturing even 1% of the total sample, and only a few were actually publications or websites that truly focused on the kinds of issues Generocity will. Most were general publications or websites like philly.com or even google.com.

One possible exception to this lack of alternative may be information on volunteer opportunities in the region. Half of the respondents were able to either cite a website they've used or said they knew of one. Among the most-often cited, several were websites that were either entirely dedicated to or gave prominent placement for information on volunteer opportunities. This tells us there may be partnership possibilities with existing local groups—such as Greater Philadelphia Cares and the United Way—which strive to offer easy ways to connect the public to volunteer opportunities.

Planning for Success. The results of this survey are being used to refine our planned functionality and to set baseline metrics for measuring our future impact. We are already starting to determine the ways we will gauge our overall success from data findings; this includes challenging ourselves to help increase, not only how much people give, but also to how many different groups they give. And we'd like to do this by encouraging and facilitating online microgiving, which seems to be in line with what people are already doing (only three respondents out of more than 5,000 reported not making any micro-donations, with the average smallest donation ranging from \$3 to \$18).

We realize this is a bold goal. More established websites like Charity Navigator and GuideStar, which provide databases of nonprofits (though with a national focus) were cited by less than one percent of our respondents when asked to name a website for finding and donating to causes, charities and nonprofits. We will also need to further explore to what extent people's somewhat greater reservation in using giving accounts and features, like personal dashboards, is sourced in their unfamiliarity with new Internet functionality, especially since younger (and presumably more Web-savvy) respondents reported higher likelihoods of usage.

And even with the stories that are at the heart of what we plan for Generocity, we know that it will take significant effort and smart partnerships to increase (from the current 23%) the number of people who say that among their top-three reasons for making an online donation was that they read something that inspired them. Since less than 1% of our respondents could name any single publication or website where they read this kind of content, we feel there is significant opportunity to increase this number..

Finally, we hope our nonprofit partners can use our survey findings to further develop their own plans for Internet-based philanthropy so they can more easily access new communities of supporters and revenue streams. The key take-away for them: what motivates our respondents to get engaged—more than any other driver—is the belief in a group’s mission. Second to this is actually feeling engaged and knowing that their donation is making a difference.

Conclusion. The findings of this survey have convinced us that we are on the right track with Generocity; that there is a demand for the kinds of content and features we will be offering that is not presently being fulfilled in Greater Philadelphia. It’s clear the region is open to innovative thinking when it comes to philanthropy, and we expect this interest to only grow as we get closer to the launch.

We look forward to a time in the not-too-distant future when Generocity makes it easier for everyone in Greater Philadelphia to live more generously.



Introduction

The idea for Generocity started with a simple question: is there a way of encouraging ordinary folks throughout Greater Philadelphia to get more involved in their communities, increase their charitable giving, and devote more time to volunteer activities? After some initial review of trends in the philanthropic world and beyond, we quickly saw that, yes—with a smart design based on rigorous research—it would be possible to create something new that could really move the needle on these issues.

The basic, underlying assumption that drove our early planning process is that people would be compelled to act by relevant information and by reducing barriers to finding and supporting local causes.

We believe the answer is an online publication dedicated to telling the stories of individuals, charities, nonprofits, schools and businesses in the region working to improve our communities. Couple that with a unique set of online tools and resources to make it easier for nonprofits to fundraise online, and help businesses and individuals find and support these causes and groups, and you've got a perfect partnership between inspiration and action.

The basic, underlying assumption that drove our early planning process is that people would be compelled to act by relevant information and by reducing barriers to finding and supporting local causes. As we thought through this unique online destination, we aggressively researched environmental trends and similar initiatives across the Web, and this information enriched our efforts and designs.

In November 2009, we decided that we had a basic outline of what we were trying to do and how we wanted to do it. Our next logical step was to test whether our assumptions and program design would be understood, accepted and used by Greater Philadelphia. We decided to launch an online survey called “Take 5. Give 5.” with the following objectives in mind:

1. **To test assumptions we've made in the formation of Generocity.** Do people in the region believe there is an underreporting of stories about ordinary people doing extraordinary things to improve the lives of others? That microgiving can, in fact, make a difference? That the choices we make about what we buy and who we work for are motivated, in part, by our personal values?
2. **To confirm the need for Generocity, that is, what we believe to be our relative uniqueness as yet another Internet site.** We did this by asking people in the region to name the publication or website where they read the last story that inspired them to get more involved in their communities; where they go to access a directory of nonprofits to donate to; where parents can find information they can use to teach their kids about the importance of giving back; and where the everyday consumer can find information to make more informed choices about what they buy based on what a company or product stands for.
3. **To learn more about the philanthropic behavior of people in the region.** We wanted to do this for two reasons: one, to refine the functionality specifications of our site; and secondly, to set baseline metrics as a gross gauge for any possible effects of operating Generocity five years hence. Thus, we asked respondents how much they donated to nonprofits in our region last year, and to cite their top three motivators for

making a contribution. Because we hope Generocity will help make the act of online microgiving (and the idea of citizen philanthropy) second nature, we specifically asked people to tell us the smallest amount they've ever donated and about their comfort level in making online donations.

4. To get targeted feedback on the initial set of the various components and features that we were planning for Generocity. This includes the online publication of stories about changemakers in the region, a comprehensive directory of nonprofits, a listing of action projects to which online visitors could make micro-donations, the ability to set up giving accounts, personal dashboards summarizing your giving history, etc. We wanted to know to what extent people thought they would use each feature.

It took us just one month to receive 5,080 responses, 127% of our original goal.

Another goal of the survey, though not captured in any of the individual questions, was to assess the region's overall interest in Generocity. As a proxy, we decided to use their willingness to participate in the survey process. We set an aggressive goal of 4,000 responses to the survey, which we based on the response rate of other regional surveys. Would we ever be able to reach this target? If so, how many months would it take us?

Key to this approach was ensuring that the region knew about the survey; after all, how could it be said that people were uninterested in something they weren't aware of? We received support from the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania, WHYY, NBC10 and the *Philadelphia Inquirer* to help us publicize the survey. Even knowing the value of their support, we were overwhelmed by the response to the survey: it took us just one month to receive 5,080 responses, 127% of our original goal.

Lastly, we hoped to use key aspects of the survey process as a demonstration of how Generocity plans to act and function differently. We built an incentive into the survey design, both to drive response and to get respondents thinking about localized, online microgiving and the potential that new philanthropic thinking could have for the region. The "Take 5. Give 5." incentive offered each person who took five minutes to complete the survey the ability to designate any registered nonprofit in the region to receive a \$5 donation from Generocity.

In the end, this simple act helped inject an additional \$25,000 into a nonprofit community desperate for resources. A small gesture, we know, but we hope the region sees it as a proof-of-concept for the ideas inspiring Generocity.

Literature Review

Three of these stood out to us as important foundations upon which to evolve the Generocity model: cause journalism, citizen philanthropy and ethical consumerism.

Early in the inception of Generocity, we began a wide-ranging review of trends, impacting not only philanthropy, but also popular culture in general, evolving technology, and the psychological foundations of emerging social media applications. Our goal was to try to learn if there was new thinking, new research or new attitudes already in the ether we could incorporate and/or appropriate into our eventual offerings that would help advance our underlying goals.

Well, we hit pay dirt. As we reviewed relevant literature, there were several themes and ideas that kept reoccurring in various contexts. Three of these stood out to us as important foundations upon which to evolve the Generocity model: cause journalism, citizen philanthropy and ethical consumerism. Since these were such important concepts in our thinking, they also became an important framework for survey design.

CAUSE JOURNALISM

Journalism is in the midst of a radical transformation. The old model with even small markets having various print and electronic outlets, each competing for and aggressively pursuing news of all stripes is long since past. Today, even a major city like Philadelphia has precious few reporters out pounding beats—working, as the old adage goes, not to just cover news, but to uncover it. Media consolidation, the declining profitability of news departments, the rise of opinion-driven journalism (where facts are often inconvenient)—have all contributed to the weakening of the level of local journalism available to the average citizen. Ironic, in an age that prides itself on an explosion of communications options.

A good source of context about this phenomenon is the Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy, a joint effort of the Aspen Institute and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. This commission produces key research documenting these trends and proposing policy responses. A key theme and frequent refrain in their material: “Journalism does not need saving so much as it needs creating.”

Eric Newton, vice president of the journalism program at the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, said in a recent opinion article in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* that there are bright spots and new journalistic paradigms rising to fill voids:

Through cause journalism, we don’t just want to inform people, but inspire them to act.

“At EveryBlock.com you can find news from 103 neighborhoods in Philadelphia, by block. At Printcasting.com, you can see how people can become publishers, starting their own magazines in just five minutes. At Spot.Us, you can see how people donate \$10 or \$20 to pay for the kinds of new stories they want to see. Traditional news organizations are also using digital technology to their advantage. They’re reaching greater numbers than ever, working with local bloggers and citizen journalists, interacting with, rather than talking at, their communities.”¹

We see Generocity fitting into this new wave of journalism by telling the stories of “everyday heroes” and things that are happening

right here in Greater Philadelphia that will motivate people to get involved. Through cause journalism, we don't just want to inform people, but inspire them to act.

CITIZEN PHILANTHROPY

The rise of new online and social media outlets, capitalizing on existing behavioral dispositions, has precipitated the founding of a new kind of philanthropist, the kind that elects a President five dollars at a time and raises \$5,000 for clean water from a new Internet army of supporters. The impact of these "micro-efforts" rests with the magnitude of their following, which can be quite considerable, as the rise of microgiving and impact of ethical consumerism can attest.

Our belief at Generocity is that anyone can be a philanthropist and every dollar makes a difference.

At the heart of what we're talking about is microgiving: "the charitable donation of small increments of money from a single donor to a single recipient."² And never has this untapped source of philanthropic revenue been so important as the effects of the current economic crisis triggered the biggest decline in charitable giving since 1956.³

Scott Harrison, founder and president of microgiving pioneer charity:water said, "I see microgiving as the next stage of online fundraising." He has reason to believe so, as the beneficiary of several microgiving campaigns. One such charity:water effort, undertaken by Twitter-user Laura Fitton, raised more than \$25,000. After all, says Harrison, "the idea of thousands of \$2 gifts adding up to wells in

Africa that impact thousands of lives is something everybody can get behind."⁴

Microgiving as a fundraising strategy came of age during the 2008 U.S. Presidential campaign, when Barack Obama raised unprecedented sums in small donations from thousands of ordinary Americans. As with charity:water, Obama's campaign found the combination of microgiving and social media crucial to its success. According to Matthew Fraser, Ph.D., "[Obama] was the only candidate to master [Web 2.0 technology] and use platforms like Facebook and YouTube to appeal to a new generation of Web-savvy voters. He is the first occupant of the White House to have won a presidential election on the Web."⁵

This new generation of voters was reflected in contributions to the Obama campaign: 47% of contributors donated \$200 or less to his campaign, while 27% donated \$2,300 or more.⁶ Clearly, and here in the words of Joe Rospars, new media director for Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign, "The biggest lesson nonprofits can draw from Barack Obama's ability to raise more than \$100 million online in a faltering economy is that fundraising now flows from engagement."⁷

Coupled with strategic use of online and social media, microgiving has proven instrumental to the success of both of these (and countless other) endeavors. This includes the ongoing Haiti disaster relief effort as we all seem increasingly less surprised to hear that groups like the American Red Cross have raised more than \$3 million via the Web, mobile texting and Twitter.

Our belief at Generocity is that anyone can be a philanthropist and every dollar makes a difference. Through our website and programs, the region will be able to easily give as little as \$1 to a variety of organizations through personal giving accounts, and still get the same level of choice, transparency, and feedback that is traditionally reserved for someone who gives thousands or millions. We believe people want to know how their money is being

spent, and how their time, energy and dollars are contributing to the organization's mission. People want more, not less, engagement.

Americans are discovering the strength of their consumer power and are exercising their right to leverage it as a vehicle for good.

ETHICAL CONSUMERISM

Like the citizen philanthropist, the American consumer appears to have adopted a similar attitude as consumer trends point to a surge of corporate social responsibility and the rising popularity (and effectiveness) of cause marketing.

More and more of us buy products and support companies that represent our personal values. That's what ethical consumerism is all about, and there is data to support associated trends.

A recent *Time* magazine poll of 1,003 adults reported that 40% purchased a product in 2009 because they liked the social or political values of the company that produced it. Nine out of ten said they value companies that positively impact social issues more than those that do not. Eight out of ten said they believe companies have a responsibility to support social causes; moreover, they want companies to talk about their efforts to support social causes. Only four out of ten, however, said they believe that companies are communicating this kind of information well.⁸

Americans are discovering the strength of their consumer power and are exercising their right to leverage it as a vehicle for good, putting “[their] money where [their] ideals are,” by demonstrating dedication to companies that engage in morally-sound business practices. The *Time* magazine article continues: “In America, we are recalibrating our sense of what it means to be a citizen, not just through voting or volunteering but also through what we buy... We are seeing the rise of the citizen consumer—and the beginnings of a responsibility revolution.”

In the marketplace, there are several noteworthy examples of how ethical consumerism is shaping the way we shop and make decisions about who and what we support through our spending:

- Think about Dove. Not too long ago, it was just a bar of soap; because of its “real beauty” campaign, now it stands for positive self-image for girls and women.
- Yoplait's partnership with the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure and their joint-campaign, “Save Lids to Save Lives,” has expanded the yogurt company's consumer base while increasing funding for the breast cancer foundation. For every pink lid consumers turn in, Yoplait makes a 10-cent donation to Race for the Cure.

While many companies are following these consumer developments, much of corporate America (including those headquartered in our region) is still catching up; currently, only 59% of the 1,000 largest U.S. companies have publicly available environmental policies, while fewer than 8% of participating companies enlist a third party to verify claims of benevolence.⁹ Generocity will incorporate this obvious consumer need with its mission to promote local businesses that, not only engage in morally sound practices, but also support regional causes and charities.

RELEVANT WEBSITES

A key part of our overall research effort was to assemble an inventory of existing websites, publications and organizations that offer some of the content and functionality we envision for Generocity. After a fairly comprehensive research process, we have determined that competitive models typically fall into one of these broad categories:

Online Publications

These websites offer stories and reporting on topics related to charitable organizations and activities:

- **GOOD Magazine** (www.good.is): GOOD is an integrated media platform that produces a website, videos, live events, and a print magazine. GOOD refers to itself as “a company and community for the people, businesses, and NGOs moving the world forward.” GOOD has seven non-conventional cause areas, such as “art and design” and “food,” and their website’s content is primarily driven by daily staff bloggers and monthly magazine article posts. The website is well-known for its visual aesthetics and as a forum for cause-marketing.
- **Other online publications:**
 - The Daily Beast (www.thedailybeast.com)
 - The Huffington Post (www.huffingtonpost.com)
 - Media Mobilizing Project (www.mediamobilizing.org)
 - The Notebook (www.thenotebook.org)
 - *The Philadelphia Inquirer/Daily News* (www.philly.com)
 - *Philadelphia Magazine* (www.phillymag.com)
 - Philadelphia Social Innovations Journal (www.philasocialinnovations.org)
 - Plan Philly (www.planphilly.com)
 - Politico (www.politico.com)
 - Salon (www.salon.com)
 - *Two One Five Magazine* (www.twoonefivemagazine.com)
 - *Utne Reader* (www.utne.com)

Charity Databases/Evaluators

These websites generally provide the sole service of providing broad information about a charity, usually through the publication of such public information as the nonprofit’s tax return.

- **Charity Navigator** (www.charitynavigator.org): Charity Navigator is the nation’s largest evaluator of charities. Using a numbers-based rating system, Charity Navigator assesses two broad areas of a charity’s financial health: (1) how responsibly it functions day-to-day, and (2) how well positioned it is to sustain its programs over time. Each charity is then awarded an overall rating, ranging from zero to four stars. The site is navigable by charity name, location or type of activity and also features opinion pieces by Charity Navigator experts, donation tips, and top-10 and bottom-10 lists which rank efficient and inefficient organizations in a number of categories.

- **GuideStar** (www.guidestar.org): GuideStar gathers and publicizes information about nonprofit organizations. GuideStar allows nonprofits to submit and update information about their organization, and then combines the information that nonprofits supply. Most of the information on GuideStar's website is available to visitors for free; however, for a fee, visitors can access tools to analyze nonprofit data and perform pre-grant due diligence. GuideStar also partners with Network for Good to enable visitors to make donations to nonprofits in their database.
- **Other charity databases/evaluators:**
 - Charity Guide (www.charityguide.org)
 - Charity Watch (www.charitywatch.org)
 - Great Nonprofits (www.greatnonprofits.com)
 - Idealist (www.idealist.org)
 - Just Give (www.justgive.org)

Online Giving or Volunteer Tools

These websites offer quick and easy services that enable individuals and groups to donate to or volunteer for specific causes in innovative ways:

- **Better the World** (www.bettertheworld.com): Better the World is a “free and easy way to raise money for charities.” It connects individuals with corporations and worthy charities. Individuals join existing “causes” on the website and reserve space on their cause’s page where corporations can advertise. Then, a percentage of the advertising revenue is donated to specified charities and causes. Every advertisement reads: “Every time you see this ad, you’re raising money for your cause!”
- **Donors Choose** (www.donorschoose.org): Donors Choose is a website that allows public school teachers from every corner of America to post supply requests for classroom projects. Requests range from pencils for a poetry writing unit, to violins for a school recital, to microscope slides for a biology class. Site visitors browse requests and give any amount of money to the projects they want to support. Once a project reaches its funding goal, Donors Choose delivers the materials to the school.
- **Network for Good** (www.networkforgood.org): Network for Good is a secure, convenient donation system that allows users to donate and volunteer online. For those who want to donate, Network for Good allows you to research and give to any of the 1.5 million charities in its database, tracking your donation history for taxes and favorite charities lists. Users can make reoccurring donations, donate in another person’s name, as well as purchase a gift card that the recipient can use to give to any charity. More than \$200,000 is donated to charities per day through their website.
- **VolunteerMatch** (www.volunteermatch.org): VolunteerMatch works to make it easier for people and causes to connect through volunteer opportunities. VolunteerMatch is the preferred recruiting tool for more than 71,000 nonprofit organizations, including United Way of Southeastern PA. To find volunteering opportunities, users enter their zip code, city or state and keywords describing the opportunity they’re looking for.
- **Other online giving or volunteer tools:**
 - Charity: water (www.charitywater.org)

- Donor Tools (www.donortools.com)
- Dream Bank (www.dreambank.org)
- The Extraordinaries (www.beextra.org)
- First Giving (firstgiving.com)
- Free Rice (www.freerice.com)
- Give A Click (www.givaclick.com)
- Give Clicks (www.giveclicks.com)
- Givezooks (www.givezooks.com)
- I'm Doing My Part (www.imdoingmypart.org)
- Kiva (www.kiva.org)
- Printcasting (www.printcasting.com)
- Spot.Us (www.spot.us)
- UPromise (www.upromise.com)
- Vittana (www.vittana.org)

Online Giving Communities

These websites leverage social networks and online giving tools to connect individuals and organizations with worthy causes:

- **Care2** (www.care2.com): Care2 is a social network website that helps connect “individuals, organizations, and responsible businesses making an impact.” Care2 members create an online identity by filling out a profile with personal information, as in most social networking sites, but Care2 also asks for information about its members’ involvement in activism. The social interactions on Care2 revolve around groups that connect people who care about similar issues. Internet petitions and news articles posted by members are frequently used.
- **Change** (www.change.org): Built upon a platform of stories or “posts” about social and environmental issues, Change works to connect people with causes and the nonprofits that are taking action to make a difference. By creating a user profile, individuals become part of Change’s social network that enables them to further causes by engaging other members, start and sign online petitions, fundraise and make donations.
- **Taking It Global** (www.tigweb.org): Taking It Global is a global online network for “youth everywhere to become actively engaged and connected in shaping a more inclusive, peaceful and sustainable world.” The website features content and tools for educators to facilitate rich, interactive learning experiences, outreach and collaboration tools for events, networks, campaigns, and causes.
- **Other online giving communities:**
 - Changemakers (www.changemakers.com)
 - Do Something (www.dosomething.org)
 - Givology (www.givology.org)
 - Global Giving (www.globalgiving.com)
 - Microgiving (www.microgiving.com)
 - New Global Citizens (www.newglobalcitizens.org)

- Pittsburgh Cares (www.pittsburghcares.org)
- Six Degrees (www.sixdegrees.org)
- Social Edge (www.socialedge.org)
- Triangle Gives Back (www.trianglegivesback.org)
- Wiser Earth (www.wiserearth.org)
- Your Cause (www.yourcause.com)
- Youth Noise (www.youthnoise.com)

Regional Charity-Support Organizations

These umbrella organizations are designed to support and provide funding and other resources directly to nonprofits working within Greater Philadelphia:

- **Greater Philadelphia Cares** (www.gpcares.com): Greater Philadelphia Cares is the largest provider of volunteer services in the region. Greater Philadelphia Cares highlights their daily activities and projects and provides a calendar of volunteering opportunities for individuals, groups, and businesses.
- **United Way of Southeastern PA** (www.uwsepa.org): United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania strives to improve people's lives by leveraging the power of donors, volunteers and communities. The UWSEPA website allows individuals, groups, and businesses to champion causes by emailing friends "action alerts" for legislative bills, donate money to United Way online, and find volunteer opportunities with nonprofits in the region through VolunteerMatch.

Other regional charity-support organizations:

- Delaware Valley Grantmakers (www.dvg.org)
- Give Philly (www.givephilly.org)
- Making a Progressive Philadelphia (MAPP) (www.phillymapp.com)
- The Philadelphia Foundation (www.philafound.org)
- The Nonprofit Center at LaSalle University (www.lasallenonprofitcenter.org)

Methodology

TARGET POPULATION

Because our eventual product will be an Internet site, we thought it only natural that our survey also be Internet-based. In addition to targeting Internet users, we were also particularly interested in targeting people who live in Greater Philadelphia given our local focus. But other than these two characteristics, we decided to cast the widest net possible to see who would respond to the survey as an initial indicator of Generocity's core audience.

More than 20,000 people received notices about our survey in their email inboxes.

RECRUITMENT

We made a concerted effort to develop and execute a smart recruitment strategy to achieve the participation levels we sought (at least 4,000). As such, this strategy had multiple elements:

- **“Take 5. Give 5.” Incentive.** We advertised that Generocity would donate \$5 to any regional nonprofit of each respondent's choice for taking five minutes to complete our online survey.
- **Advertisement.** We placed advertisements in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* (full page ad on 11/12/09 and half page ads on 11/10/09 and 11/15/09), the *Philadelphia Daily News* (full page ad on 11/13/09), WHYY radio (29 spots 11/18/09–11/26/09), WHYY website (banner ad 11/18/09–12/13/09), WHYY In the Loop e-newsletter, WHYY ticker tape on the exterior of their building at Race and Vine Streets (11/19/09–11/25/09), and television plugs on NBC10's Good News (11/27/09 and 12/04/09) and NBC10's website (12/07/09–12/14/09) potentially reaching over a million people based on average circulation, listenership, viewership and Web traffic data.
- **Public Relations.** We distributed a press release announcing the launch of the survey to every media outlet in the region.
- **E-blasts.** More than 20,000 people received notices about our survey in their email inboxes. This includes the more than 12,000 recipients of United Way's *What Matters* e-newsletter, the email databases of various agencies, and personal contacts.
- **Social Media.** We created Facebook and Twitter pages to help promote the launch of the survey. Once the survey began, we used these pages to encourage fans and followers to forward information about the survey to their networks.
- **Coffee Klatches.** We held three invitation-only coffee klatches, that is, forums for community leaders to learn about Generocity and our “Take 5. Give 5.” Survey. Many who attended a klatch assisted with our public outreach efforts by making personal appeals of their own.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

We created a self-report Web survey based on our research objectives and literature review. The survey consists of five sections totaling 34 research and nine demographic questions.

- The first section on philanthropic views was comprised of four questions that asked people to respond using a five-point Likert scale.
- The second section was comprised of six questions that asked people to either cite a specific publication/website reference or respond that they couldn't remember or didn't know of one.
- The third section was comprised of eight questions that asked respondents to specify information tied to their past giving or volunteering experiences. Two additional items in this section asked people to select options or type in their response.
- The fourth section was made up of 14 questions, each of which asked respondents to select one of five options to convey to what extent they believe they would use a website feature or component tied to philanthropy.
- The fifth, and final, section asked standard demographic questions: date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, educational level, and household income. We also asked respondents to specify their home zip code, their occupation using an open-ended field, and to select options describing their self-perceived role(s) and the ways they heard about Generocity.

PROCEDURE

Once people arrived at the Generocity.org site, they could click on a “Take 5. Give 5.” survey link, which then took them to a page that provided a brief explanation of the survey. Online visitors then could start taking the survey, completing each section chronologically before proceeding to the next section. Once they completed all five sections, participants were asked to either specify a nonprofit that would receive the \$5 donation from Generocity, or to select one of the charities we listed as default options. Participants could choose to share their contact information with us, send us additional input, sign up for our mailing list, and let us know if they are interested in volunteering with Generocity.

DATA ANALYSIS

In analyzing the data, we first obtained frequency distributions and descriptive summary statistics.

We then examined the response distributions of each variable, both visually (using graphs) and statistically (using frequency counts, percentages, summary statistics, such as the median, means, standard deviations, and their 95% standard errors).

Based on each survey item's content, metrics, and distribution, we identified and eliminated anomalies. Then we recomputed the frequency distributions and descriptive summary statistics once more. Written responses, such as “prefer not to answer” and “don't remember” were initially included to examine their prevalence, and then excluded in the second analysis.

The overall sample size provided large enough gender, race/ethnicity, household income and education level subsamples to compute subsample statistics with small margins of errors (i.e., +/- three to five percentage points with a 95% confidence interval). Stratified analyses were conducted to describe and compare the responses by gender, ethnicity, household income and education level.

Study Findings

TABLE I: Demographic Overview of Respondents

	Sample Size	Percentage	95% Margin of Error
Overall			
	5,080	100%	± 1.3%
Gender			
Male	1,358	27%	± 3%
Female	3,722	73%	± 2%
Race/Ethnicity			
African American	426	9%	± 4%
Asian American	198	4%	± 8%
Hispanic	112	2%	± 10%
White	4,103	85%	± 1%
Age			
8-105	4,676	Mean/s.d. 38.79/18.6	Median=36 Q1=36; Q3=51
Adults: 18-90	4,168	Mean/s.d. 39.79/14.2	Median=38 Q1=27; Q3=51
Household Income (Adults: 18-90)			
\$100,000+	658	16%	± 4%
80,000 – 99,999	759	18%	± 4%
50,000 – 79,999	925	22%	± 3%
30,000 – 49,999	520	12%	± 4%
0 – 29,999	1,306	31%	± 3%
Education Levels (Adults: 18-90)			
Did not graduate high school	18	<1%	± 24%
Still in secondary school	63	1%	± 12%
GED	21	1%	± 22%
High school diploma	491	12%	± 4%
Vocational school	103	2%	± 10%
Bachelor's degree	1,929	46%	± 2%
Master's degree	1,052	25%	± 3%
Professional degree	325	8%	± 5%
Doctorate degree	166	4%	± 10%

OUR SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS

A total of 5,080 people completed our survey. Within three days of launching the survey, we already had responses from 425 people. Within a week, participation grew five-fold to over 2,000. Because we surpassed 3,500 responses by the end of the second week, we decided to keep the survey going until we reached 5,000—which we did within 30 days of launch.

The final sample represents 1,358 (27%) males and 3,722 (73%) females. Eighty-five percent (4,103) describe themselves as white; 9% (426) as African American, 4% (198) as Asian American, and 2% (112) as Hispanic. We had a wide age representation with the youngest reporting to be eight years old and the eldest to be 105. The median age was 36. To review data on household incomes and education levels, we focused on an 18-90 age subsample.

The survey respondents represent a relatively affluent group with more than half (56%) reporting household incomes higher than \$50,000 and with the majority (84%) reporting they are college graduates. Among the 3,422 respondents with a bachelor's degree, 38% report also having achieved a master's, professional or doctorate degree.

Our respondents reflect diverse personal roles. When asked to describe the roles they assume in life, 38% reported they were parents/guardians and 27% young professionals. Nearly two out of ten respondents said they were a nonprofit executive (19%), teacher/professor (17%), student (17%), or a member of a faith-based organization (15%). We count among our sample community leaders (13%) and business owners (10%). The additional roles respondents wrote-in include nonprofit board member or employee (n=130), volunteer (n=74) and retiree (n=70).

Of the 4,595 zip codes that were reported, nearly half (49%) represent Philadelphia county zip codes. The rest of the region was also represented: Bucks (5%), Chester (4%), Delaware (15%) and Montgomery (16%). There were also people from outside the region with (we assume) ties to Greater Philadelphia that completed the survey, representing 13% of the respondents.

TABLE 2: Respondents' Viewpoints on Cause Journalism, Microgiving, Corporate Responsibility, and Ethical Consumerism

	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q1. There are a lot of untold stories that should be written about ordinary people in the Greater Philadelphia region who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment.	5,080	95 (2%)	31 (1%)	289 (6%)	1,788 (35%)	2,877 (57%)
Q2. Donating money to causes, charities and nonprofits, no matter how small the amount, can make a difference.	5,080	89 (2%)	21 (0%)	133 (3%)	1,296 (26%)	3,541 (70%)
Q3. If given a choice between two comparable companies, you would work for the company that is better known for its community involvement.	5,080	87 (2%)	78 (2%)	616 (12%)	1,803 (35%)	2,496 (49%)
Q4. As a consumer, you would be more likely to buy a product that is tied to a cause, charity, or nonprofit over a similar product that is not.	5,080	89 (2%)	181 (4%)	716 (14%)	1,871 (37%)	2,223 (44%)

Q1-Q2. Most people believe that there are a lot of untold stories that should be written about ordinary people in the Greater Philadelphia region who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment. Ninety-two percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this belief. Even more (96%) agreed or strongly agreed that donating money to causes, charities and nonprofits—no matter how small the amount—can make a difference.

Q3-Q4. Eight out of ten (84%) reported that they would work for the company that is better known for its community involvement if given a choice between two comparable companies. Eight out of ten (81%) also said they would more likely buy a product that is tied to a cause, charity, or nonprofit over a similar product that is not.

TABLE 3: Respondents' References for Cause Journalism, Nonprofit Directories, Volunteer Opportunities, Local Causes, and Ethical Consumerism

	n	Publication or Website	Can't Remember	Never Read or Don't Know
Q5. In what publication or website did you read the last story that led you to get involved in a local cause, charity or nonprofit?	5,062	1,704 (34%)	2,242 (44%)	1,116 (22%)
Q6. Let's say you're interested in reading stories online about people in the region who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment. What website would you visit?	5,064	1,288 (25%)	516 (10%)	3,260 (64%)
Q7. Let's say you want to use the Internet to find and donate to local causes, charities or nonprofits. What website would you visit?	5,067	1,659 (33%)	473 (9%)	2,935 (58%)
Q8. Let's say you want to use the Internet to find local volunteer opportunities. What website would you visit?	5,063	2,031 (40%)	491 (10%)	2,541 (50%)
Q9. Let's say you're a parent interested in using the Internet to find information about the ways your family can help others by supporting local causes, charities, and nonprofits. What website would you use?	5,070	1,221 (24%)	376 (7%)	3,473 (69%)
Q10. Let's say you're a consumer interested in using the Internet to learn about products that support local causes, charities, or nonprofits. What website would you use?	5,069	758 (15%)	399 (8%)	3,912 (77%)

Q5. Most respondents (66%) either could not remember the name of the publication or website where they read a story that led them to get involved in a local cause, charity or nonprofit (44%), or they said they never read a story that led them to get involved in a local group (22%). Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites by the 34% of the respondents who could identify a website, news outlets (n=338) were cited most often, followed by an individual nonprofit organization (n=132), then Facebook, a social networking site (n=119). Only two of the top-ten frequently cited—idealist.org (n=22) and Grid Magazine (n=18)—are websites dedicated to cause efforts. Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 4: Top-Ten Publications/Websites for a Story that Inspired Community Involvement (Cited by 34% of Respondents)

	Publication/Website	n	Percentage
1.	<i>Philadelphia Inquirer</i>	275	<1%
2.	Facebook	119	<1%
3.	PAWS	51	<1%
4.	Bike & Build	38	<1%
5.	<i>City Paper</i>	25	<1%
6.	United Way of Southeastern PA	25	<1%
7.	Idealist	22	<1%
8.	<i>Philadelphia Weekly</i>	20	<1%
9/10.	Greater Philadelphia Cares	18	<1%
	<i>Grid Magazine</i>	18	<1%
	<i>New York Times</i>	18	<1%

Q6. Most respondents (74%) either did not know what website they'd visit (64%) or could not remember the domain name of the website they visited (10%) to read stories about people in the region who are doing compelling things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment. Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites by the 25% of the respondents who named a website, news outlets (n=359) were cited most often, followed by a specific nonprofit organization (n=126), then the Google search engine (n=81) and Facebook, a social networking site (n=48). Only one of the top-ten frequently cited—idealist.org (n=29)—is a website focused on cause efforts. Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 5: Top-Ten Websites for Cause Journalism Stories (Cited by 25% of Respondents)

	Website	n	Percentage
1.	Philly.com	330	<1%
2.	Google	81	<1%
3.	United Way	73	<1%
4.	Facebook	48	<1%
5.	Idealist	29	<1%
6.	Greater Philadelphia Cares	20	<1%
7.	Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance	17	<1%
8.	Variety: The Children's Charity	16	<1%
9.	<i>Philadelphia Weekly</i>	15	<1%
10.	<i>City Paper</i>	14	<1%

Q7. Most respondents (67%) either did not know what website they'd visit (58%) or could not remember the domain name of the website they visited (9%) to find and donate to local causes, charities, or nonprofits. Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites by 33% of the respondents, the Google search engine (n=387) was cited most often, followed by three regional umbrella nonprofit organizations (United Way, Greater Philadelphia Cares, and Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance) or individual charities (n=310). Also cited were sites designed to house nonprofit directories, specifically GuideStar, Idealist, and Charity Navigator (n=187). Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 6: Top-Ten Websites for Making Donations to Nonprofits (Cited by 33% of Respondents)

	Website	n	Percentage
1.	Google	387	<1%
2.	United Way	223	<1%
3.	GuideStar	72	<1%
4.	Idealist	66	<1%
5.	Charity Navigator	49	<1%
6.	Facebook	42	<1%
7.	Greater Philadelphia Cares	37	<1%
8.	Philly.com	36	<1%
9/10.	Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance	25	<1%
	Individual charity	25	<1%

Q8. Half of the respondents did not know what website they'd visit to find local volunteer opportunities; however, the other half cited a website they visited (40%) or said they knew one, but couldn't remember the domain name (10%). Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites by the respondents who could remember, the Google search engine (n=360) was cited most often. Three of the top-ten cited most often are websites dedicated to providing information on volunteer opportunities: two national sites, Idealist (n=253) and VolunteerMatch (n=175), and one local site, Greater Philadelphia Cares (n=243). Two local umbrella nonprofits, United Way (n=189) and Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance (n=33), were also among the top-ten cited. Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 7: Top-Ten Websites for Local Volunteer Opportunities (Cited by 40% of Respondents)

	Website	n	Percentage
1.	Google	360	<1%
2.	Idealist	253	<1%
3.	Greater Philadelphia Cares	243	<1%
4.	United Way	189	<1%
5.	VolunteerMatch	175	<1%
6.	Craig's List	81	<1%
7/8.	Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance	33	<1%
	Philly.com	33	<1%
9.	PAWS	26	<1%
10.	Habitat for Humanity	17	<1%

Q9. Seven out of ten respondents did not know what website they'd visit if they were a parent interested in using the Internet to find information about the ways their family can help others by supporting local causes, charities, and nonprofits. Twenty-four percent of the respondents cited a website they would visit and 7% said they couldn't remember the name of the website they would visit if they were searching for this parent-specific information. Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites, the Google search engine or some other type of search engine (n=332) was cited most often. Three of the top-ten cited most often are websites dedicated to providing information on volunteer opportunities (227): Greater Philadelphia Cares (n=98), Idealist (n=83) and VolunteerMatch (n=46). One local umbrella nonprofit, United Way (n=154), and several individual charities (n=26) were also among the top-ten cited. Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 8: Top-Ten Websites for Parent Information on Local Causes (Cited by 24% of Respondents)

	Website	n	Percentage
1.	Google	322	<1%
2.	United Way	154	<1%
3.	Greater Philadelphia Cares	98	<1%
4.	Idealist	83	<1%
5.	VolunteerMatch	46	<1%
6.	Philly.com	31	<1%
7.	Variety: Children's Charity	16	<1%
8/9.	Craig's List	12	<1%
	Other search engine	12	<1%
10.	Individual charity	10	<1%

Q10. Approximately nine out of ten respondents did not know what website they'd visit or couldn't remember what website they'd visit if they were a consumer interested in using the Internet to learn about products that support local causes, charities, and nonprofits. Fifteen percent of the respondents cited a website they'd visit for this purpose. Among the top-ten most frequently cited websites, Google and Yahoo search engines (n=344) were cited most often. Only three of the top-ten cited are websites that gather this type of consumer information: Sustainable Business Network (n=16), Idealist (n=12) and Igive (n=10). Each of the top-ten listings was cited by less than 1% of all respondents.

TABLE 9: Top-Ten Websites for Consumer Information on Products that Support Local Causes (Cited by 15% of Respondents)

	Website	n	Percentage
1.	Google	337	<1%
2.	United Way	35	<1%
3/4.	Philly.com	22	<1%
	Product maker's website	22	<1%
5.	Sustainable Business Network	16	<1%
6.	Facebook	13	<1%
7.	Idealist	12	<1%
8.	Good Search	11	<1%
9.	Igive	10	<1%
10.	Yahoo	7	<1%

TABLE 10: Volunteering and Philanthropic Experiences

	n	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Q11. About how many times did you volunteer last year?	4,151	27	10	0	365
Q12. About how many times did you volunteer within Greater Philadelphia last year?	3,384	25	9	0	365
Q13. About how much money did you donate last year?	4,297	\$2,273	\$500	0	\$300,000
Q14. About how much money did you donate to groups within Greater Philadelphia last year?	3,487	\$1,866	\$300	0	\$250,000
Q15. To about how many different groups within Greater Philadelphia did you donate money last year?	3,485	4	3	1	50
Q16. What's the smallest amount of money you've ever donated?	4,782	\$16	\$5	0	\$5,000
Q17. What's the largest amount of money you've ever donated?	4,740	\$2,904	\$150	0	\$2,000,000
Q18. Approximately how many of the donations you made last year were done online?	2,577	4	2	0	65

Q11. Respondents reported a wide range of the number of times they volunteered last year with only two reporting they didn't volunteer at all and 65 reporting they volunteered virtually every day of the year. The median times people reported volunteering was 10 times. The middle 50% volunteered between four and 24 times last year.

Q12. Respondents reported a similar wide range in the number of times they volunteered within Greater Philadelphia last year with four reporting they didn't volunteer at all and 47 reporting they volunteered virtually every day of the year. The middle 50% said they volunteered between four and 19 times last year.

Q13. Respondents varied in the amount they donated last year, ranging from \$0 to as much as \$300,000. The median donation amount last year was \$500. The middle 50% reported donations between \$125 and \$1,400. Only one person reported not making any donation.

Q14. Respondents reported a similar wide range in the amount they donated to groups within Greater Philadelphia last year, ranging from \$0 to as much as \$250,000. The median donation amount is slightly less at \$300. The middle 50% reported donations between \$100 and \$999 to groups within Greater Philadelphia.

Q15. Most of the respondents (70%) gave donations to less than five different groups within Greater Philadelphia last year: 20% to only one group and 50% to two to four groups.

Q16. The smallest amount of donations made by respondents ranged from \$0 to \$5,000.

The median amount was \$5 and the middle 50% reported their smallest donations ranged from \$3 to \$18. Only three reported their smallest donations as being \$0.

Q17. Conversely, the largest amount of donations made by respondents ranged from \$0 to \$2,000,000. The median amount was \$150, and the middle 50% reported their largest donations ranged from \$45 to \$480.

Q18. The number of times respondents made donations online last year is variable with responses ranging from 0 to 65. With the median at two, the middle 50% reported making one to four donations online last year. Less than 1% said they made no donations online last year.

TABLE 11: Primary Reasons for Not Making Donations Online (n=5,079)

Q19. I have made or would have no problem making a donation online.	3,012 (59%)
Q19. I prefer to donate by mail or in person.	954 (19%)
Q19. I have security concerns about using my credit card online.	653 (13%)
Q19. Another reason. Please specify:	333 (7%)
Q19. The process is too complicated.	127 (3%)

Q19. Most of the respondents (59%) said they have made or would have no problem making a donation online. Twenty percent said they prefer making donations by mail or in person; 13% said they have security concerns about online transactions and 3% said it was because they thought the online process was too complicated. The other reasons cited by 7% of the respondents for not making a donation online included: preference for a more personal touch in making their donations; not wanting to pay online fees; inability of nonprofits to receive online donations; and wanting more anonymity.

TABLE 12: Top-Three Reasons For Making Donations to Local Groups (n=5,079)

Q20. I believed in the group's mission.	4,517 (89%)
Q20. I thought my donation could make a difference.	3,478 (68%)
Q20. It was connected with my community.	3,110 (61%)
Q20. I was asked.	2,026 (40%)
Q20. I read something that inspired me.	1,196 (23%)
Q20. Another reason. Please specify:	418 (8%)
Q20. I wanted a tax deduction.	344 (7%)
Q20. I've never helped a local cause, charity or nonprofit.	101 (2%)

Q20. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents said belief in a group's mission was one of the top-three reasons for making a donation. This reason outranks all others. Sixty-eight percent picked "thinking their donation could make a difference" as a top-three reason. "Feeling a connection with their community" was chosen by 61% of the respondents. "Because they were asked" was chosen by four out of ten respondents. Only 2% picked "reading something that inspired them" as one of the top-three reasons for making a donation. Respondents also wrote in the following top-three reasons for making a donation: the local group or cause affected someone close to them, they are affiliated with the local group or cause, and a friend or family member is affiliated with the local group or cause.

TABLE 13: Utilization of Proposed Generocity Features (n=5,079)

	n	Won't Use It	Probably Won't Use It	May Use It	Will Use It	Will Use It/ Encourage Others to Use It
Q21. Compelling stories and photography about people in the region who are doing things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment.	5,079	94 (2%)	321 (6%)	1,891 (37%)	1,401 (28%)	1,372 (27%)
Q22. A website that provides “how-to” information and advice from local experts on various topics about Greater Philadelphia’s causes, charities, and nonprofits.	5,080	85 (2%)	254 (5%)	1,533 (30%)	1,623 (32%)	1,585 (31%)
Q23. A website that promotes your cause-related project(s) and gives you the ability to recruit volunteers, secure donations, and show the impact of your work.	5,080	148 (3%)	385 (8%)	1,336 (26%)	1,290 (25%)	1,921 (38%)
Q24. A comprehensive and well-organized database of local causes, charities, and nonprofits, with a description of each - viewable by zipcode and on a map.	5,080	63 (1%)	170 (3%)	1,095 (22%)	1,540 (30%)	2,212 (44%)

Q21. The majority of respondents (92%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use compelling stories and photography about people in the region who are doing things to improve the lives of others, their communities, and the environment. Six percent said they probably won't use it and only 2% said they won't use it based on our short description of the feature.

Q22. The majority of respondents (93%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a website that provides “how-to” information and advice from local experts on various topics about Greater Philadelphia’s causes, charities, and nonprofits. Five percent said they probably won't use it and only 2% said they won't use it based on our short description of the feature.

Q23. The majority of respondents (89%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a website that promotes your cause-related project(s) and gives you the ability to recruit volunteers, secure donations, and show the impact of your work. Eight percent said they probably won't use it and only 3% said they won't use it based on our short description of the feature.

Q24. The majority of respondents (96%) said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a comprehensive and well-organized database of local causes, charities, and nonprofits, with a description of each, viewable by zip code and on a map. Only 3% said they probably won't use it and even less (1%) said they won't use it based on our short description of the feature.

TABLE 14: Utilization of Proposed Generocity Features (n=5,079)

	n	Won't Use It	Probably Won't Use It	May Use It	Will Use It	Will Use It/ Encourage Others to Use It
Q25a. Personalized online “giving accounts” that would emphasize the power of small donations (“microgiving”).	5,080	211 (4%)	618 (12%)	2,009 (40%)	988 (19%)	1,254 (25%)
Q25b. Personalized online “giving accounts” that would allow you to donate to regional causes, charities, and nonprofits with great flexibility.	5,080	232 (5%)	692 (14%)	2,118 (42%)	963 (19%)	1,075 (21%)
Q25c. Personalized online “giving accounts” that would allow you to create online registries to which others would contribute (e.g., as birthday or wedding gifts).	5,080	379 (7%)	1,026 (20%)	1,944 (38%)	735 (14%)	996 (20%)
Q25d. Personalized online “giving accounts” that would allow you to deposit “allowances” into a child’s online giving account to encourage philanthropy from a very young age.	5,080	761 (15%)	1,225 (24%)	1,736 (34%)	545 (11%)	813 (16%)
Q25e. Personalized online “giving accounts” that would allow you to spread your giving across many causes, charities, and nonprofits in small but meaningful denominations.	5,080	406 (8%)	999 (20%)	2,173 (43%)	712 (14%)	790 (16%)

While the majority of respondents said they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use personalized “giving accounts” that performed a variety of functionality (as expressed in survey questions Q25a – Q25e), respondents seem less convinced about their utilization of these giving account features than their utilization of compelling stories (Q21), “how-to” information (Q22), project promotion (Q23) and nonprofit directory (Q24).

Q25a. Eighty-four percent of the respondents said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use personalized online “giving accounts” that emphasize the power of small donations (“microgiving”). Twelve percent said they probably won’t use it and 4% said they won’t use it based on our short description of the feature.

Q25b. Eighty-two percent of the respondents said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use personalized online “giving accounts” that give donors more flexibility in making contributions to regional causes, charities, and nonprofits. Fourteen percent were not sure they would use it, and 5% said they won’t use it based on a short description of the feature.

Q25c. Seventy-two percent of the respondents said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use personalized online “giving accounts” that site visitors to create online registries to which others can contribute, for example, in lieu of birthday or wedding gifts. Twenty percent of the respondents were not sure they would use it, and 7% said they won’t use it based on a short description of the feature.

Q25d. Sixty-one percent of the respondents said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a feature that permits parents/guardians to deposit “allowances” into a child’s online “giving account” to encourage philanthropy from a very young age. Twenty-four percent of the respondents were less convinced they would use this feature, and 15% said they won’t use it based on a short description of the feature.

Q25e. Seventy-three percent of the respondents said that they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use personalized online “giving accounts” that allow site visitors to spread their giving across many causes, charities, and nonprofits in small but meaningful denominations. Twenty percent of the respondents were not sure they would use it, and 8% said they would not use it based on a short description of the feature.

TABLE 15: Utilization of Proposed Generocity Features (n=5,079)

	n	Won't Use It	Probably Won't Use It	May Use It	Will Use It	Will Use It/ Encourage Others to Use It
Q26. A website that allows you to connect with like-minded people to form “giving circles” focused around shared philanthropic goals.	5,080	390 (8%)	1,090 (21%)	2,100 (41%)	713 (14%)	787 (15%)
Q27. A website that shows the impact your contribution has made through the use of graphs, charts, follow up stories, etc.	5,080	180 (4%)	579 (11%)	1,910 (38%)	1,396 (27%)	1,015 (20%)
Q28. A website that helps you identify companies and products that support local causes, charities, and nonprofits through advertisements and sponsorships.	5,080	119 (2%)	330 (7%)	1,650 (32%)	1,577 (31%)	1,404 (28%)
Q29. Personalized online summaries (also called “dashboards”) that would allow you to track your giving and community involvement over time.	5,080	350 (7%)	871 (17%)	1,962 (39%)	1,043 (21%)	851 (17%)
Q30. A website that gives everyone, regardless of their age and income level, the opportunity to raise money for their favorite cause, charity or nonprofit, and become philanthropists.	5,080	171 (3%)	432 (9%)	1,856 (37%)	1,203 (24%)	1,418 (28%)

Q26-30. Approximately nine out of ten respondents said they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a website that:

- Gives everyone—regardless of their income level—the opportunity to become philanthropist by helping them raise money for their favorite cause (89%);
- Shows the impact their contribution(s) has made through the use of graphs, charts, follow-up stories, etc. (85%); and
- Identifies companies and products that support local causes, charities, and nonprofits through advertisements and sponsorships (91%).

The majority also said they may use, will use, or will use and strongly encourage others to use a website that allows you to connect with like-minded people to form “giving circles” focused around shared philanthropic goals (70%) and “dashboards” that would allow them to track their giving history (77%). They seemed, however, less sure of these two features. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents said they would not, or probably would not, join giving circles; 24% said they would not, or probably would not, use dashboards.

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

Given the relatively large subsamples, we were able to analyze the data by gender, race/ethnicity, household income, and education level. We expected and did find variations in our findings according to respondents' gender, race/ethnicity, household income and education level; yet, all the responses followed similar patterns across each demographic group. That is to say, we did not find any meaningful differences among our respondents according to their gender, race/ethnicity, income, or gender. We defined a meaningful difference as a percentage point difference greater than ten.

Several differences smaller than this, however, suggest additional research is possibly warranted to further delineate variations by these demographic variables.

- **Gender.** Compared to male respondents, a higher percentage of female respondents were able to identify websites on local volunteer opportunities (Q8). Women also said in higher proportions that they were more likely to use proposed Generocity features (Q21-Q30). Conversely, male respondents generally reported higher donation amounts than their female counterparts (Q13-Q14).
- **Race/ethnicity.** There were also variations in responses based on respondents' race/ethnicity. A higher percentage of African American and Hispanic respondents cited references to parent information about philanthropy than either Asian American and white respondents (Q9). Compared to their African American (52%), Asian American (43%) and Hispanic (50%) counterparts, white respondents (62%) had less of a problem making a donation online (Q19). A higher percentage of white respondents (90%) selected belief in a group's mission as one of their top-three reasons for making donations compared to African American (86%), Hispanic (77%) and Asian Americans (76%) who chose this less frequently (Q20).
- **Household income.** There were also several noteworthy variations in responses by differences in household income. Respondents with proportionately higher income levels reported in slightly higher percentages that they made donations because they wanted a tax deduction (Q20). It should be noted that all income groups generally selected tax purposes less frequently than other reasons for giving. People with higher income levels reported in slightly lower percentages that they had never helped a local charity (Q20) and would be likely to take part in giving circles (Q26). As expected, in higher income brackets, executives and business owners were more prevalent. Likewise, in lower income brackets, students and young professionals were more prevalent.
- **Education levels.** While there were no meaningful trends in responses based on differences in education levels, we note here several variations that may suggest further study. People with higher levels of education were more likely to say they have made or would have no problem making online donations than their counterparts with lower levels of education (Q19). A greater percentage of respondents with lower levels of education were more likely to say than their counterparts with higher levels of education that they read something that inspired them (Q20); will use giving accounts for their children (Q25d); will spread giving across many causes (Q25e); use graphs and charts to see impact of their contributions (Q27); personal dashboards (Q29); and a website that gives everyone tools to be philanthropists (Q30). Education levels, it should be noted, are also proxies for differences in age as lower levels represent greater percentages of students.

Study Limitations

As with most, if not all, research designs, there are limitations to our study that must be duly noted.

Our sample is not a random sample or regional sample of Greater Philadelphia. Instead, as a self-selected sample, our representatives' views may or may not represent prevalent regional views, or those of donors versus non-donors.

There is, however, indication of a possible donor bias in our sample: our respondents, as a group, showed a higher percentage rate of giving (99%) than the national percentage rate, which is 71% for non-secular versus 61% for secular populations to secular causes, according to Arthur C. Brooks in his book, *Who Really Cares*.¹⁰

As a group of “givers,” our respondents may have been particularly motivated to take our survey through our targeted advertisement and public outreach efforts, including the \$5 micro-donation we used as an incentive. They may also represent a community of people who disproportionately already embrace the ideals of cause journalism, citizen philanthropy, and ethical consumerism that frame our plans.

Because people could take the “Take 5. Give 5.” survey only through the Generocity website, our study was also limited to populations who have access to the Internet and the skills necessary to complete a Web questionnaire. As an Internet-based survey (compared to a mixed-mode survey), the findings of our survey may be subject to biases resulting from under-coverage and non-response; furthermore, there is no way of knowing how representative the sample is of the regional population as a whole. As with all Web surveys that use non-probability-based samples, the relationship between the sample and the population is unknown, providing no theoretical basis for computing a margin of sampling error.

Discussion of Findings

We asked people throughout Greater Philadelphia to inform our efforts as we seek to build a new approach to philanthropy in the region—and more than 5,000 answered our call.

People from throughout the five-county region—representing a wide range of community roles, including parents/guardians, young professionals, nonprofit leaders, business executives, teachers, students and members of faith-based organizations—took the time to complete our survey. Our sample also included large subsamples of both men and women, major race/ethnic groups (African American, Asian American, Hispanic and white), a wide age range, and diverse household incomes and educational levels.

Our survey takers have clearly indicated an opening in the market for an online publication like Generocity, with its ongoing, cause-oriented content, and tools to support microgiving.

It is important to note here—and we freely acknowledge—the limitations of our sample: it was a self-selected, non-randomized group—limited to those with Internet access—and may represent the opinions of those with a predilection for giving.

With all this in mind, we are quite encouraged by our survey findings, as well as by everyone's energetic response to Generocity. The feedback we've received from community leaders, media partners and ordinary folks has been overwhelmingly supportive.

As for the specific survey results, we were told in unambiguous terms that there is an underreporting of stories about ordinary people doing extraordinary things to improve the lives of others; that microgiving in Greater Philadelphia can be impactful; that the choices we make about what we buy and who we work for are motivated, in part, by our personal values.

Our respondents also convincingly told us that there is a demand for the kinds of content and features Generocity will offer, and that there are currently no viable (or at least well-known) alternatives. These features included what we expect to be the backbone of Generocity's offerings: stories that inspire them to get more involved in their communities; a comprehensive directory of nonprofits; parent-friendly information that can be used to teach kids about the importance of giving back; and consumer information about what a company or product stands for.

One possible exception is information on volunteer opportunities in the region. Half of the respondents were able to either cite a website they've used or said they knew of one. Among the top-ten cited, several were sites that were either entirely dedicated to or gave prominent placement for information on volunteer opportunities. This tells us that there may be partnership opportunities with certain local groups—such as Greater Philadelphia Cares and the United Way—which strive to offer easy ways to connect the public to volunteer opportunities.

The results of this survey are being used to refine our planned functionality and to set baseline metrics for measuring our future impact. We are already starting to determine the ways we will gauge our overall success from data findings; this includes challenging ourselves to help increase, not only how much people give, but also to how many different groups they give. And we'd like to do this by encouraging and facilitating online microgiving, which seems to be in line with what people are already doing (only three respondents out of more than

5,000 reported not making any micro-donations, with the average smallest donation ranging from \$3 to \$18).

We realize that this is a bold goal. More established websites like Charity Navigator and GuideStar, which provide databases of nonprofits (though with a national focus) were cited by less than 1% of our respondents when asked to name a website for finding and donating to causes, charities and nonprofits. We will also need to further explore to what extent people may be reluctant to use online giving accounts and features, like personal dashboards, because of their relative unfamiliarity with this kind of new Internet functionality. Younger (and presumably more Web-savvy) respondents reported higher likelihoods of usage.

And even with the stories that are at the heart of what we plan for Generocity, we know that it will take tremendous effort and smart partnerships to increase (from the current

23%) the number of people who say that among their top-three reasons for making an online donation was that they read something that inspired them. Since less than 1% of our respondents could name any single publication or website where they read this kind of content, we feel there is significant opportunity to impact this number.

The key take-away for them [nonprofits]: what motivates our respondents to get engaged—more than any other driver—is the belief in a group’s mission.

Finally, we hope our nonprofit partners can use our survey findings to further develop their own plans for Internet-based philanthropy so they can more easily access new communities of supporters and revenue streams. The key take-away for them: what motivates our respondents to get engaged—more than any other driver—is the belief in a group’s mission. Second to this is actually feeling engaged and knowing that their donation is making a difference.

Our bottom line from the survey is that these findings have convinced us we are on the right track with Generocity. It’s clear the region is open to innovative thinking when it comes to philanthropy, and we expect this interest to only grow as we get closer to the launch. We look forward to a time in the not-too-distant future when Generocity makes it easier for everyone in Greater Philadelphia to live more generously.

Endnotes

1. NEWTON, E. (2010, JANUARY 24). INNOVATING TO SAVE THE NEWS. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER.
2. MICROGIVING. (N.D.). IN WIKIPEDIA FROM [HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/MICROGIVING](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/microgiving).
3. KELLER, H. (2009, JUNE 2). ALARMING DECLINE IN PHILANTHROPY. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER.
4. BORTHWICK, J. AND LERER, K. (2009, DECEMBER 24). MICROGIVING: A NEW ERA IN FUNDRAISING. RETRIEVED FROM HUFFINGTON POST: [HTTP://WWW.HUFFINGTONPOST.COM/JOHN-BORTHWICK-AND-KENNETH-LERER/MICRO-GIVING-A-NEW-ERA-IN_B_153392.HTML](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-borthwick-and-kenneth-lerer/micro-giving-a-new-era-in_b_153392.html).
5. NEWS BLAZE. (2009, JANUARY 28). HOW SOCIAL MEDIA HELPED BARACK OBAMA TO BECOME THE MOST POWERFUL MAN. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://NEWSBLAZE.COM/STORY/20090128105841ZZZZ.NB/TOPSTORY.HTML](http://newsblaze.com/story/20090128105841zzzz.nb/topstory.html).
6. ANNENBERG CENTER FACT CHECK.
7. CHANGE.ORG (2008). THE ENGAGEMENT IMPERATIVE. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.CONTRIBUTEMEDIA.COM/TRENDS_DETAILS.PHP?ID=207](http://www.contributemedia.com/trends_details.php?id=207).
8. STENGEL, RICHARD (2009, SEPTEMBER 10). FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS, A RESPONSIBILITY REVOLUTION. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.TIME.COM/TIME/NATION/ARTICLE/0,8599,1921444,00.HTML](http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1921444,00.html).
9. STENGEL, RICHARD (2009, SEPTEMBER 10). FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS, A RESPONSIBILITY REVOLUTION. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.TIME.COM/TIME/NATION/ARTICLE/0,8599,1921444,00.HTML](http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1921444,00.html).
10. BROOKS, ARTHUR C. (2006, NOVEMBER 27). WHO REALLY CARES: THE SURPRISING TRUTH ABOUT COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM. BASIC BOOKS.