



Catalogue no. 71-542-XIE

Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating

C A R I N G a n s I N V O L V E D s



Canadian Centre for Philanthropy



Volunteer Canada



Canadian Heritage
Health Canada
Human Resources Development Canada
Statistics Canada

Canada

How to obtain more information

Specific inquiries about this product and related statistics or services should be directed to:
Karen Roberts, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6, (613) 951-3726.

For information on the wide range of data available from Statistics Canada, you can contact us
by calling one of our toll-free numbers. You can also contact us by e-mail or by visiting our website.

National inquiries line	1 800 263-1136
National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired	1 800 363-7629
Depository Services Program inquiries	1 800 700-1033
Fax line for Depository Services Program	1 800 889-9734
E-mail inquiries	infostats@statcan.ca
website	www.statcan.ca

Ordering and subscription information

This product, Catalogue no. 71-542-XPE, is published as a standard printed publication at a price of
CDN \$15.00 per issue. The following *additional shipping charges* apply for delivery outside Canada:

	Single issue
United States	CDN \$6.00
Other countries	CDN \$10.00

This product is also free in electronic format on the Statistics Canada Internet site as Catalogue no. 71-542-XIE.
To obtain single issues or to subscribe, visit our website at www.statcan.ca, and select Products and Services.

All prices exclude sales taxes.

The printed version can be ordered by

- phone (Canada and United States) 1 800 267-6677
- fax (Canada and United States) 1 877 287-4369
- e-mail order@statcan.ca

Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating

Michael Hall, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy
Larry McKeown, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy
Karen Roberts, Statistics Canada

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2001

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from Licence Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

August 2001

Catalogue no. 71-542-XPE
ISBN 0-660-18607-1

Catalogue no. 71-542-XIE
ISBN 0-662-30941-3

Frequency: Occasional

Ottawa

La version française de cette publication est disponible sur demande (n° 71-542-XPF et 71-542-XIF au catalogue).

National Library of Canada Cataloguing in Publication Data

Hall, Michael H., 1955-

Caring Canadians, involved Canadians :
highlights from the 2000 National Survey of
Giving , Volunteering and Participating

Will be available also via Internet. Adobe Acrobat
reader required.

Issued also in French under title: Canadiens dévoués,
Canadiens engagés : points saillants de l'Enquête
nationale de 2000 sur le don, le bénévolat et la
participation.

ISBN 0-660-18607-1 (paper)

ISBN 0-662-30941-3 (Internet)

CS71-542-XPE

1. Voluntarism – Canada – Statistics. 2. Charities –
Canada – Statistics. 3. Social participation – Canada
— Statistics. I. Hall, Michael H. , 1955- . II. McKeown, Larry.
III. Roberts, Karen. IV. Statistics Canada. V. Canadian Centre for
Philanthropy. VI. Title.

HV40 C37 2001
C2001-988006-5

361.3'7'0971021

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Michelle Goulbourne and David Lasby of the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy for their invaluable contributions to the analysis of the survey data and to the writing and reviewing of this report. We further wish to thank the following NSGVP partners for their contributions both as members of the NSGVP Steering Committee and for their constructive comments on earlier drafts of this report: Paddy Bowen of Volunteer Canada, Don McRae of Canadian Heritage, Liz Rootham of Human Resources Development Canada, Diane Jacovella of the Privy Council Office, Bill Bradley of Health Canada, and Catherine Bertrand, Wayne Smith and Sange de Silva of Statistics Canada. We would also like to express our appreciation to the members of the NSGVP Working Group for their contributions, including Tony Falsetto of Human Resources Development Canada, Allan Gordon of Health Canada, Christine Lessard of Canadian Heritage and Barry MacKillop of the Privy Council Office. Much gratitude is due to the Statistics Canada 2000 NSGVP team for their work in preparing the survey and the data. The survey team of Yanick Beaucage, Dominique Guy, June Lavergne and Isabelle Lévesque was led by Karen Roberts, who contributed to all stages of the development and delivery of both the survey and this report. The report was shepherded through the publication process by a Statistics Canada team that included Alan Bulley, Sherry Galey, Elizabeth Irving, Ginette Lavoie, Christine Duchesne, Judith Côté, Suzanne Alain, Danielle Baum, Stéphane Fournier and Jennifer Pfitzer.

Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long-standing co-operation involving Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses, governments and other institutions. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued co-operation and good will.

Foreword

Canadians support one another and their communities in countless ways; until recently, however, the breadth and depth of this support was largely unknown and undocumented. In 1997, the National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) provided the first comprehensive look at the contributions Canadians make to one another through their gifts of volunteer time and money. In 2000, the NSGVP was conducted again, enabling us to assess whether there had been any changes to these contributions, as well as the nature of these changes. Fittingly, the release of the results of the 2000 survey coincides with the United Nations International Year of Volunteers (IYV), which serves to highlight the ways in which Canadian life is enriched by the contribution of voluntary time.

The NSGVP is the result of a partnership of federal government departments and voluntary sector organizations that includes the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Canadian Heritage, Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, Statistics Canada and Volunteer Canada. First conducted in 1997 as a special survey by Statistics Canada, in 2000 the NSGVP was conducted as part of the federal government's Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI) and current plans call for the survey to be repeated in 2003 as part of the VSI.

The NSGVP, given its scale, furnishes the most comprehensive assessment of giving, volunteering and participating ever undertaken in Canada and,

perhaps, in the world. It asked Canadians a series of questions about how they

- give money and other resources to individuals and to charitable and non-profit organizations;
- volunteer time to charitable and voluntary organizations and directly to individuals; and
- participate in organizations by becoming members.

The content and methodology used in the 2000 NSGVP were, for the most part, the same as in the 1997 NSGVP. The 2000 survey was conducted by Statistics Canada as a supplement to the Labour Force Survey (LFS) in October, November and early December of 2000. The 2000 NSGVP is based on a representative sample of 14,724 Canadians aged 15 and older and reflects a 63% response rate.

The NSGVP allows us to report on the health of charitable giving, volunteering and participating in Canada in 2000. Using 1997 as a benchmark, we are able to determine whether the care that Canadians demonstrate for one another, their communities and their environment is growing, remaining stable, or on the wane. It also tells us which Canadians are more involved and which are less involved. Taken all together, the results from this second in a series of surveys helps to highlight our strengths and our vulnerabilities as a caring society.

Table of contents

Introduction	9
Chapter 1 Charitable giving	13
Chapter 2 Volunteering	31
Chapter 3 Civic participation	49
Conclusion	53
Appendix A: Glossary of terms	57
Appendix B: Data quality	61
Appendix C: Provincial data	63

Introduction

The National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) provides a ‘snapshot’ of the state of voluntary and civic action in Canada and offers a means of tracking changes in giving, volunteering and participating over time. Every three years, the NSGVP lets us assess the extent to which individual Canadians are moved to support their fellow citizens, their communities and their environment with voluntary contributions of time and money. The 2000 NSGVP shows that the support Canadians provide is dynamic and has been changing since the first benchmark NSGVP survey in 1997.

The 2000 survey revealed the enormous breadth of support that Canadians provide, both individually and collectively. Canadians donate money and volunteer time to support the arts, local sports clubs, medical research, food banks, shelters, international relief efforts, and their own places of worship, among many other causes. They help their neighbours and friends in a variety of ways, such as by driving people to appointments, visiting individuals who are ill or shut-in, and baby-sitting small children. Canadians take out memberships in thousands of organizations in order to pursue collective goals and to participate in civic activities. They are active in rural areas, in towns and cities and, more and more, in virtual communities on the Internet. Canadians volunteer their time, money and skills to support local, regional, national and global causes.

In 1997, Canadians donated almost \$4.5 billion and contributed over 1.1 billion hours to charities and non-profit organizations. However, the 1997 survey also showed that a small group of about 11% of all Canadians 15 years and older was responsible for providing more than half (51%) the total dollar value

of all donations and 42% of all volunteer hours.¹ These Canadians can be distinguished by a number of characteristics. They are, for example, older, more likely to be married, and particularly likely to have a high level of religious involvement.

Such reliance on a small minority of the population to provide the bulk of volunteer time and charitable donations may be a source of vulnerability for charitable and non-profit organizations and the people they serve. Any decline in number among this small core group of contributors could have dramatic repercussions. With the 2000 NSGVP, we can begin tracking the reliance on support from this segment of the population.

As we report, the 2000 NSGVP shows that there have been a number of changes in the support that Canadians provide. Although the percentage of the population that donates money to charitable and non-profit organizations remains unchanged, there has been a decline in the percentage of people who volunteer since 1997. Meanwhile, those who are involved in giving and volunteering appear to be doing more. Canadian donors are giving larger average donations and volunteers are increasing the average amount of time they contribute. Although the total number of charitable dollars given has increased, the total number of volunteer hours provided has declined. In 2000, charitable and non-profit organizations were relying on a somewhat smaller core group of people to provide the bulk of charitable dollars and volunteer hours.

¹ The 1997 NSGVP defined these core supporters as Canadians who are in the top 25% of donors and who also volunteer. For more information, see Hall, M. and A. Febraro. 1999. “Much comes from the few: The thin base of support for charitable and nonprofit organizations.” *Research Bulletin*, 6, 2. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.

The NSGVP and the Voluntary Sector Initiative

The years since the first NSGVP in 1997 have witnessed an increasing acknowledgment of the value of individual philanthropy and voluntary action. The United Nations General Assembly declared 2001 the International Year of Volunteers (IYV) in recognition of the enormous social and economic contribution of volunteers worldwide. In 2001, Canadians have an opportunity to celebrate the contribution made by millions of volunteers to thousands of charitable and voluntary organizations throughout the country.

In June 2000, the federal government and the voluntary sector launched the Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI), which is intended to both increase the sector's capacity to meet the demands placed on it by Canadian society and to improve the federal government's policies, programs and services to Canadians. The VSI provides a formal recognition of the voluntary sector as an important pillar of Canadian society along with the private and public sectors. Among the many VSI initiatives is a commitment to conduct the NSGVP again in 2003 and to conduct additional studies of giving, volunteering and participating in the intervening years.

For additional information on the Voluntary Sector Initiative, please visit the VSI website at <http://www.vsi-isbc.ca/>.

Summary of main findings

This report provides an overview of the findings of the 2000 NSGVP and reveals the changes that have occurred since 1997. Because giving, volunteering and participating are influenced by a complex set of factors, it is difficult to attribute changes in these behaviours over time exclusively to one particular factor. Given the overview nature of the report, detailed causal explanations about the survey's findings will require more extensive research.

Giving to organizations

Almost 22 million Canadians—91% of the population aged 15 and older—made donations, either financial or in-kind, to charitable and non-profit organizations between October 1, 1999 and September 30, 2000. Almost 8 in 10 (78%) made direct financial donations either in response to a request from, or by approaching, an organization; 41% deposited money in cash boxes at store check-outs; and 4% reported leaving a bequest to a charitable, religious or spiritual organization as part

of a will. In-kind donations were also common: 69% donated clothing or household goods and 54% donated food to a charitable organization such as a food bank.

The estimated financial support provided totalled more than \$5 billion and represented an increase of 11% in giving since 1997. The vast majority—\$4.9 billion—came from the 78% of Canadians who gave in response to requests from organizations or by approaching organizations on their own initiative.² The percentage of Canadians making such donations was unchanged from 1997.

The average annual donation in 2000 increased by 8% from 1997, to \$259. Canadian donors made fewer, but larger, individual donations in 2000: donors gave an average of 3.7 donations, which averaged \$70, compared with 1997, when donors gave an average of 4 donations, which averaged \$60.

² The remaining amount, estimated at just over \$100 million, came from money deposited in collection boxes such as those often located at store check-out counters.

The 2000 NSGVP reveals that Canadian charities and non-profit organizations continue to rely on a relatively small group of donors. The top one-quarter of donors who gave \$213 or more during the year accounted for 82% of the total donations.

Volunteering through an organization

The 2000 NSGVP shows that 6.5 million Canadians, or 27% of the population aged 15 and older, volunteered³ during the one-year period preceding the survey. This is a decline from the 7.5 million Canadians, or 31% of the population, who volunteered in 1997. There were fewer volunteers in 2000 despite there being more Canadians; the population of Canada increased by almost 2.5% from 1997 to 2000.

However, with the decline in the numbers of Canadians volunteering, we observe an increase in the intensity of volunteering among those who do volunteer. On average, each individual volunteer in 2000 contributed 162 hours over the year, up from 149 hours during 1997. This increase happened in spite of the finding that the most common reason given for not volunteering more was the lack of time.

With fewer Canadians volunteering, the total number of hours volunteered declined by an estimated 5% since 1997 to about 1.05 billion hours in 2000.

As in 1997, the survey also found that volunteering was not evenly distributed throughout the population. In 2000, the top quarter of volunteers, for example, contributed an average of 471 hours of their time throughout the year and accounted for 73% of the overall total hours. This is similar to 1997, when the top quarter of volunteers accounted for 72% of the overall total hours, but contributed, on average, 431 hours of their time. However, it is worth noting that in absolute numbers there are fewer volunteers in the top quarter than there were in 1997—approximately 1.6 million in 2000 versus about 1.9 million in 1997.

3 In the NSGVP, volunteering is defined as doing unpaid activities as part of a group or organization.

Other forms of support

Many Canadians provide support to individuals directly rather than working through a charitable or voluntary organization. Such support can be provided through donations of money or donations of time.

The NSGVP asked Canadians about the types of support they provided to individuals outside their household. Forty-one percent of respondents indicated that they gave money directly to relatives who did not live with them, to homeless or street people, or to others. This has declined slightly from the 44% who reported giving money to individuals outside their household in 1997.

Almost 8 out of 10 Canadians (77%) contributed their time to assist people on their own, not through an organization. As was the case in 1997, the most commonly reported activities were shopping or driving to appointments or stores, performing housework, baby-sitting and doing home maintenance or yard work for others.

Civic participation

The NSGVP also asked questions about other forms of involvement in society. Canadians were asked to report on their membership in associations and organizations, voting in elections, and ways in which they kept abreast of news and public affairs.

Just over one-half of respondents (51%) reported that they belonged to at least one organization or group in 2000 (such as community associations, service clubs and unions). The same percentage of Canadians (51%) reported such memberships in 1997.

Patterns of support and linkages

Many Canadians support each other and their communities by donating their money, giving their time, or practising forms of active citizenship. However, there are some groups of Canadians who engage in these activities more than others. Moreover, individuals who give, volunteer and participate in any of these behaviours are more likely than others to engage in all of these behaviours. For example, volunteers are more likely than non-volunteers to make charitable donations, help others directly and belong to associations or community groups.

Social and economic context: 1997 to 2000

Since giving, volunteering and participating are influenced by a complex set of factors, it is probably unwise to draw conclusions about variations in these behaviours among different regions and population groups without taking these factors into account. For example, variations among provinces in the volunteer rate of those aged 15 to 19 can be partly attributed to the requirement in some provinces that students perform compulsory community service in order to graduate from secondary school. Similarly, strong government support for certain types of charities and non-profit organizations in a particular province may reduce their need to raise funds and consequently lower the level of donations they receive.

When trying to understand changes in giving, volunteering and participating over time, it is particularly important to take note of changes in the broader environment in which these behaviours occur. For example, charitable donations appear to vary with changes in economic conditions, which can affect discretionary income. It is also reasonable to expect that volunteering may be affected by economic changes, particularly those that influence the availability of discretionary time.

In the three-year period since the 1997 NSGVP, Canada saw steady economic growth and a decline in the national unemployment rate from over 9% in 1997 to under 7% by the end of 2000. Over one million more Canadians were working in 2000 than in 1997. Moreover, the level of full-time employment for younger Canadians (aged 15 to 24 years) increased by more than 15% from 1997 to 2000.

Such changes in the job market may have an impact on volunteering. For example, much of the growth in volunteering between 1987 and 1997 can be attributed to an increase in volunteering among young people, many of whom identified volunteering as a means of obtaining employment.⁴ With increased labour market demand for younger adults, the use of volunteer activity to gain work experience may have been reduced for those aged 20 to 24, thereby contributing to the observed decline in volunteering in this group.

Income levels have also been increasing since 1997, a development that should have a positive influence on charitable donations. For example, in 1998, average family income rebounded to its highest level in a decade and registered the strongest annual increase since 1989.⁵ With higher incomes, people have more money for discretionary expenditures.⁶

Tax policy changes may also have an influence on charitable donations. The introduction of better tax incentives for donations led to a 14% jump in charitable giving in 1996. Donations claimed by taxpayers have continued to increase moderately since that time.⁷ Before 1996, Canadians could claim tax credits for charitable donations up to a maximum of 20% of their taxable income. This maximum was raised to 50% of taxable income for the 1996 tax year and raised again to 75% for the 1997 tax year.⁸

The following three chapters on giving, volunteering and participating explore the results of the 2000 NSGVP in broader detail and show some of the ways in which Canadians care for one another and are involved in their society.

4 The 1987 Voluntary Activity Survey assessed volunteer participation using many of the same questions on volunteering as the 1997 NSGVP, enabling comparisons to be made between findings in 1987 and 1997.

5 In 1998, average family after-tax income was up 3.7% from the previous year after adjusting for inflation. The major source of this increase was market income that included earnings from employment ("Family income 1998," *The Daily*, June 12, 2000).

6 For example, according to the 1999 Survey of Household Spending, average household total expenditure from 1997 to 1999 increased by 7.1% ("Household spending 1999," *The Daily*, December 12, 2000).

7 See McKeown, L. 2001. "Trends in individual donations: 1984-1999." *Research Bulletin*, 8, 1. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.

8 The 2000 federal budget also reduced the capital gains inclusion rate from 75% to 66.7%, effectively further reducing the rate for gifts of publicly traded shares; it continues to be one-half the standard rate.

CHAPTER 1

Charitable giving

Charitable giving is an essential part of Canadian life. The vast majority of Canadians make charitable gifts, thus helping to improve the quality of life in their communities and in the country as a whole. Canadians give money and goods to support the work of charitable and non-profit organizations, making it possible for them to provide the services that are so vital to the well-being of individuals. Many people also give money and goods directly to individuals in need. Some Canadians are more committed to charitable giving than others, but virtually all Canadians make a charitable gift over the course of a year.

This chapter reviews the findings of the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) concerning the charitable giving of Canadians during the one-year period prior to the survey⁹ and highlights some of the changes that have occurred since the 1997 NSGVP. It also examines other ways in which Canadians provide support to charitable and non-profit organizations—by purchasing goods or participating in charitable gaming, for example.

The chapter begins by outlining some of the more significant changes in charitable giving since the 1997 NSGVP. It highlights findings from the 2000 NSGVP about the extent of charitable giving and the amounts given, and provides a profile of Canadian donors. A discussion of provincial variations and the role of religion is followed by information on the types of organizations Canadians support and the methods used to donate, as well as people's motivations for giving and reasons for not giving more. Finally, evidence is presented that demonstrates the linkages between charitable giving and other forms of support such as volunteering and participating in community organizations.

Giving in 2000: what's new?

In the three years since the 1997 NSGVP, there have been a number of changes in the donations Canadians make directly to charitable organizations, some of which may signal the beginning of longer-term trends:

- Although the same percentage of the population (78%) made charitable gifts to organizations in 2000 as in 1997, the total amount donated increased by an estimated 11% to over \$4.9 billion. Because the population grew by about 2.5%, most of this growth in the total amount donated was due to an increase in the average amount donated.
- Donors gave an average annual total of \$259, an increase of \$20 from 1997.
- Donors in 2000 made fewer donations over the course of the year. The total number of individual donations declined to 70 million from 74 million in 1997. In 2000, donors gave 3.7 donations, on average, compared with 4 donations in 1997.
- Donors made larger donations. In 2000, donors gave an average of \$70 per donation, compared with \$60 in 1997.
- The percentage of the population that made donations increased in four provinces from 1997 to 2000: in Alberta, from 75% to 85%; in Prince Edward Island, from 83% to 86%; in Nova Scotia, from 83% to 87%; and in Manitoba, from 81% to 84%.
- Residents of Prince Edward Island and Manitoba increased their average annual donations by over 25% in 2000.

9 October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000

- The survey reveals changes in the patterns of giving among different age groups from 1997. Most notable are the increases in the average annual donations of Canadians aged 15 to 24 (from \$79 to \$118) and those aged 25 to 34 (from \$159 to \$229). Among adults aged 65 and older, the average annual donation dropped from \$328 to \$308.
- Although Canadians with a university degree continue to give the most (an average of \$480 in 2000), their rate of donating declined to 84% in 2000 from 90% in 1997.
- Religious organizations continue to receive the highest percentage of the total amount of money donated in Canada. Religious organizations were given \$2.4 billion, or 49% of the \$4.9 billion donated in 2000, virtually unchanged from the 51% donated to these groups in 1997. The percentage of Canadians making donations to religious organizations declined from 35% in 1997 to 32% in 2000.
- The way Canadians donate money is also changing. In 2000, donors made 20% fewer gifts in response to door-to-door canvassing. More donors (18%) are now deciding in advance the amounts they will give and the organizations they will support. However, fewer people (41% of donors in 2000 compared with 44% in 1997) reported that they give regularly to the same organization.
- Compared with 1997, more Canadian donors in 2000 have concerns about charitable fundraising. A large percentage of donors reported 'not liking the way in which requests are made' (47% compared with 41% in 1997) and 'thinking that the money will not be used efficiently' (46% compared

with 40% in 1997) as reasons for not giving more money to charitable and non-profit organizations.

- Almost half of all donors in 2000 (49%) indicated that they would contribute more if governments offered them a better tax credit—an increase from 37% of donors in 1997.


The support that Canadians provide

Almost 22 million Canadians—91% of the population aged 15 and older—made donations, either financial or in-kind, to charitable and non-profit organizations during the one-year period covered by the NSGVP. Seventy-eight percent of Canadians—more than 19 million—made direct financial donations to an organization, the same as in 1997. Just over 41% supported charitable and non-profit organizations by putting money in cash boxes at store check-out counters (up 5% compared with 1997) and 4% reported leaving a donation to a charitable, religious or spiritual organization as part of a will. In-kind donations were also common: 69% donated clothing or household goods (up by 7% from 1997) and 54% donated food to a charitable organization such as a food bank (Figure 1.1).

The dollar value of the direct financial support provided to charitable and non-profit organizations in 2000 totalled an estimated \$5 billion. Most of this financial support—\$4.9 billion (98%)—was given by Canadians who responded to requests from organizations or approached organizations on their own. Donations in cash boxes accounted for an additional \$100 million.

Figure 1.1

Donations to charitable and non-profit organizations, by type of donation, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Other ways of financially supporting charitable and non-profit organizations

Although direct financial donations are a critical form of support to charitable and non-profit organizations, Canadians also provide indirect financial support to these organizations. In 2000, 70% of Canadians aged 15 years and older purchased goods such as chocolate bars, apples, poppies, flowers and coupon books, the proceeds of which went to charitable or non-profit organizations; 43% purchased charity-sponsored raffle or lottery tickets (excluding government-sponsored lotteries such as Lotto 6/49); and 7% supported organizations through charity-sponsored bingos or casinos (Figure 1.2).


While there was little change in the rate of indirect support, the amount appears to have declined since 1997. Canadians reported providing almost \$1.19 billion in indirect support in 2000, down from \$1.28 billion reported in 1997. Although there has been little change in the amount spent on the purchase of goods (\$415 million, compared with \$410 million in 1997), there has been a decrease in purchases of charity-sponsored raffle or lottery tickets (\$440 million, down from \$463 million in 1997) and a sharp decline in charitable gaming (\$330 million compared with \$409 million in 1997).

Of course, not all of the money Canadians spend on charity-sponsored goods, lottery or raffle tickets and charitable gaming goes to support the work of charitable or non-profit organizations. Some of this money is used to cover the costs incurred by these organizations to purchase these goods or provide these services. Although we are unable to estimate such costs from the NSGVP, we can conclude that when this indirect support is added, Canadians give more to charities and non-profits than the \$5 billion they provide in donations. These organizations therefore also benefit from some portion of the \$1.2 billion spent by Canadians on charity-sponsored goods, lottery or raffle tickets and charitable gaming.

Figure 1.2

Participation in and distribution of indirect financial support to charitable and non-profit organizations, Canadians aged 15 and older, 2000

(Total=\$1.19 billion)



According to the 2000 NSGVP, 78% of Canadians made direct donations to charitable organizations (excluding donations in cash boxes), generating an annual total of almost \$5 billion (Table 1.1).¹⁰ Although the percentage of Canadians making donations in 2000 was the same as in 1997, the total annual amount donated increased by over 11%.

The increase in the total dollar value of donations between 1997 and 2000 appears to be the result of two factors: larger donations on the part of donors and growth in the Canadian population. In 2000, the average annual total donation was \$259, an 8% increase from 1997. The population of Canadians 15 years and older has also grown by almost 2.5% since 1997.

With the donor rate unchanged in 2000, we would expect this population growth to be accompanied by an increase in the absolute number of both donors and donations. However, while the total number of donors has increased since 1997, the total number of individual donations has declined, from 74 million to 70 million. Donors reported an average of 3.7 donations in 2000, down from the average of 4 donations reported in 1997. At the same time, the average amount given in each individual donation increased to \$70 from \$60.


Table 1.1
Donating rate, number of donations and annual amounts donated, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000

	2000	1997
Rate of donating		
Total population ('000)	24,383	23,808
Donors ('000)	19,036	18,563
Donor rate (%)	78	78
Number of donations		
Total number ('000)	70,465	74,413
Average number	3.7	4.0
Average amount (\$)	70	60
Amount of donations		
Total amount (\$'000)	4,938.8	4,435.1
Average annual amount (\$)	259	239
Median annual amount (\$)	73	76

10 The analysis presented in the remainder of this chapter focusses on direct financial donations to charitable and non-profit organizations, excluding donations in collection boxes.

Looking only at average or total donations does not reveal the fact that most charitable dollars are given by a small percentage of Canadians. In Figure 1.3, we grouped donors into four equal-sized categories based on their annual donations and calculated the percentage of total donations provided by each group. More than 80% of the total value of donations to charitable and non-profit organizations in 2000 came from the one-quarter of donors who contributed \$213 or more. In other words, just under 20% of Canadians (or one-quarter of the 78% who donated) provided 82% of the total value of donations in 2000. This is similar to 1997, when 80% of the total value of donations came from the almost 20% of Canadians who contributed over \$205 annually.

Figure 1.3
Distribution of donations by annual amount donated, Canadian donors aged 15 and older, 2000



A profile of Canadian donors

Personal and economic characteristics

The likelihood of making a charitable donation and the amount donated are influenced by a variety of factors, including the financial capacity to give, values and attitudes related to giving, and opportunities to give. As a result, charitable giving tends to vary across the population with age, sex, education and income (Table 1.2).

The percentage of Canadians making donations to charitable and non-profit organizations increases with age until mid-life and declines thereafter. Canadians aged 15 to 24 are the least likely to be donors (64% made donations), while those aged 35 to 44 are the most likely to be donors (86% made donations). The amount given by donors also increases with age, but peaks among Canadians between the ages of 45 and 54, who reported average annual donations of \$338. There have been a few changes in the pattern of giving among different age groups since 1997. Most notable are the large increases in the average annual donations among those aged 15 to 24 (from \$79 to \$118) and those aged 25 to 34 (from \$159 to \$229), as well as the decline in the average donation among seniors 65 and older (from \$328 to \$308).

The percentage of Canadian men (75%) and women (81%) donating to charitable organizations remained unchanged from 1997. Unlike 1997, men and women gave approximately the same average annual donation in 2000. Women's average annual donation increased from \$236 in 1997 to \$259 in 2000. However, their annual median donation declined from \$83 in 1997 to \$70 in 2000. This indicates that the gains in the size of women's average annual donation in 2000 are due to a relatively small number of large donations.

Married Canadians (including those in common-law unions) had a higher likelihood of being donors (84%) than did those who were single (66%), separated or divorced (72%), or widowed (77%). However, as was the case in 1997, donors who were widowed tended to give larger average annual donations in 2000 (\$328). Those who were separated or divorced donated an average of \$86 more in 2000 than in 1997.

The likelihood of making financial donations increased with education, ranging from 68% among those with less than a high school education to 84% among those with a university degree. The difference observed between education levels is also evident for the amount of individual donations—the average annual amount ranged from \$152 among those with less than a high school education to \$480 among those with a university degree. Compared with 1997, the donor rate declined from 90% to 84% among those with a university degree.

Employed individuals were more likely to be donors (82%) than unemployed individuals (65%) and those not in the labour force (73%). People who were employed, whether full-time or part-time, also made higher average donations. This pattern was also evident in 1997.

The likelihood of donating and of making higher donations increased with income level, as was the case in 1997. In 2000, 63% of those with a gross household income of less than \$20,000 were donors. The percentage of Canadians making charitable donations increased to 86% for those with a gross household income of \$100,000 or more. Average annual donations among this group of high-income Canadians were at least twice as large as the average donations made by donors with incomes of less than \$80,000. However, the donor rate among Canadians with incomes of \$100,000 or more declined from 91% in 1997 to 86% in 2000. In addition, the average annual amount donated by these higher income Canadians declined from \$608 in 1997 to \$529 in 2000.

Table 1.2


Donating rate, average and median annual donations by personal and economic characteristics, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000

	Annual amount					
	Donating rate (%)		Average donation (\$)		Median (\$)	
	2000	1997	2000	1997	2000	1997
Total	78	78	259	239	73	76
Age						
15-24	64	59	118	79	25	20
25-34	77	78	229	159	65	55
35-44	86	84	242	258	78	83
45-54	83	83	338	291	100	105
55-64	81	83	316	313	100	108
65 and older	77	80	308	328	101	140
Sex						
Male	75	75	260	243	77	73
Female	81	81	259	236	70	83
Marital status						
Married and common-law	84	85	282	261	83	92
Single, never married	66	63	169	162	40	35
Widowed	77	76	328	302	120	121
Separated, divorced	72	73	286	200	75	70
Education						
Less than high school	68	68	152	156	43	50
High school diploma	80	76	210	198	58	75
Some postsecondary	77	78	231	177	80	60
Postsecondary diploma	84	84	252	240	80	82
University degree	84	90	480	473	170	168
Labour force status						
Employed	82	83	273	253	79	81
Full-time	83	84	274	242	83	85
Part-time	76	79	271	297	63	65
Unemployed	65	64	139	103	35	29
Not in the labour force	73	72	243	227	70	78
Household income						
Less than \$20,000	63	63	142	134	35	40
\$20,000-\$39,999	75	77	190	182	52	60
\$40,000-\$59,999	79	81	214	221	65	80
\$60,000-\$79,999	83	86	233	255	83	91
\$80,000-\$99,999	87	89	348	290	125	118
\$100,000 or more	86	91	529	608	176	200

Although donors with higher household incomes made larger donations, they tended to give a smaller percentage of their overall pre-tax income. As Figure 1.4 shows, when annual donations are calculated as a percentage of pre-tax household income, donors in lower household income categories gave a larger percentage of their income in financial donations than did those in higher income groups. This relationship between income and the percentage of income donated has not changed substantially since 1997.

Figure 1.4

Percentage of household income spent on donations by level of household income, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Provincial variations


Financial giving to non-profit and charitable organizations also varies substantially by province.¹¹ This variation may be attributed to many factors, including differences in the economic circumstances, the social and cultural values, and the personal characteristics of the people who make up provincial populations.

Provincial variations exist in two forms: the percentage of individuals in the population who make donations (Figure 1.5) and the average annual total value of donations made by donors (Figure 1.6). Compared with the national average (78%), in 2000 higher donating rates were observed in the Atlantic

provinces (79% to 87%) and in the Prairie provinces (83% to 85%). The donor rate in Alberta jumped from 75% in 1997 to 85% in 2000. Donor rates have also increased in Nova Scotia (from 83% to 87%), in Prince Edward Island (from 83% to 86%), and in Manitoba (from 81% to 84%). In contrast, donor rates declined slightly in New Brunswick (from 82% to 79%) and Ontario (from 80% to 78%).

Figure 1.5

Donor rate by province, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




The provincial pattern of average annual donations is similar to the pattern of donor rates. Average annual donations were largest in Manitoba and Alberta (\$383 and \$369, respectively.) Manitoba and Prince Edward Island both recorded increases in average annual donations of 25% from 1997 to 2000 (from \$307 to \$383 in the former, and from \$235 to \$299 in the latter).

11 Please see Appendix C for more detailed provincial data.

As mentioned earlier, charitable giving is a complex behaviour that is influenced by many factors. Drawing conclusions about regional variations in generosity without a deeper understanding of these factors may lead to inappropriate comparisons. Moreover, giving to organizations is only one of several ways that Canadians can choose to support one another and their communities.

Figure 1.6

Average annual donation by province, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



The role of religion


Religious factors appear to play an important role in charitable giving. The NSGVP asked Canadians to report on their religious affiliations and the frequency with which they attended religious services or meetings (excluding special occasions such as weddings, funerals or baptisms). They were also asked how religious they considered themselves to be. Generally, religiosity—or level of religious commitment—is associated with a heightened incidence of charitable giving and larger donations, both to religious organizations and to other types of charitable and non-profit organizations.

Almost one in three Canadians (32%) made charitable donations to religious organizations, and these donations accounted for half (49%) the total value of all donations made. This has declined somewhat since 1997, when 35% made donations that accounted for 51% of the total dollar value. In general, donations made to religious organizations continued to be much larger than those to non-religious organizations. Donors contributed an annual average of \$310 to religious organizations, compared with \$140 to non-religious organizations (comparable amounts in 1997 were \$270 and \$125, respectively).

Canadians who stated that they had a religious affiliation, regardless of what it was, were much more likely to be donors than were those without such an affiliation (Figure 1.7). In 2000, more than 8 in 10 (83%) of those reporting a religious affiliation made a charitable donation, compared with 72% of those reporting none. There is also an association between religious affiliation and the amount that people contributed (Figure 1.8). On average, donors with a religious affiliation contributed \$296 throughout the year, compared with \$146 for donors with no religious affiliation. Presented from a different perspective, in 2000, people with a religious affiliation (74% of Canadians) accounted for 87% of all charitable donations. By comparison, in 1997, people with a religious affiliation (73% of Canadians) accounted for 88% of all donations.

Figure 1.7

Donor rate by religious affiliation, attendance at religious services and level of religious commitment, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




The more frequently people attend religious services, the more likely they are to make donations (Figure 1.7), and the more they give (Figure 1.8). Nine out of 10 Canadians who reported attending religious services on a weekly basis made charitable donations that amounted to \$577, on average. In comparison, 77% of those who did not attend services weekly made donations; their average donation was \$176. Donors who attended a religious service weekly were more likely to give to both religious and non-religious organizations.

Canadians who described themselves as ‘very religious’ were more likely to make financial donations (Figure 1.7) and to give more on average (Figure 1.8). Eleven percent of the population claimed to be very religious in 2000, and they accounted for 29% of all donations. In 1997, they made up 12% of the population and accounted for 33% of the total value of donations. Those who consider themselves very religious were more likely to give to both religious and non-religious organizations.

Figure 1.8

Average annual donation by religious affiliation, attendance at religious services and level of religious commitment, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




The organizations supported by Canadians

Canadians benefit from the many services and programs offered by charitable and non-profit organizations across the country. The diverse activities engaged in by these organizations range from operating food banks to supporting research on diseases; from providing rehabilitative services to offering job training; from providing disaster relief to offering recreational and sports programs; from protecting the environment to providing opportunities for religious worship. Through their donations, Canadians support the work of charitable and non-profit organizations that they value.

Figure 1.9 shows the distribution of all donations reported according to the type of organization receiving the donation.¹² Health organizations received the highest number of individual donations (41% of all reported donations), followed by social service organizations (20%) and religious organizations (14%). Compared with 1997, health organizations received a slightly larger share of the number of donations (3% more).

Figure 1.9
Distribution of number of donations by type of organization, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




Religious organizations received 14% of the total number of donations; these donations, however, amounted to over \$2.4 billion, almost half (49%) the value of all donations (Figure 1.10). Annual average donations made to religious organizations tend to be much larger than those made to non-religious organizations (\$310 versus \$140).

12 Survey respondents were asked about the organizations to which they made donations. These organizations were classified into 12 categories according to the classification system described in Appendix A.

As a group, health organizations were the second largest beneficiary of charitable giving, receiving \$963 million, or almost 20% of the total amount of donations (up slightly from 17% in 1997). Social service organizations were the third largest beneficiary, receiving \$503 million, or 10% of the total amount of charitable donations.

Figure 1.10
Distribution of amount of donations by type of organization, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




The majority of donors contributed to a variety of causes, rather than limiting their support to only one type of organization. While 29% of donors restricted their donations to one type of organization, the remaining 71% of donors supported two or more types of organizations: of these, 31% supported two different types, 22% three different types, and 18% four or more different types of organizations. This pattern was the same as in 1997.

Financial support given directly to individuals

Canadians support one another not only by contributing to the work of charities and non-profits, but also by making direct gifts of money to others. More than 4 in every 10 (41%) Canadians aged 15 and older reported giving money directly to people living outside their household (Figure 1.11): 28% gave money (excluding loans) to relatives who didn't live with them; 19% gave money to homeless or street people; and 8% gave money to other individuals. There has been a modest decline in reports of direct gifts of money since 1997 when 44% of Canadians reported giving money to people living outside their household.

Figure 1.11

Percentage who gave money directly to others, not through an organization, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




How Canadians make financial donations

Charitable and non-profit organizations use a variety of approaches to obtain financial support, and Canadians respond differently to each. As Figure 1.12 shows, the most frequent ways in which donations were made were by responding to a request from a door-to-door canvasser (15% of the total number of

donations), responding to a request through the mail (15%), and sponsoring someone in an event such as a walkathon (15%). Two of the least frequent ways in which Canadians made donations include responding to telephone solicitations (3%) and to television or radio campaigns (2%). Compared with 1997, the most notable change was a decline in the percentage of donations made by way of door-to-door canvassing (from 19% in 1997 to 15% in 2000).

Figure 1.12


Percentage of total donations by solicitation method, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Note: 'Other' contains all other methods including approaching an organization on one's own, donating through the Internet, giving stocks/options, being asked by someone at work, responding to telephone requests and to TV and radio campaigns, as well as any other method not mentioned.

Figure 1.13

Percentage of the total value of donations by solicitation method, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Note: 'Other' contains all other methods, including approaching an organization on one's own, donating through the Internet, giving stocks/options, being asked by someone at work, responding to telephone requests and to TV and radio campaigns, as well as any other method not mentioned.

While some methods of making charitable donations are used more frequently, others generate a greater volume of funds (Figure 1.13). For example, the donations made through a collection at a church, synagogue, mosque or other place of worship represented only 11% of the total number of donations. However, the total value of these donations was almost \$2.2 billion and accounted for 44% of the value of all donations. Both the number and the amount of donations made through a place of worship have declined since 1997 (13% of the total number and 48% of the total value of donations).

As was the case in 1997, most donors made charitable donations in more than one way. While 24% of donors used only one method of giving in 2000, the remaining 76% of donors used more than one.


Encouraging Canadians to give: planning ahead versus giving spontaneously

To what extent do Canadians plan their donations rather than simply respond to the fundraising requests of charitable and non-profit organizations? The NSGVP 2000 shows that while most donors do not make decisions about their donations beforehand, those who do plan ahead give more than those who do not. Figure 1.14 shows three different measures used to assess how donors make decisions about their donations.

The majority of donors (82%) do not decide in advance the total amount of money they will donate annually. However, those who do (18%) account for a relatively larger share of the total dollar value of donations (33%).

Figure 1.14

Percentage of donors and donations by characteristics measuring the spontaneity of making donations, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Only about one-quarter of donors (25%) decide ahead of time which organizations they will support, rather than deciding in response to being asked for a donation. However, the donors who do make such decisions in advance accounted for 39% of the total dollar value of all donations. This was up from 1997, when 20% of donors made their donation decisions in advance and accounted for 32% of the value of donations. Sixty-one percent of donors reported that they did not decide in advance which organizations to support (down from 65% in 1997). Finally, the remaining donors (14%) indicated that they made such decisions both in advance and at the time they were asked.

Donors were asked to indicate whether they donated to certain organizations on a regular basis or whether they tended to vary the organizations they supported. The proportion of donors who gave to certain organizations on a regular basis declined to 41% in 2000 from 44% in 1997. This minority of regular donors provided the majority of the total dollar value of donations (59%), although they accounted for more in 1997 (65%).

These findings have important implications for the fundraising activities of charitable and non-profit organizations. Most donors make their donation decisions in response to being asked, which suggests that the way in which they are asked can be a critical factor in determining whether a donation will be made and how much will be given. Donations do not generally seem to be 'locked in' to a cause, nor are the amounts given budgeted in advance. The most recent NSGVP showed that donors in 2000 were somewhat more likely to plan their donations than were donors in 1997, but that fewer donors were giving to specific charities or non-profits on a regular basis.

The reasons for making financial donations

What moves people to give and what keeps them from giving more? Answers to these questions can provide important insights to organizations seeking financial support and to anyone with an interest in the charitable giving of Canadians. The NSGVP asks a number of questions that help us understand peoples' decisions about whether or not to donate to charitable and non-profit organizations.

Motivations

Donors were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with six possible reasons for giving to charitable organizations (Figure 1.15). Most donors agreed that their reasons for giving were related to feeling compassion toward people in need (94%) and wanting to help a cause in which they personally believe (91%); these levels were the same as in 1997. Many donors agreed that they had been personally affected by the cause the organization

supports (69%, up from 65% in 1997) and that they owed something to the community (58% in both years). The percentage of donors who agreed that their giving was to fulfil religious obligations or beliefs declined from 34% in 1997 to 31% in 2000. Finally, 13% agreed that an income tax credit was a reason for their donation (compared with 11% in 1997).

Barriers

The NSGVP also examines peoples' reasons for not giving more to charities, or for not giving at all. Donors were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of possible reasons for not donating more (Figure 1.16), while non-donors were asked about possible reasons for not donating at all (Figure 1.17).

Just over half of donors agreed the reason they do not donate more to charitable organizations is that they wished to save their money for their own future needs (51%) and that they preferred to spend their money in other ways (46%). The percentage of donors agreeing with both of these reasons has declined somewhat since 1997.

Figure 1.15

Reasons for making financial donations, Canadian donors aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000





Figure 1.16

Reasons for not making more financial donations, Canadian donors aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




Increasingly, Canadian donors appear to agree that they do not donate more because they dislike the way in which requests are made (47% versus 41% in 1997) and do not think the money will be used efficiently (46% versus 40% in 1997). There has also been an increase in the percentage of donors who state that they do not donate more because they give money to people directly, rather than through organizations (36% versus 32% in 1997), and because they give voluntary time instead of money (26% versus 23% in 1997).

Many Canadians who did not donate in 2000 indicated that financial reasons were important (Figure 1.17). A higher percentage of non-donors than donors agreed that they did not donate because they wished to save their money for their own future needs (59%), or because they preferred to spend their money in other ways (53%).

Figure 1.17

Reasons for not making financial donations, Canadian non-donors aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



In 2000, as was the case in 1997, the two least frequently reported reasons for not donating, or for not donating more, were the same for donors and non-donors. A relatively small percentage in each group agreed that they do not donate more, or do not donate at all, because it is hard to find a cause worth supporting (15% for donors, 21% for non-donors). An even smaller percentage agreed that they do not donate more, or do not donate at all, because they do not know where to make a contribution (9% for donors, 15% for non-donors).


The links between charitable giving and other forms of support

Canadians support one another and their communities through their involvement in a broad spectrum of activities including charitable giving, volunteering, helping others directly, giving money to others directly, and participating in organizations or groups. The NSGVP shows that these activities are linked. Donors are more likely than non-donors to engage in other supportive activities and the likelihood of involvement in these activities increases with the amount given (Figure 1.18).

The more an individual gives, the greater is the likelihood of providing other types of support as well. Among the top 25% of donors (who contributed \$213 or more), almost one in two (46%) also volunteered time, and 73% were members of an organization or group. In comparison, fewer than one in every five (19%) of the lowest 25% of donors were volunteers, and 42% were members of, or participated in, organizations. Among non-donors, only 11% volunteered and 28% were members of, or participants in, organizations.

Figure 1.18

Individuals involved in supportive activities, by amount of annual donation, Canadians aged 15 and older, 2000



The role of tax credits


Donors to registered charitable organizations are eligible to receive income tax credits for their donations. Recent federal budgets have increased the tax credits available to Canadians, in an effort to encourage financial support to charitable organizations.

Do donors take advantage of the tax credits that are offered for their donations? Many do, particularly those who make larger donations. Overall, 45% of all donors indicated that they, or someone else in their household, intended to claim a tax credit for charitable donations.¹³ As Figure 1.19 shows, however, this percentage increased to 76% among those whose yearly donations totalled over \$212 (the top 25% of donors who provide 82% of all donations).

Would donors contribute more if governments offered them a better tax credit for their charitable donations? Almost half of all donors (49%) indicated that they would. This is a substantial increase from the 37% of donors who indicated this in 1997. In addition, the more Canadians give, the more likely they are to say that they would contribute more (Figure 1.19).

Figure 1.19

Percentage of donors claiming a tax credit and percentage that would contribute more if given a better tax credit, by amount of annual donation, Canadian donors aged 15 and older, 2000



13 This is virtually the same as the percentage in 1997 (46%). Note that this percentage is incorrectly stated as being 41% in the 1997 NSGVP report: Hall M. et al. 1998. *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating* (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 71-542-XPE). Ottawa: Minister responsible for Statistics Canada, p. 25.

CHAPTER 2

Volunteering

Canadians who volunteer their time, energy and talents to charitable and non-profit organizations play an important role in improving their communities and the lives of others. Volunteers contribute in many ways. They coach children and youth; serve meals and deliver food to the needy; provide health care; serve as volunteer drivers; provide consulting and administrative support; take part in canvassing, campaigning and fundraising; work to protect the environment and wildlife; help educate others and advocate on important issues; and serve on boards and committees.

This chapter discusses Canadians' contributions of volunteer time to charitable and non-profit organizations during the one-year period prior to the 2000 NSGVP¹⁴ and highlights some of the changes that appear to have occurred since the 1997 NSGVP. It also examines the ways Canadians support one another by providing help or assistance directly to individuals on a one-to-one basis.

Volunteering in 2000: what's new?

There have been some changes in the volunteer activities of Canadians since the 1997 NSGVP. Among the more noteworthy changes are the following:

- The estimated percentage of Canadians who volunteered in 2000 declined to 27% from 31% in 1997, and the total number of hours volunteered declined by 5% to just over 1 billion. The greatest decline in the volunteer rate was among those employed part-time (from 44% to 33%) and those with a university degree (from 48% to 39%).
- In 2000, the average annual number of hours contributed per volunteer increased to 162 hours from 149 hours in 1997. The greatest increases were found among those who were widowed (67 more hours per year, on average), those who were 65 years and older (67 more hours), those with household incomes under \$20,000 (59 more hours), and those who were unemployed (54 more hours).
- The volunteer rate declined in all provinces except Prince Edward Island.
- Although religion continues to play an important role in volunteering—with those attending religious services on a weekly basis volunteering more than those who do not (41% versus 24%)—the volunteer rate among Canadians who attend a place of worship weekly has declined from 46% in 1997.
- Volunteers in 2000 were less likely to be involved in certain types of activities. Fewer volunteers reported canvassing, campaigning or fundraising (40% compared with 44% in 1997).
- A greater number of volunteers in 2000 indicated that one reason they did not volunteer more hours was because they contributed money instead of time (24% compared with 19% in 1997). This reason was given even more frequently by those who did not volunteer at all (38% compared with 33% in 1997).
- For the first time in 2000, the NSGVP asked Canadians about mandatory community service. Over 7% of those who volunteered in 2000 stated that they were required to do so by their school, their employer or the government.
- Employer support for volunteering may be increasing. In 2000, more than one-quarter of employed volunteers (27%) reported receiving approval from their employer to modify their hours of work in order to volunteer (compared with 22% in 1997), and 22% reported receiving recognition from their employer for their volunteer work (compared with 14% in 1997).

14 October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.

Volunteering in Canada

The nature of volunteering appears to be changing in Canada, with an increasing number of hours being contributed by a declining number of Canadians. According to the 2000 NSGVP, just over 6.5 million Canadians volunteered their time and skills to groups and organizations between October 1, 1999 and September 30, 2000 (Table 2.1). This is almost 1 million fewer than the estimated number that volunteered in 1997.

Since 1997, there has been a 13% decrease in the number of volunteers, despite an almost 2.5% increase in the Canadian population 15 years and older. In 2000, 27% of Canadians aged 15 and older volunteered, a decline from 31% in 1997. Interestingly, the 2000 volunteer rate of 27% is the same as it was in 1987.

Although the percentage of Canadians who volunteer has declined, those who did volunteer gave more time. There has been a 9% increase in the average total hours contributed by volunteers since 1997. In 2000, volunteers contributed 162 hours per year, on average, compared with 149 hours in 1997. However, the average number of hours contributed by volunteers in 2000 still remains below the 1987 level of 191 hours.

Accompanying the decline in the volunteer rate since 1997 is a drop in the total number of volunteer hours contributed. Volunteers contributed a total of just over 1 billion hours in 2000, a decrease of 56 million hours since 1997. This decline in the total number of volunteer hours would have been larger had it not been for the increase in the average number of hours contributed by volunteers between 1997 and 2000.

The approximately 1 billion hours of volunteer time contributed in 2000 represents the equivalent of 549,000 full-time year-round jobs (assuming 40 hours of work per week for 48 weeks). Compared with 1997, there has been a decrease of 29,000 full-time year-round volunteer job equivalents.

Table 2.1

Rate of volunteering and number of hours volunteered, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1987, 1997 and 2000

	2000 NSGVP	1997 NSGVP	1987 VAS ¹
Rate of volunteering			
Total population ('000)	24,383	23,808	19,202
Total volunteers ('000)	6,513	7,472	5,337
Volunteer participation rate (%)	26.7	31.4	26.8
Hours volunteered			
Total hours volunteered ('000,000)	1,053.2	1,108.9	1,017.5
Full-time year-round job equivalents ²	549,000	578,000	530,000
Average hours volunteered per year	162	149	191

1. 1987 Volunteer Activity Survey, Statistics Canada.


2. Assuming 40 hours of work per week for 48 weeks.

Looking at the total and average number of hours volunteered provides only a partial picture of volunteering and obscures the fact that most volunteer hours are contributed by a small percentage of Canadians. In Figure 2.1, we grouped volunteers into four equal-sized categories based on total number of hours volunteered annually and calculated the percentage of hours provided by each group. Almost three-quarters of all volunteer hours (73%) come from the one-quarter of volunteers (25%) who contributed 188 hours or more.

Viewed from the perspective of the entire population, this means that 7% of all Canadians (one-quarter of the 26.7% of Canadians who volunteer) provided 73% of all volunteer hours in 2000. This finding is similar to 1997 when 8% of Canadians provided 72% of all volunteer hours. It should be noted, however, that the top quarter of volunteers in 2000 contributed more hours, on average, than did their counterparts in 1997 (471 in 2000 compared with 431 in 1997).

Figure 2.1

Distribution of volunteering by annual hours volunteered, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 2000



A profile of Canadian volunteers

Personal and economic characteristics

Although Canada's 6.5 million volunteers come from all walks of life, there are some characteristics that distinguish those who volunteer from those who do not. From a societal perspective, it is illuminating to identify which segments of the population are most attracted to making contributions of volunteer time.

In 2000, the rate of volunteering was higher for youth (29% for those aged 15 to 24) and those in their mid-adult years (30% for those aged 35 to 54) than it was for other age groups (Table 2.2). Compared with 1997, the volunteer rate has declined for all age

groups, most notably the 35-to-44 age group, where the rate decreased from 37% to 30% in 2000. Turning to the average number of volunteer hours, the amount of time spent volunteering increases with age, from a low of 130 hours for 15- to 24-year-olds to a high of 269 hours for those aged 65 and older. In comparison with 1997, there has been a 21-hour increase in average hours volunteered among 55- to 64-year-olds and a 67-hour increase among those 65 and older.

Women continue to be slightly more likely to volunteer than men (28% versus 25%, respectively), while men continue to contribute more total volunteer hours per year, on average (170 versus 155 hours, respectively).

Married people had the highest rate of volunteering (28%) and widowed Canadians had the lowest rate (17%). However, volunteers who were widowed, or who were separated or divorced, gave more hours (253 and 181 hours, respectively) than those who were married (165) or single (136). Volunteers who were widowed contributed, on average, 67 more hours in 2000 than in 1997.

Volunteer rates and volunteer hours generally increase with level of education. The percentage of people that volunteered ranged from 19% for those with less than high school education to 39% for those with university degrees. Although volunteer rates have declined since 1997 for each education group, the greatest decline was among those with a university education (from 48% to 39%). Canadians with higher levels of education tend to volunteer more hours, and those with some postsecondary education contribute the most. Compared with 1997, the greatest increases in average number of hours volunteered occurred among those with less than high school education (from 126 to 154 hours) and among those with some postsecondary education (from 153 to 173 hours).

Most volunteers are employed. In 2000, approximately 67% of volunteers were employed (compared with 65% in 1997), 30% were not in the labour force, and 4% were unemployed.

People who were employed, especially those with part-time jobs, were more likely to volunteer than those who were unemployed, or who were not in the labour force.¹⁵ Compared with 1997, the

¹⁵ Labour force status includes three categories: employed (working), unemployed (looking for work), or not in the labour force (neither working nor looking for work). See Appendix A for a full description.

volunteer rate in 2000 declined for people in all labour force categories, with the greatest decline occurring among the part-time employed (from 44% in 1997 to 33%). Since 1997, the average number of hours volunteered increased for all volunteers regardless of labour force status, with the unemployed experiencing the largest increase (from 121 hours in 1997 to 175 hours in 2000).

Higher levels of household income increase the likelihood of volunteering. Only 17% of people with household incomes under \$20,000 volunteered,

compared with 39% of those with incomes of \$100,000 or more. At the same time, the average number of hours volunteered tends to decline with income, and volunteers reporting the lowest levels of household income gave the most time in 2000 (207 hours, on average). Since 1997, volunteer rates have declined for people in all income categories. Although there have been increases in the number of hours volunteered for most income categories since 1997, the largest increases occurred among those with less than \$20,000 in household income (from 148 hours in 1997 to 207 hours in 2000).

Table 2.2

Percentage volunteering and average hours volunteered during the year, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000

Characteristic	2000	1997	2000	1997
	(%)	(%)	(average hours)	(average hours)
Age				
15-24	29	33	130	125
25-34	24	28	131	133
35-44	30	37	153	142
45-54	30	35	158	157
55-64	28	30	181	160
65 and older	18	23	269	202
Sex				
Male	25	29	170	160
Female	28	33	155	140
Marital status				
Married and common-law	28	33	165	151
Single, never married	26	31	136	133
Separated, divorced	25	29	181	157
Widowed	17	20	253	186
Education				
Less than high school	19	21	154	126
High school diploma	23	29	150	159
Some postsecondary	33	36	173	153
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	28	34	165	149
University degree	39	48	166	159
Labour force status				
Employed	28	34	147	138
Full-time	27	32	145	138
Part-time	33	44	155	139
Unemployed	25	29	175	121
Not in the labour force	24	27	193	176
Household income				
Less than \$20,000	17	22	207	148
\$20,000-\$39,999	21	29	179	163
\$40,000-\$59,999	26	33	162	150
\$60,000-\$79,999	31	36	156	144
\$80,000-\$99,999	35	42	127	128
\$100,000 or more	39	45	150	143

Volunteer activity: a way to enhance job opportunities?

Many volunteers appear to be looking to their volunteer activities to help them in the job market. Not only can volunteering help a person get a job, but it can also provide valuable employment skills and increase the chances of success in the workplace.


Despite a more favourable labour market in 2000 compared with 1997, volunteering is increasingly viewed by survey respondents as a way to improve employment prospects. Close to two-thirds of unemployed volunteers (62%) held this belief in 2000 compared with 54% in 1997. Young people aged 15 to 24 were particularly likely to hold this view. More than three out of four youths looking for work (78%) thought volunteering would help them get a job. Nevertheless, unemployed youth volunteers devoted a relatively low number of hours to volunteering (132 hours per year, on average).

More than one in every five volunteers (23%) agreed that improving job opportunities was a reason for volunteering, with younger volunteers aged 15 to 24 being even more likely (55%) to indicate this as a reason (Figure 2.2). Many volunteers believed that their volunteer work had indeed helped them get a job, especially younger volunteers. While 14% of volunteers agreed that their volunteering activities had at some point helped them to obtain employment, a greater percentage (24%) of younger volunteers (aged 15 to 24) were likely to agree.

Many employed volunteers believe that volunteering gives them a chance to learn skills that can be applied directly to their jobs; this belief was also more frequently reported by younger volunteers. More than one-third of employed volunteers (37%, up from 34% in 1997) held this belief compared with almost half of employed 15- to 24-year-olds (49%, up from 46% in 1997).

Figure 2.2


Percentage of individuals who volunteered to improve job opportunities; percentage who stated that volunteering had helped them to obtain employment, Canadian volunteers aged 15 to 64, 2000



Provincial variations


Participation in volunteer activities varies substantially from province to province (Figure 2.3). The volunteer rate was higher in Saskatchewan (42%), Alberta (39%), Prince Edward Island (37%), Manitoba (36%) and Nova Scotia (34%) than in other provinces. When the current provincial rates are compared with 1997, declines are evident in every province except Prince Edward Island. The largest declines occurred in Ontario (from 32% to 25%) and British Columbia (from 32% to 26%).

Figure 2.3
Volunteer participation rates by province, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Volunteers in the Atlantic provinces contributed more hours, on average, (ranging from 183 in Prince Edward Island to 206 hours in Newfoundland) than did volunteers in other provinces. In contrast, volunteers in the Prairie provinces contributed fewer hours (ranging from 139 in Alberta to 154 hours in Saskatchewan) (Figure 2.4). Alberta was the only province to show a decline, albeit slight, in the average number of hours volunteered since 1997.

Figure 2.4
Average annual volunteer hours by province, Canadian aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



The role of religion

Many religions advocate the practice of philanthropy and encourage their members to contribute time and money to those in need. The 1997 NSGVP demonstrated, perhaps not surprisingly, that volunteering is more prevalent among Canadians who are actively religious. The 2000 NSGVP again asked Canadians three questions about their religion: they were asked to indicate their religious affiliation, the frequency with which they attended religious services, and the level of their religious commitment.


People who reported having a religious affiliation were somewhat more likely to volunteer than those who did not (28% versus 26%) (Figure 2.5). Volunteers with a religious affiliation gave more time, on average, than did those without one (168 hours versus 149 hours) (Figure 2.6). Since 1997, the rate of volunteering has declined for both those with and those without religious affiliations, while the average number of hours volunteered by both groups has increased.

Attendance rates are an even more important indication of the likelihood that someone will volunteer their time and energy. For example, those who attended religious services or meetings on a weekly basis in the previous year were much more likely to volunteer than those who did not (41% versus 24%); they also gave more time, on average

The NSGVP also asks people about the extent to which they consider themselves to be religious. Those Canadians who said they were very religious were more likely to volunteer (37% volunteered); they also gave more hours, on average, than those who said they were not (200 hours versus 156 hours).

Figure 2.5

Volunteer participation rates by religious affiliation, attendance of religious services and level of religious commitment, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




(202 hours versus 149 hours). While the rate of volunteering has declined since 1997 for both those who attended services weekly and those who did not, the average number of hours contributed has increased, particularly among those who did not attend services weekly (from 129 hours in 1997 to 149 hours in 2000).

Since 1997, the percentage of the very religious who volunteer has dropped from 44% to 37%, and the average number of hours volunteered by Canadians who do not consider themselves to be very religious increased from 138 hours to 156.

Figure 2.6

Average hours volunteered annually by religious affiliation, attendance of religious services and level of religious commitment, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



While volunteering appears to be associated with religious practices, religious volunteers do not dedicate their voluntary activities solely to religious organizations. For example, while 21% of all

volunteers reported giving some time to religious organizations, these organizations accounted for only 16% of the total number of hours volunteered.


How volunteers become involved

Many Canadians begin volunteering because they are asked to contribute their time by someone in an organization. In 2000, this was the most common way of becoming a volunteer—or initiating a ‘volunteer event’¹⁶—with an organization (Figure 2.7). However, fewer volunteers in 2000 reported that they had started volunteering in this way. While 44% of all volunteering in 1997 was initiated by a personal invitation to contribute, only 30% of volunteering in 2000 began this way.

The second most common way volunteers began their involvement was by approaching the organization themselves. Again, fewer volunteer events in 2000 were started in this way than in 1997 (16% versus 29%). Other important ways of becoming a volunteer in 2000 included being a member of the organization (15%) and having a child or spouse involved with the organization (12%).¹⁷ Finally, being asked by a friend or relative outside the organization prompted 9% of volunteer events in 2000.

Figure 2.7

How volunteers became involved, Canadian volunteers aged 15 years and older, 2000



16 In this report, each organization reported by an individual constitutes one ‘volunteer event.’ A volunteer event represents an involvement with an organization. It does not take into account the number of different activities performed nor the frequency, timing or duration of volunteering in that organization. For each volunteer event reported (up to a maximum of three), volunteers were asked how they first became involved with the organization for which they volunteered.

17 These two ways of initially becoming a volunteer for an organization were added as new response categories in 2000 as a result of answers provided to the 1997 survey. The addition of these new categories may be responsible for some of the decline in the other categories.

The connection between early life experiences and volunteering

Volunteering in adulthood appears to be related to a number of early life experiences. In comparison with the volunteer rate for all Canadians (27%), the probability of volunteering is higher among those who, in their youth

- were active in student government (42% volunteered in 2000);
- had a parent who volunteered in the community (39%);
- were active in a religious organization (38%);
- did some kind of volunteer work (36%);
- were helped by others (35%);
- belonged to a youth group (35%);
- saw someone they admired helping others (34%);
- did door-to-door canvassing (33%); or
- participated in an organized team sport (31%).

Compared with 1997, there has been a 4% to 9% decline in the percentage of volunteers reporting each of these early life experiences. These findings suggest that the exposure to some early life experiences may help to increase the chances of volunteering in adulthood, although the links between these experiences and later volunteering may be weakening.

Mandatory community service

In the 2000 NSGVP, volunteers were asked if one of the reasons they volunteered was because they were required to do so by their school, their employer or the government.¹⁸ Over 7% of Canada's volunteers—approximately 484,000—reported that this was the case; these Canadians averaged almost 150 hours over the year, for a total of more than 72 million hours.¹⁹

Volunteering in order to graduate from secondary school is one of the more common forms of mandatory community service. This is now a province-wide requirement in several provinces, including Ontario, and has been implemented by some school districts within other provinces. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the volunteers who indicated they volunteered because they were required to were aged 15 to 19 (35%), single (48%), and had less than a high school diploma (32%). Interestingly, nearly two-thirds (61%) of these volunteers were women. However, men who said they were required to volunteer contributed more time, on average, than women (172 versus 136 hours).

About 225,000 of the 484,000 Canadians who volunteered because they were required to did so for one organization only. This group of volunteers bolstered the national volunteering rate by almost a full percentage point.

¹⁸ Community service orders issued through the justice system are an example of government-required volunteering.

¹⁹ It is not possible to determine from the survey if all, or how many, of the hours contributed were required.


The organizations supported by volunteers

Volunteers express their support for the work of charitable and non-profit organizations every time they make a contribution of time. By supporting the work of these organizations, volunteers help to ensure that their communities benefit from the diverse set of services these organizations provide. These services range from day-care for children to literacy programs for adults; from recreational opportunities for youth to friendly visiting for seniors; from prenatal training for parents-to-be to research on cures for diseases; and from shelters for the homeless to home-building for those in need.

Most volunteering events and most volunteer hours were directed toward five types of organizations.²⁰ As figures 2.8 and 2.9 show, arts, culture and recreation (including sports) organizations accounted for the highest percentage of volunteer events (23%) and volunteer hours (26%). These are followed by social service organizations (20% of events and 20% of hours); religious organizations (14% and 16%); education and research organizations (13% and 11%); and health organizations (13% and 9%). Other types of organizations²¹ accounted for the remaining 17% of both volunteer events and volunteer hours. There was little change from 1997 in the types of organizations for which Canadians volunteered in either events or hours.²²

Figure 2.8

Distribution of volunteer events by type of organization, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




Most volunteers (59%) restricted their volunteering to one organization over the course of a year. Just over one-quarter (26%) volunteered for two organizations and 15% volunteered for three or more organizations. These findings are similar to those obtained in the 1997 NSGVP.

20 Respondents were asked to indicate the names of the organizations for which they volunteered and to state what the organizations did. Based on this information, organizations were classified into 12 categories according to the types of activities performed. The classification system is described in Appendix A.

21 The seven remaining types of organizations are development and housing; law, advocacy and politics; environment; professional associations and unions; philanthropy and voluntarism; international; and organizations not elsewhere classified.

22 Please note that the 1997 estimates of the distribution of events and hours by type of organization have been revised and, as such, differ from those originally published in the 1997 report.

Figure 2.9
Distribution of volunteer hours by type of organization, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




What volunteers do

Canadians engage in a wide spectrum of volunteer activities in their efforts to support each other and their communities (Figure 2.10). Some aid voluntary organizations by serving on boards and committees or by performing office work, while others assist by providing services such as delivering food, fighting fires or protecting the environment. Still others help to raise funds for organizations by canvassing and fundraising.

The NSGVP measures volunteer activity by asking Canadians about their participation in 15 general types of volunteer activities. The 10 most frequently reported activities are shown in Figure 2.10. More than half of all volunteers (57%) helped to organize or supervise activities or events for an organization. Other common activities included serving as an unpaid member of a board or committee (41%), and canvassing, campaigning or

fundraising (40%). Consulting, executive, and office or administrative work was carried out by 30% of volunteers. Each of the following activities was reported by less than 30% of volunteers: providing information to help educate, influence public opinion or lobby on behalf of an organization; teaching or coaching for an organization; providing care or support to others through an organization; collecting and delivering food; doing volunteer driving on behalf of an organization; performing maintenance or repair activities; helping to improve the environment; and participating in self-help groups.

Figure 2.10
Types of volunteer activities, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



The types of activities undertaken by volunteers appear to be changing. Compared with 1997, there has been an increase in the percentage of volunteers who organized or supervised events (from 51% to 57%) and in the percentage that helped to improve the environment (from 11% to 16%). In contrast, there has been a decline in the percentage that took part in canvassing, campaigning or fundraising (from 44% to 40%).


Helping people directly: informal volunteering

Many Canadians show their concern for others, not only by formally volunteering with organizations, but also by providing direct help to others on a one-to-one basis. The NSGVP asked people to indicate whether they had provided, on their own and not through an organization, unpaid help to other people. In 2000, 77% of Canadians reported helping others, up from 73% in 1997. Of these Canadians, 79% had helped people other than relatives (up from 71% in 1997) and 63% had helped relatives not living with them (down from 66% in 1997).

What kinds of help do Canadians provide the most? Over half of those who provided help directly to others (57%) did so by shopping for them or driving them to appointments or stores (Figure 2.11). Other forms of help included housework (51%), unpaid baby-sitting (51%), yard or maintenance work (49%), visiting the elderly (45%), and providing care for the sick or elderly (42%).

Figure 2.11

Activities done directly for others, not through an organization, Canadians helping people directly aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Compared with 1997, there are some notable changes in how people report helping one another. The largest increase was in the percentage of people providing housework directly to others (to 51% from 43% in 1997), and the sharpest decline was in the percentage writing letters, finding information or filling out forms for others (down to 38% from 47% in 1997).

The reasons for volunteering

The decision to contribute time to groups and organizations in the charitable or non-profit sector is a complex one, and is influenced by a variety of factors. Not only are there many motivations for volunteering—ranging from the utilitarian to the humanitarian—but there are also competing demands on people’s time and alternative ways to provide support (by giving money instead of time, for example). To better understand why individuals volunteer, and why some individuals volunteer more time than others, the NSGVP asked a series of questions that assessed people’s reasons for volunteering and explored the factors that kept them from volunteering more.

Motivations

Respondents said they volunteer because of feelings of personal connection or obligation to an organization, a desire for personal or professional self-development and a desire to maintain social connections. The NSGVP asked volunteers whether they agreed or disagreed with seven possible reasons for being a volunteer (Figure 2.12).

Almost all volunteers (95%) agreed that the reason they volunteer is to help a cause they believe in. Approximately 8 out of 10 volunteers (81%) volunteered because they wanted to put their skills and experience to use. Over two-thirds (69%) volunteered because they had been personally affected by the cause the organization supports. Fifty-seven percent were attracted to voluntary service because they saw it as an opportunity to explore their strengths. Finally, 23% volunteered because they wanted to improve their job opportunities.

Compared with 1997, there has been little change in the percentage of volunteers reporting these reasons for volunteering. The desire to fulfil religious obligations or beliefs by performing volunteer activities declined from 29% to 26%, while volunteering because one’s friends volunteered showed the largest increase, from 25% to 30%.

Barriers

What keeps people from volunteering or from volunteering more of their time? To assess this, the NSGVP presented volunteers and non-volunteers with a list of 10 possible barriers. Volunteers were asked whether each was a possible reason for not volunteering more, and non-volunteers were asked whether each was a reason for not volunteering at all (Figures 2.13 and 2.14).

Figure 2.12

Reasons for volunteering, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000





Figure 2.13


Reasons for not volunteering more, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



The reason most frequently given by volunteers for not volunteering more (76%) and by non-volunteers for not volunteering at all (69%) was lack of time. The next most frequently given was being unwilling to make a year-round commitment (34% of volunteers, 46% of non-volunteers). A substantial percentage of volunteers (29%) and of non-volunteers (22%) agreed that the reason they were not more active as volunteers was because they had already made their contribution to volunteering. Finally, 24% of volunteers and 38% of non-volunteers indicated that they did not volunteer more because they gave money instead of time.

Figure 2.14

Reasons for not volunteering, Canadians who did not volunteer aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Some reasons for not volunteering more appear to have increased in importance since the 1997 NSGVP. Volunteers and non-volunteers were both more likely to agree in 2000 than in 1997 that they did not volunteer more because they gave money instead of time (24% versus 19% for volunteers; 38% versus 33% for non-volunteers). In 2000, non-volunteers were also more likely to indicate that they did not volunteer because they had not been personally asked (37% versus 32% in 1997) and because they did not know how to become involved (20% versus 16% in 1997).

The benefits of volunteering


Many volunteers recognize the personal benefits that accrue from volunteering. More than three-quarters (79%) agreed that their volunteer activity had given them interpersonal skills such as understanding people better, learning how to motivate others, and learning how to deal with difficult situations (Figure 2.15). Two-thirds (68%) reported that their volunteer activity had provided them with communication skills such as public speaking, writing, conducting meetings, and doing public

relations. Just under two-thirds (63%) had increased their knowledge on a variety of subjects (such as health, women’s issues, political issues, criminal justice and the environment). Over half (57%) reported that volunteering had given them organizational and managerial skills.

There have been only modest changes in the perceived benefits of volunteering since 1997. In 2000, more volunteers indicated that their volunteer activities had provided them with technical or office skills such as using computers, bookkeeping, or library cataloguing (33% versus 25% in 1997) and with organizational and managerial skills (57% versus 51%).

Figure 2.15

Benefits of volunteering, Canadian volunteers aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Youth volunteers

In 2000, volunteerism among Canadian youth changed in nature and focus. The percentage of young people (those aged 15 to 24) who volunteered declined to 29% in 2000 from 33% in 1997. However, these volunteers gave more hours, on average (130 hours versus 125 hours in 1997). Almost one in five (18%) of these young volunteers reported that some or all of the hours they contributed were required by their school, their employer or the government.

What causes do Canadian young people support? Most youth volunteering occurs with three types of organizations:

- education and research—23% of youth volunteer events and 19% of youth volunteer hours;
- social services—20% of events and 22% of hours; and
- arts, culture and recreation, which includes sports—20% of events and 18% of hours.

These results are very similar to those from 1997, with one notable exception: the percentage of youth volunteer hours accounted for by education and research organizations declined from 29% in 1997 to 19% in 2000.

What activities are Canadian youth volunteers involved in? The main types of activities include:

- organizing and supervising events (53% versus 49% in 1997);
- canvassing, campaigning and fundraising (39% versus 43% in 1997);
- teaching or coaching (34% versus 29% in 1997);
- providing care, support or counselling (29% versus 23% in 1997); and,
- serving as an unpaid member of a board or committee (26% in 2000 and 25% in 1997).

Finally, as was the case in 1997, younger volunteers appear to have different motivations for volunteering than do volunteers in general. They are more likely to volunteer to improve their job opportunities (55% versus 16% for non-youth volunteers), to explore their own strengths (71% versus 54%) and because their friends volunteered (42% versus 28%). They are less likely to volunteer to help a cause in which they believe (90% versus 96% for non-youth), because they were personally affected by the cause the organization supports (59% versus 71% for non-youth), or to fulfil religious obligations or beliefs (19% versus 28% for non-youth).


The links between volunteering and other forms of support

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the ways in which Canadians support one another and their communities are interconnected. Volunteers are more likely than non-volunteers to make charitable donations, help others directly, give money directly

to others and participate in community organizations (Figure 2.16). Moreover, the likelihood of providing these other types of support tends to increase with the amount of time contributed. For example, more than 9 out of every 10 (93%) of the top 25% of volunteers (those contributing 188 hours or more annually) made charitable donations in 2000 compared with 73% of those who did not volunteer. Similarly, 79% of Canadians in the top 25% of volunteers were involved in community organizations compared with 42% of non-volunteers. These results are similar to those observed in 1997.

Figure 2.16

Percentage of Canadians aged 15 and older engaged in supportive activities, by amount of time volunteered, 2000



Employer support for employee volunteer activities

In 2000, approximately 67% of volunteers were employed and many received support from their employers for their volunteer activities. As in 1997, the most common type of support reported by volunteers was the approved use of their employer's facilities and equipment (28%). An increasing number of employed volunteers reported receiving approval from employers to modify their work hours in order to take part in volunteer activities (27%, up from 22% in 1997.)

There was also an increase in the percentage who reported receiving recognition or a letter of thanks from their employer for their volunteer activities in 2000 (22% compared with 14% in 1997). Interestingly, younger volunteers appear to be more likely than others to receive some types of employer support. Men aged 35 to 44 and women aged 15 to 24 were more likely to report having received approval from employers to modify work hours (30% and 34%, respectively).

CHAPTER 3

Civic participation

Not only do Canadians contribute volunteer time and make charitable donations, they also support each other and their communities by joining non-profit groups and organizations, participating in their activities, keeping informed about news and current affairs, and expressing their political preferences through voting. Such 'civic' participation is an important ingredient in building and maintaining vibrant communities.

Groups and organizations such as service clubs, hobby organizations, sports and recreation organizations, school groups, political organizations and neighbourhood associations enable Canadians to come together to pursue common interests. Communities gain as well because many of these organizations undertake activities that benefit not only their own members, but also the broader community, such as organizing sports clubs for youth, supporting museums, and preserving heritage sites and wetlands. Participation in groups and organizations promotes interpersonal trust and social bonds among community members and provides a solid foundation for community action on many fronts.

To measure civic participation,²³ the NSGVP asked respondents about their membership and participation in various kinds of community organizations and groups, their voting behaviour during elections, and the extent to which they followed news and public affairs.

Participating in 2000: what's new?

In the three years since the 1997 NSGVP, there were some important changes in the ways in which Canadians participate in their society:


- Although the participation rate (51%) remained the same in 2000 as 1997, it increased in Prince Edward Island, Alberta and British Columbia and declined in Ontario.
- There were notable declines in participation among Canadians with a university degree (from 74% to 67%) and those reporting household incomes of \$100,000 or more (from 73% to 63%). This parallels declines in volunteering among these Canadians.
- More than one in every five Canadians is a member of a work-related organization or group in 2000, up slightly from 1997.

In 2000, just over one in every two (51%) Canadians aged 15 and over was a member of, or participated in, the types of groups or organizations shown in Figure 3.1. This rate is the same as the participation rate in 1997 (51%). As was the case in 1997, the most common organizations or groups in which respondents were involved in 2000 were work-related, such as unions or professional organizations (reported by 21% of respondents) and sports and recreation organizations (18%).

23 While the term 'civic participation' conventionally refers to the political activity of individuals, in this report the term refers to a broader set of activities that entail involvement in civic (community) life.

Figure 3.1


Percentage participating as members by type of organization or group, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000



Exercising the right to vote is one of the many ways Canadians participate in community life, and voting is a key indicator of the democratic health of a society. According to the 2000 NSGVP, 74% of Canadians of voting age (18 or older) reported having gone to the polls in the last federal election, 73% in the last provincial election, and 60% in the last municipal election (Figure 3.2). This is quite similar to 1997.

Figure 3.2

Percentage who reported voting in the last election, Canadians aged 18 and older, 1997 and 2000



Finally, following newsworthy events and public affairs is one indication of Canadians' awareness of their community and society. In 2000, almost 9 in 10 Canadians (88%) reported following the news and current affairs daily or several times a week. This is a slight decline from 1997, when 90% reported following the news with this frequency.

A profile of Canadian participators

Personal and economic characteristics

Membership and participation in groups and organizations among Canadians varies with personal and economic characteristics (Table 3.1). The likelihood of being a member or participant was highest among people between the ages of 35 and 64 (over 50%) and lowest among those aged 15 to 24 (47%) and 65 and over (47%). Compared with 1997, the civic participation rate increased slightly for younger Canadians (aged 15 to 24) and older Canadians (aged 65 and over), while it declined for those between the ages of 35 and 64.

Men had a slightly higher incidence of membership and participation than did women (53% versus 48%). Married people (53%) were more likely to be involved with groups and organizations than were those who were single (48%), separated or divorced (45%), or widowed (47%). Compared with 1997, widowed Canadians showed the greatest increase in civic participation.

As was the case in 1997, the rate of membership in organizations and groups increased with education and income. For example, over 67% of those with a university degree were members or participants, compared with 40% of those who did not complete secondary school. Similarly, Canadians with higher levels of household income were more likely to belong to an organization or group. As with the rate of volunteering, the largest declines in the rate of participation since 1997 occurred among those with a university education (from 74% to 67%) and among those with incomes of \$100,000 or more (from 73% to 63%).

Employed individuals (54%) were more likely to belong to an organization or group than were individuals who were either unemployed (37%) or not in the labour force (45%). This finding is not unexpected, given that membership in a work-related organization or group is the most common type reported by Canadians. However, when compared with 1997, employed Canadians reported a lower rate of participation while those not in the labour force reported a higher rate.

Finally, the likelihood of being a member of, or participant in, an organization or group was greater among those who indicated they were either very religious (62%) or somewhat religious (53%) than it was among those who were not very religious (45%) or not at all religious (45%).

Table 3.1

Membership in organizations or groups by personal and economic characteristics, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000


Characteristic	2000 (%)	1997 (%)
Age		
15–24	47	44
25–34	49	48
35–44	53	55
45–54	54	57
55–64	53	54
65 and older	47	45
Sex		
Male	53	53
Female	48	49
Marital status		
Married and common-law	53	54
Single, never married	48	46
Separated, divorced	45	44
Widowed	47	39
Education		
Less than high school	40	40
High school diploma	48	45
Some postsecondary	51	53
Postsecondary diploma	53	53
University degree	67	74
Labour force status		
Employed	54	57
Full-time	55	57
Part-time	54	58
Unemployed	37	36
Not in the labour force	45	42
Household income		
Less than \$20,000	33	34
\$20,000–\$39,999	43	45
\$40,000–\$59,999	54	54
\$60,000–\$79,999	57	60
\$80,000–\$99,999	62	69
\$100,000 or more	63	73
Religious commitment		
Not at all religious	45	43
Not very religious	45	45
Somewhat religious	53	54
Very religious	62	65

Provincial variations

Civic participation, like giving and volunteering, varied across Canada's provinces (Figure 3.3). The percentage of Canadians who reported belonging to, or participating in, at least one organization or group was highest in the four western provinces (from 59% to 61%), Prince Edward Island (59%) and Nova Scotia (57%). Since 1997, there has been a notable increase in civic participation in Prince Edward Island, Alberta and British Columbia, while there has been a slight decline in Ontario and Quebec.

Figure 3.3

Percentage participating as members in an organization or group by province, Canadians aged 15 and older, 1997 and 2000




Links with other forms of support

As we have already noted, there are linkages among the various forms of support that individuals provide. People who belong to, or participate in, an organization or group are more likely to give and to volunteer than are those who do not (Figure 3.4). For example, 40% of people who were members of at least one organization or group volunteered in 2000, compared with just 14% of those who were not members. These linkages among civic participation and other forms of support were also found in 1997. In both years, people who were members of at least one organization or group volunteered at a rate almost three times higher than those who were not members.

Figure 3.4

Percentage reporting supportive activities by membership in an organization or group, Canadians aged 15 and older, 2000



Conclusion

What does this ‘snapshot’ of the state of voluntary and civic action tell us? It shows that philanthropy and volunteering continue to be vibrant characteristics of Canadian life. Virtually all Canadians, during the course of a year, help to improve the lives of others, their community or their environment, either through their own efforts or by donating time or money to charitable and non-profit organizations. The NSGVP paints a picture of increasing financial contributions on the part of Canadians and a decline in the number who devote their discretionary time to volunteer activities. It also shows that those who do engage in volunteer activity are doing more.

Giving, volunteering and participating are all influenced by a complex set of factors that includes economic conditions, demographics, values and government policy. It is important, therefore, to consider how these factors may be changing as well as the possible impact of these changes on the types of support people are willing and able to provide.

Economic factors such as income levels and income growth affect the amount of discretionary income that people have available for donations. The economy has an impact on the labour market, affecting employment rates, hours of work and the quality of people’s work, which, in turn, influence the availability and quality of free time that individuals can devote to volunteering.

Changing demographic conditions also influence giving, volunteering and participating. For example, an aging population will have consequences for giving and volunteering. For some, age brings greater discretionary income to channel towards charitable donations, as mortgages are retired and housing costs are reduced. For others, aging may bring declining health that interferes with the ability to volunteer. Other demographic factors such as changes in the ethnocultural composition of the population,

immigration and increased population mobility may also exert an influence.

Values, of course, underlie all the choices individuals make about which behaviours to engage in, and these too are subject to change. Changing values about what is done with discretionary income and free time will have an impact on giving, volunteering and participating. For example, the NSGVP shows that religious beliefs are a hallmark of the active volunteer and donor. Declines in levels of religious commitment may have an impact on giving and volunteering.

Finally, governments exert influence on giving and volunteering through the development of policies designed to encourage these activities. Improved tax credits for donations and the introduction of mandatory community service as a requirement for secondary school graduation are examples of government contributions to giving and volunteering.

The objectives of this first report of the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating have necessarily been limited to providing an initial, high-level, descriptive analysis of survey findings. Identification of all of the critical trends in giving, volunteering and participating, and analysis of their causes and impacts, is well beyond the scope of this report. A deepening time-crunch in Canadian families and growing family incomes seem to be important factors in the patterns of growth and decline in volunteering, participating and giving between 1997 and 2000, but even these relationships require further exploration and confirmation. Other influences, such as evolving values, the role of ‘compulsory volunteering,’ the evolving demographic composition of Canadian society and tax-treatment of charitable donations, also require further investigation.

The spectrum of support

Canadians engage in a broad spectrum of activities to support each other and their communities, and these activities are best understood when examined all together rather than in isolation from one another. Almost every Canadian gives either money or goods to charitable and non-profit organizations and many give money directly to people who live outside of their homes. Over one-quarter of Canadians volunteer their time to a charitable or non-profit organization and almost 8 in 10 Canadians help people on their own, not through an organization (for example, by doing housework for them or by driving them to appointments).

Although the vast majority of Canadians engage in at least one of these supportive activities, many do so in only modest amounts. The small number of people who are highly active provide the bulk of support in the country. Indeed, the 2000 survey reveals that an even smaller proportion of Canadians—fewer than 1 in 10 (9% compared with almost 11% in 1997)—are ‘core supporters’ and provide 46% of the total dollar value of all donations and 40% of all volunteer hours.²⁴

It is also important to note that those Canadians who provide any one of these many types of support are more likely to provide other types. For example, those who volunteer are more likely to make charitable donations than are those who do not volunteer. They are also more likely to give help directly to others, to belong to organizations and to vote in elections. This also means that those who are highly active in providing the bulk of support in one area (such as volunteering) are also likely to be highly active in providing support in other areas.

In sum, most Canadians make some contribution of time or money over the course of a year. However, some give much more than others. Moreover, those

who provide one kind of support such as charitable giving are also more likely to provide other kinds of support such as volunteering. What emerges is a portrait of a society in which most citizens provide modest, albeit important, levels of support to one another, but which also depends heavily upon the contributions of a small core of particularly engaged citizens.

The results from the NSGVP in 1997 and 2000 may raise as many questions as they answer, which is, in part, one of the purposes of this series of surveys. The NSGVP focusses primarily on tracking behaviours and the characteristics of the individuals who engage in these behaviours. It enables us to track whether giving, volunteering and participating are on the rise, or declining, and whether such changes are widespread or confined to identifiable pockets in the population. The NSGVP serves as a barometer of the vitality of the support Canadians provide and points to areas where more in-depth study is required.

A question of paramount interest is why the percentage of Canadians who volunteer has declined from 31% in 1997 to 27% in 2000. There are a number of possible explanations, none of which are mutually exclusive. Perhaps Canadians are more pressed for time because of the demands of work and family and are having difficulty finding time to volunteer. Canadians, particularly younger Canadians, may also be feeling less need to use volunteering to help them in the labour market. Because religious belief appears to be a hallmark of giving and volunteering, it is also possible that declines in volunteering can be attributed to declining religiosity.²⁵ Alternatively, organizations may be changing their volunteer recruitment practices. With respect to this latter possibility, it is worth noting that fewer donors are giving by way of door-to-door canvassing and fewer volunteers appear to be engaged in this activity. In addition, there has been a decline in the number of volunteers who report becoming involved with an organization as a result of being asked.

24 These core supporters are defined as Canadians who are in the top 25% of donors and who also volunteer.

25 While there were only very modest changes in measures of religious affiliation, attendance and belief between 1997 and 2000 according to the NSGVP, there has been a long-term decline. Over the last 50 years in Canada, the percentage of the adult population attending religious services has declined dramatically from 67% attending during a typical week in 1946 to only 22% in 1998 (Clark, W. 2000. “Patterns of religious attendance,” *Canadian Social Trends*, Winter, 59.)

Charitable giving does not display quite the same vulnerabilities as does volunteering. However, it is difficult to pinpoint the reasons that the donor rate has held steady since 1997 while the amounts donated have increased. Donations may be increasing partly as a function of economic growth, increasing incomes and greater discretionary income. Donations may also be being used as a substitute for volunteering. Finally, some of the increase in donations may be the result of improved tax credits for charitable giving. With respect to this latter suggestion, it is worth noting that there were more Canadian donors who cited the income tax credit as a reason for giving in 2000 than in 1997.

Caring and involved Canadians

Canadians, as a people, embody the title of this report: *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians*. They give, volunteer and participate to support and connect with individuals, groups and communities. They offer their time, skills and compassion. They donate money to organizations and causes to support efforts that they and their families value most. Their contributions add to the quality of life of individuals and to the health of their communities. Their actions help to define who we are as Canadians.

Appendix A: Glossary of terms

Major survey concepts and variables

Certain key variables or concepts are used frequently in the data analyses and interpretations contained in this report. Rather than defining these concepts in each section, we have provided an alphabetical summary below.

Donors

These are people who made donations of money to a charitable or non-profit organization in the 12-month reference period preceding the survey. This definition excludes those who made donations of loose change to coin collection boxes located beside cash registers at store check-outs.

Demographic and employment-related data

The NSGVP was conducted as a supplement to the October 2000 Labour Force Survey (LFS). As such, the demographic and employment data originate from the LFS.

Employed

Those people who worked for pay or profit during the week preceding the survey are considered employed, as are those who had a job but were not at work for reasons such as illness, family responsibilities or vacation. Persons on layoff are not considered employed.

Employed full-time or part-time

Full-time workers are defined as those who usually work 30 or more hours a week; part-time workers usually work fewer than 30 hours a week.

Household income

Data on household income are based on total household income from all sources before taxes during the 12-month reference period. Items such as tips, commissions, alimony and child support are included.

Median

The median value is the statistical ‘halfway point’ of a distribution of values. The median donation, for example, is the value for which half of donors report higher donations and half report lower donations.

Not in the labour force

These are people in the civilian non-institutionalized population aged 15 years and older who were neither employed nor unemployed during the week preceding the survey.

Organization classification

Respondents were asked to provide information on the organizations for which they volunteered and to which they made donations. Respondents were first asked to provide the name of the organization. A pick-list of the most common organizations reported in the 1997 survey was used. If the organization cited by the respondent was not on this pick-list, the respondent was then asked to provide information about the purpose of the organization in order to place it in a broad category.

The International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations (ICNPO), Revision 1, developed by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, was used to code organizations. A major advantage of the ICNPO system is that it is used widely by other countries and thus allows for international comparisons. The ICNPO system groups organizations into 12 major activity groups,

including a catch-all ‘not elsewhere classified’ category. These 12 major activity groups are further divided into 24 subgroups. For this report, the 12 major activity groups reported on are the following:

1. *Culture and recreation*: This category includes organizations and activities in general and specialized fields of culture and recreation. Three subgroups are included: (1) culture and arts (that is, media and communications; visual arts, architecture, ceramic art; performing arts; historical, literary and humanistic societies; museums; and zoos and aquariums); (2) sports; and (3) other recreation and social clubs (that is, service clubs and recreation and social clubs).
2. *Education and research*: This category includes organizations and activities administering, providing, promoting, conducting, supporting and servicing education and research. Four subgroups are included: (1) primary and secondary education organizations; (2) higher education organizations; (3) organizations involved in other education (that is, adult/continuing education and vocational/technical schools); and (4) organizations involved in research (that is, medical research, science and technology, and social sciences).
3. *Health*: This category includes organizations that engage in health-related activities, providing health care, both general and specialized services, administration of health care services, and health support services. Four subgroups are included: (1) hospitals and rehabilitation; (2) nursing homes; (3) mental health and crisis intervention; and (4) other health services (that is, public health and wellness education, outpatient health treatment, rehabilitative medical services, and emergency medical services).
4. *Social services*: This category includes organizations and institutions providing human and social services to a community or target population. Three subgroups are included: (1) social services (including organizations providing services for children, youth, families, the handicapped and the elderly, and self-help and other personal social services); (2) emergency and relief; and (3) income support and maintenance.
5. *Environment*: This category includes organizations promoting and providing services in environmental conservation, pollution control and prevention, environmental education and health, and animal protection. Two subgroups are included: environment and animal protection.
6. *Development and housing*: This category includes organizations promoting programs and providing services to help improve communities and promote the economic and social well-being of society. Three subgroups are included: (1) economic, social and community development (including community and neighbourhood organizations); (2) housing; and (3) employment and training.
7. *Law, advocacy and politics*: This category includes organizations and groups that work to protect and promote civil and other rights, advocate the social and political interests of general or special constituencies, offer legal services, and promote public safety. Three subgroups are included: (1) civic and advocacy organizations; (2) law and legal services; and (3) political organizations.
8. *Philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism*: This category includes philanthropic organizations and organizations promoting charity and charitable activities including grant-making foundations, organizations promoting and supporting voluntarism, and fundraising organizations.
9. *International*: This category includes organizations promoting cultural understanding between peoples of various countries and historical backgrounds, as well as those providing emergency relief and promoting development and welfare abroad.
10. *Religion*: This category includes organizations promoting religious beliefs and administering religious services and rituals (for example, churches, mosques, synagogues, temples, shrines, seminaries, monasteries and similar religious institutions), in addition to related organizations and auxiliaries of such organizations.

11. *Business and professional associations, unions:*
This category includes organizations promoting, regulating and safeguarding business, professional and labour interests.

12. *Groups not elsewhere classified*

Participators

These are people who reported membership or participation in at least one community organization or group at the time of the survey. The data in this report do not deal with the extent of respondents' participation in such organizations.

Population

The target population includes all people aged 15 years and older residing in Canada except for the following: residents of the Yukon and Northwest Territories, persons living on Indian reserves, inmates of institutions, and full-time members of the Armed Forces.

Reference period

Most of the survey's questions on giving and volunteering are set in the context of a one-year time span or reference period.

2000 NSGVP: The one-year period from October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.

1997 NSGVP: The one-year period from November 1, 1996 to October 31, 1997.

Rounding

In this report, counts have been rounded, but because the totals are based on unrounded data, they will not always equal the sum of individually rounded items. Percentages were usually rounded to units (occasionally to one decimal place) after they were calculated using unrounded data.

Unemployed

Unemployed people are those who, during the week preceding the survey (the reference week), were without work and were available for work and (a) had actively looked for work in the four weeks preceding the reference week or (b) were on temporary layoff, or (c) had a new job to start in four weeks or less from the reference week.

Volunteers

These are people who volunteer, that is, who willingly perform a service without pay, through a group or organization. The data in this report deal with people who volunteered at least once in the 12-month reference period preceding the survey.

Appendix B: Data quality

Sample design

The 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) was conducted as a supplement to the October 2000 Canadian Labour Force Survey (LFS). One person aged 15 or older was randomly selected from eligible LFS households. After completing the LFS interviews, the selected individuals were surveyed for the NSGVP using computer-assisted interviewing.

The first set of NSGVP questions pertained to volunteer activities. A preprogrammed random selection process gave respondents who did not volunteer a 65% chance of being screened out of the survey at this point. The 13,449 respondents who were screened out were not included in the survey results; they were used, however, in the calculation of the final response rate of 63.2%. The sample size for the 2000 NSGVP was 14,724 individuals.

Survey errors

Sample surveys produce estimates based on information collected from, and about, a sample of individuals. Somewhat different findings would be obtained if a census—a complete count of all individuals in a population—were taken using the same method (that is, using the same questionnaire, interviewers, supervisors, and processing). The difference between the estimates obtained from the sample survey and the values that would be obtained from a complete count is called *sampling error*.

Errors that are not related to sampling may occur at almost every phase of a survey operation. Interviewers may misunderstand instructions, respondents may make errors in answering questions, answers may be entered incorrectly on the questionnaire, and errors may be introduced in the processing and tabulation of the data. These are examples of *non-sampling errors*.

Non-sampling errors

Over a large number of observations, errors occurring randomly will have little effect on survey estimates. Errors occurring systematically, however, will contribute to biased estimates. Considerable effort is made to reduce non-sampling errors in a survey by implementing quality assurance measures at each step of data collection and processing. These measures include using skilled interviewers; providing extensive training on survey procedures and the questionnaire; conducting observation to detect problems in the survey design or instructions; implementing procedures to minimize data capture errors; and doing quality checks to verify data editing and coding.

A major source of non-sampling error is the effect of *non-response* on the survey results. The extent of non-response varies from partial non-response (failure to answer just one or some questions) to total non-response. *Total non-response* occurs when the interviewer is unable to contact the respondent, no member of the household is able to provide the information, or the respondent refuses to participate in the survey. For the 2000 NSGVP, a non-response adjustment was made to the weight²⁶ of respondents who completed the survey to compensate for those who did not respond.

Owing to a higher than expected level of total non-response, the adjustment was based on a detailed grouping of personal and economic as well as geographic information. Since the NSGVP was a supplement to the LFS, there were LFS characteristics such as education available for both the respondents and non-respondents. As such, the

26 In a sample survey, weights are applied to individuals in the sample to produce estimates representative of the entire population.

groupings were created to capture significant differences in response rates based on these characteristics. This method should reduce any bias that may exist from a higher than expected level of non-response.

Partial non-response to a survey occurs when the respondent misunderstands or misinterprets a question, refuses to answer a question, or cannot recall the requested information. Commonly, these answers are coded as *not stated*. For certain key variables in the NSGVP, however, an imputation process was used to replace missing or inconsistent answers with a reasonable value. The imputed value was based on the experience of another respondent with similar or identical characteristics.

Sampling errors

It is standard practice to indicate the magnitude of the sampling error for estimates from a sample survey. The *standard error of the estimate*, derived from the survey results, is the basis for measuring the size of sampling errors. However, because of the large variety of estimates from a survey, the standard error is usually expressed relative to the estimate to which it pertains. This measure, expressed as a percentage, is known as the *coefficient of variation (C.V.)*. It is obtained by dividing the standard error of the estimate by the estimate itself.

For example, suppose the survey estimates that 78% of Canadian volunteers reported using their skills and experience as a reason for volunteering. If this estimate has a standard error of 0.03, then the coefficient of variation of the estimate is calculated as:

$$\left(\frac{.03}{.78} \right) \times 100\% = 3.8\%$$

A range with a known probability of containing the true value can be defined using the C.V. and the estimate. For example, with a 95% probability, the range around the sample estimate is found by adding and subtracting 1.96 multiplied by the sample estimate and by its C.V.²⁷ In this case, the true value is in the range between 72.2% (78% – 5.8%) and 83.8% (78% + 5.8%), 19 times out of 20. Note that a lower C.V. is better since it indicates a statistically more precise estimate.

For this report, survey estimates are put into one of three categories:

- sample estimates with a C.V. less than 16.5%—unqualified;
- sample estimates with a C.V. between 16.5% and 33.3%—noted with an *; and
- sample estimates with a C.V. greater than 33.3%, or based on fewer than 30 respondents—suppressed.

For further information on data quality in general, see Statistics Canada's website at www.statcan.ca. For further information on the data quality of the NSGVP, please contact

Client Services
Special Surveys Division
5th Floor, Section B-5
Jean Talon Building
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0T6
ssd@statcan.ca
1 888 297-7355

²⁷ The calculation is $1.96 \times 78\% \times 3.8\% = 5.8\%$

Appendix C: Provincial data

Newfoundland
Donors
Number of Donors: 376,000
Donor Rate: 85%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	85	68.5*	100	182*	50*
Age					
15–24	73	3.0*	4*	52*	20*
25–34	89	9.9*	14*	147*	41*
35–44	92	12.7*	19*	154*	55*
45–54	90	8.7*	13*	114	53
55–64	85
65 and older	81	14.3*	21*	297*	154*
Sex					
Male	81	35.3*	52*	202*	50*
Female	90	33.2	48	165	50
Marital status					
Married or common-law	90	53.8*	79*	212*	63*
Single	76	6.8*	10*	75*	30*
Widowed	78	3.3*	5*	174*	75*
Separated or divorced
Education level					
Less than high school	79	13.5	20	107	36
High school diploma	82	5.1*	7*	98*	30*
Some postsecondary	88
Postsecondary diploma	90	19.2	28	152	70
University degree	100	14.8*	22*	366*	135*
Labour force status					
Employed	91	45.8*	67*	252*	60*
Full-time	93	41.4*	60*	273*	70*
Part-time	82	146*	44*
Unemployed	89	4.2*	6*	102*	45*
Not in labour force	79	18.5	27	121	44
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	79	6.1*	9*	88*	30*
\$20,000–\$39,999	83	14.7	21	120	40
\$40,000–\$59,999	84	248*	60*
\$60,000–\$79,999	93	12.5*	18*	165	50
\$80,000 or more	97

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**Newfoundland
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 138,000
Volunteer Rate: 31%**

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	31	28.6	100	206	96
Age					
15–24	40	8.0*	28*	254	122
25–34	33	3.7*	13*	151*	64*
35–44	35	6.4*	22*	203*	72*
45–54	32	4.7*	16*	173*	112*
55–64	32*	2.6*	9*	159*	105*
65 and older
Sex					
Male	27	12.4	43	215	130
Female	36	16.2*	57*	201	54
Marital status					
Married or common-law	32	17.6	62	195	90
Single	34	9.8*	34*	240	112
Widowed
Separated or divorced
Education level					
Less than high school	22	8.3*	29*	241	148
High school diploma	28*
Some postsecondary
Postsecondary diploma	36	8.8*	31*	173*	60*
University degree	49*	5.4*	19*	273	172
Labour force status					
Employed	36	14.2	50	197	107
Full-time	36	10.3	36	177	90
Part-time
Unemployed	30*	2.5*	9*	178*	100*
Not in labour force	27	11.9*	42*	226	88
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	16	1.7*	6*	119*	48*
\$20,000–\$39,999	30	10.1*	35*	227	107
\$40,000–\$59,999	39	6.0*	21*	198	90
\$60,000–\$79,999	35*	5.4*	19*	193*	60*
\$80,000 or more	46*	5.4*	19*	252*	155*

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Prince Edward Island
Donors
Number of Donors: 94,000
Donor Rate: 86%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	86	28.2	100	299	101
Age					
15–24	66	1.2*	4*	88*	35*
25–34	85	1.9*	7*	121*	42*
35–44	99	6.4*	23*	295*	163*
45–54	89	5.2*	18*	290*	120*
55–64	92	711*	274*
65 and older	84	5.3	19	362*	245*
Sex					
Male	77	14.7*	52*	355*	90*
Female	94	13.5	48	254	118
Marital status					
Married or common-law	91	20.7*	74*	320*	122*
Single	71
Widowed	88	2.8*	10*	546*	254*
Separated or divorced	92	1.1*	4*	179*	100*
Education level					
Less than high school	74	5.5*	19*	201*	60*
High school diploma	91	3.7*	13*	238*	90*
Some postsecondary	88	1.9*	7*	208*	105*
Postsecondary diploma	91	9.8*	35*	327*	126*
University degree	97	7.3*	26*	581*	158*
Labour force status					
Employed	90	19.5*	69*	316*	93*
Full-time	92	17.3*	62*	334*	93*
Part-time	80	2.1*	8*	219*	97*
Unemployed
Not in labour force	76	7.9*	28*	281	160
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	87	2.9*	10*	234*	65*
\$20,000–\$39,999	82	6.0*	21*	230	80
\$40,000–\$59,999	82	7.7*	27*	259*	91*
\$60,000–\$79,999	99	4.5*	16*	297*	115*
\$80,000 or more	92

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Prince Edward Island
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 40,000
Volunteer Rate: 37%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	37	7.4	100	183	73
Age					
15–24
25–34	30	0.6*	8*	106*	61*
35–44	39	1.5*	21*	177	88
45–54	46	2.1*	29*	231*	100*
55–64	46*	0.9*	13*	162*	69*
65 and older
Sex					
Male	34	3.9	53	213	100
Female	39	3.5*	47*	159*	64*
Marital status					
Married or common-law	38	5.1	70	190	73
Single	39*	1.7*	23*	166*	61*
Widowed
Separated or divorced
Education level					
Less than high school	23	1.1*	14*	124	50
High school diploma	34*	154*	54*
Some postsecondary
Postsecondary diploma	47	3.1*	42*	201	88
University degree	52*	1.7*	23*	245*	122*
Labour force status					
Employed	38	4.4	60	171	82
Full-time	39	3.7	50	168	87
Part-time
Unemployed
Not in labour force	31	2.1*	29*	187*	48*
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	131*	60*
\$20,000–\$39,999	32	2.0*	27*	195*	68*
\$40,000–\$59,999	31	1.9*	26*	170*	69*
\$60,000–\$79,999	59	1.6*	22*	175*	61*
\$80,000 or more	58*	1.5*	20*	220	122

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Nova Scotia
Donors
Number of Donors: 652,000
Donor Rate: 87%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	87	132.3	100	203	70
Age					
15–24	73	4.6*	3*	51*	20*
25–34	88	14.3*	11*	130*	55*
35–44	94	31.0*	23*	213	93
45–54	83	28.6	22	252	140
55–64	94	24.8*	19*	292	86
65 and older	91	29.0	22	269	74
Sex					
Male	85	58.9	45	193	62
Female	89	73.4	55	212	76
Marital status					
Married or common-law	92	87.2	66	212	86
Single	75	17.5*	13*	119*	30*
Widowed	91	13.7*	10*	302*	48*
Separated or divorced	86	13.8*	10*	288*	90*
Education level					
Less than high school	82	24.7	19	128	40
High school diploma	90	14.4*	11*	163	48
Some postsecondary	82	5.0*	4*	95*	50*
Postsecondary diploma	90	47.9	36	219	120
University degree	92	40.3*	31*	403	188
Labour force status					
Employed	90	82.4	62	216	86
Full-time	91	67.6	51	213	89
Part-time	86	14.8*	11*	227*	74*
Unemployed	85
Not in labour force	83	45.2	34	196	45
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	82	18.2*	14*	190	50
\$20,000–\$39,999	91	25.6	19	144	55
\$40,000–\$59,999	81	33.5	25	208	74
\$60,000–\$79,999	88	25.5*	19*	223*	65*
\$80,000 or more	93	29.5	22	285	160

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**Nova Scotia
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 253,000
Volunteer Rate: 34%**

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	34	47.2	100	186	88
Age					
15–24	35	5.5*	12*	125*	25*
25–34	27	4.1*	9*	120	69
35–44	36	11.8	25	216	114
45–54	41	10.7	23	191	95
55–64	42	9.5*	20*	254*	104*
65 and older	23	5.5*	12*	205*	120*
Sex					
Male	32	23.9	51	206	104
Female	35	23.4	49	170	69
Marital status					
Married or common-law	36	33.2	70	205	105
Single	31	8.4*	18*	136*	50*
Widowed	245*	141*
Separated or divorced	36	3.3*	7*	165*	95*
Education level					
Less than high school	24	8.8	19	153	60
High school diploma	40	8.2*	17*	212*	90*
Some postsecondary	27*	291*	144*
Postsecondary diploma	33	13.7	29	173	90
University degree	56	11.5*	24*	189	106
Labour force status					
Employed	36	27.9	59	180	95
Full-time	34	21.5	46	183	92
Part-time	49	6.3*	13*	172*	105*
Unemployed	37*	86*	15*
Not in labour force	29	17.9	38	219	92
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	25	6.2*	13*	207	104
\$20,000–\$39,999	29	11.8*	25*	212	87
\$40,000–\$59,999	35	12.1	26	178	88
\$60,000–\$79,999	34	9.2*	20*	207*	96*
\$80,000 or more	50	7.9*	17*	142	81

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

New Brunswick
Donors
Number of Donors: 478,000
Donor Rate: 79%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	79	123.8	100	259	70
Age					
15–24	71
25–34	84	15.3*	12*	176*	67*
35–44	76	21.4*	17*	227	78
45–54	80	22.9*	19*	254	90
55–64	72	14.3*	12*	283*	125*
65 and older	92	33.8*	27*	396*	121*
Sex					
Male	78	64.5	52	280	60
Female	80	59.3	48	239	78
Marital status					
Married or common-law	82	77.7	63	247	85
Single	69	281*	35*
Widowed	84	10.7*	9*	330	154
Separated or divorced	84
Education level					
Less than high school	66	21.5*	17*	161*	40*
High school diploma	85	276*	61*
Some postsecondary	91	9.6*	8*	205*	70*
Postsecondary diploma	84	37.7	...	268	100
University degree	85	26.9*	22*	485*	197*
Labour force status					
Employed	83	70.2	57	251	75
Full-time	84	58.4	47	244	78
Part-time	76
Unemployed
Not in labour force	74	52.4*	42*	292*	75*
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	67	12.5*	10*	150*	40*
\$20,000–\$39,999	75	36.6*	30*	277*	77*
\$40,000–\$59,999	87	32.7	26	256	54
\$60,000–\$79,999	78	19.4*	16*	279*	106*
\$80,000 or more	94	22.6*	18*	344*	144*

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**New Brunswick
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 174,000
Volunteer Rate: 29%**

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	29	33.0	100	190	82
Age					
15–24	29	3.3*	10*	112*	42*
25–34	23	2.4*	7*	103	51
35–44	34	6.7*	20*	157*	84*
45–54	33	9.1*	27*	243	152
55–64	31	6.0*	18*	275*	72*
65 and older	21	5.6*	17*	292*	96*
Sex					
Male	26	14.9	45	195	94
Female	31	18.0	55	187	64
Marital status					
Married or common-law	32	25.2	76	206	88
Single	25	4.6*	14*	123*	44*
Widowed
Separated or divorced	...	1.4*	4*	209*	120*
Education level					
Less than high school	19	5.3*	16*	140*	61*
High school diploma	29	8.3*	25*	237*	60*
Some postsecondary	27	254*	102*
Postsecondary diploma	33	8.3*	25*	152	75
University degree	49	7.6*	23*	235*	140*
Labour force status					
Employed	31	16.5	50	158	76
Full-time	30	14.4	43	169	82
Part-time	37*	2.2*	7*	110*	42*
Unemployed
Not in labour force	24	15.1*	46*	259	98
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	17	4.3*	13*	207*	104*
\$20,000–\$39,999	26	8.5*	26*	183*	60*
\$40,000–\$59,999	31	9.7*	29*	213*	75*
\$60,000–\$79,999	36	5.4*	16*	168*	116*
\$80,000 or more	41	5.2*	16*	179*	64*

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Quebec
Donors
Number of donors: 4,401,000
Donor rate: 74%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	74	515.7	100	117	45
Age					
15–24	55	27.7*	5*	52*	17*
25–34	73	62.0*	12*	86	33
35–44	85	107.3	21	99	40
45–54	77	124.7	24	147	55
55–64	82	90.6	18	149	57
65 and older	70	103.4	20	169	85
Sex					
Male	71	280.4	54	135	50
Female	77	235.3	46	101	38
Marital status					
Married or common-law	79	329.0	64	113	45
Single	64	107.7*	21*	107*	33*
Widowed	78	35.6*	7*	164	110
Separated or divorced	64	170*	37*
Education level					
Less than high school	64	89.9	17	81	30
High school diploma	77	62.7	12	76	30
Some postsecondary	62	22.4*	4*	87	34
Postsecondary diploma	80	137.2	27	100	45
University degree	83	203.4	39	246	118
Labour force status					
Employed	78	335.6	65	118	45
Full-time	80	284.0	55	123	45
Part-time	68	51.5*	10*	98	40
Unemployed	58
Not in labour force	69	158.0	31	113	50
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	56	39.8*	8*	73*	27*
\$20,000–\$39,999	72	131.6	26	95	30
\$40,000–\$59,999	78	96.4	19	88	35
\$60,000–\$79,999	82	90.3	18	128	78
\$80,000 or more	86	157.5	31	234	135

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Quebec
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 1,135,000
Volunteer Rate: 19%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	19	180.5	100	159	69
Age					
15–24	18	24.1*	13*	140*	60*
25–34	19	18.1	10	98	48
35–44	21	37.5	21	137	60
45–54	18	29.7	16	147	62
55–64	22	31.4	17	194	101
65 and older	16	39.7	22	283	144
Sex					
Male	20	99.1	55	170	70
Female	18	81.4	45	148	68
Marital status					
Married or common-law	20	117.8	65	156	73
Single	17	40.0	22	150	60
Widowed	14*	7.7*	4*	204*	90*
Separated or divorced	19	15.0*	8*	193*	72*
Education level					
Less than high school	14	38.9*	22*	159	58
High school diploma	13	29.0*	16*	210	74
Some postsecondary	28	15.0*	8*	128*	80*
Postsecondary diploma	21	62.0	34	170	80
University degree	27	35.6	20	132	72
Labour force status					
Employed	19	90.6	50	131	60
Full-time	19	63.8	35	118	56
Part-time	20	26.8*	15*	178*	96*
Unemployed	...	12.1*	7*	132*	62*
Not in labour force	19	77.8	43	199*	84*
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	15	32.5	18	224	120
\$20,000–\$39,999	16	54.5	30	174	60
\$40,000–\$59,999	18	40.4	22	163	80
\$60,000–\$79,999	25	29.2*	16*	138	50
\$80,000 or more	28	23.8	13	110	72

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**Ontario
Donors
Number of Donors: 7,293,000
Donor Rate: 78%**

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	78	2,275.7	100	312	100
Age					
15–24	67	139.2*	6*	137*	27*
25–34	74	327.4*	14*	260	95
35–44	85	491.8	22	284	90
45–54	82	577.9	25	432	121
55–64	82	340.0	15	392	133
65 and older	77	399.5	18	371	140
Sex					
Male	76	1,022.0	45	295	100
Female	80	1,253.7	55	327	97
Marital status					
Married or common-law	85	1,652.8	73	342	109
Single	65	301.9	13	187	55
Widowed	71	174.7*	8*	448*	170*
Separated or divorced	71	146.3	6	323	100
Education level					
Less than high school	67	267.6	12	164	50
High school diploma	79	379.1*	17*	257	61
Some postsecondary	80	188.6	8	273	100
Postsecondary diploma	83	623.6	27	310	100
University degree	84	816.8	36	550	205
Labour force status					
Employed	82	1,596.9	70	326	100
Full-time	83	1,339.6	59	328	100
Part-time	76	257.3	11	318	80
Unemployed	59
Not in labour force	73	646.2	28	292	97
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	64	78.6	3	127	33
\$20,000–\$39,999	75	361.3	16	230	60
\$40,000–\$59,999	77	371.6	16	240	90
\$60,000–\$79,999	83	362.7	16	271	88
\$80,000 or more	84	1,101.5	48	497	174

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Ontario
Volunteers
Number of volunteers: 2,378,000
Volunteer rate: 25%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	25	393.5	100	165	70
Age					
15–24	28	63.6*	16*	150	48
25–34	19	49.4*	13*	149*	56*
35–44	29	94.8	24	163	72
45–54	31	75.6	19	151	72
55–64	28	46.5	12	157	88
65 and older	17	63.6*	16*	261*	110*
Sex					
Male	24	184.8	47	172	72
Female	27	208.7	53	160	66
Marital status					
Married or common-law	27	256.4	65	165	72
Single	24	80.1	20	136	50
Widowed	16	320*	153*
Separated or divorced	24	29.2	7	192	72
Education level					
Less than high school	18	66.0*	17*	154*	40*
High school diploma	22	54.4	14	135	52
Some postsecondary	28	44.8*	11*	187*	72*
Postsecondary diploma	26	110.6	28	174	80
University degree	38	117.6	30	176	96
Labour force status					
Employed	27	256.1	65	157	64
Full-time	25	193.1	49	155	65
Part-time	36	63.0	16	164	60
Unemployed	23*	7.7*	2*	106*	47*
Not in labour force	22	129.7	33	193	90
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	13	25.9*	7*	201	113
\$20,000–\$39,999	20	79.6	20	193	65
\$40,000–\$59,999	26	81.4	21	158	70
\$60,000–\$79,999	28	73.5	19	166	66
\$80,000 or more	33	133.0	34	152	70

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Manitoba
Donors
Number of Donors: 726,000
Donor Rate: 84%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	84	277.8	100	383	120
Age					
15–24	71	12.2*	4*	115*	35*
25–34	82	40.9*	15*	336*	90*
35–44	90	69.6	25	445	130
45–54	89	50.9	18	384	125
55–64	93	36.7*	13*	408*	125*
65 and older	83	67.5	24	566	203
Sex					
Male	85	133.7	48	375	120
Female	84	144.1	52	390	125
Marital status					
Married or common-law	91	207.6	75	426	135
Single	72	25.3*	9*	161	45
Widowed	83	25.9*	9*	547*	209*
Separated or divorced	71
Education level					
Less than high school	74	61.7	22	311	80
High school diploma	84	42.0	15	279	100
Some postsecondary	86	11.7*	4*	201*	110*
Postsecondary diploma	93	73.7	27	352	135
University degree	91	88.8*	32*	813*	210*
Labour force status					
Employed	88	177.6	64	362	110
Full-time	89	149.1	54	379	115
Part-time	83	28.5*	10*	296*	65*
Unemployed
Not in labour force	78	94.5	34	428	143
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	65	28.1*	10*	420*	105*
\$20,000–\$39,999	83	67.4	24	351	110
\$40,000–\$59,999	87	57.2	21	272	120
\$60,000–\$79,999	85	36.8	13	287	102
\$80,000 or more	95	88.3*	32*	688*	220*

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**Manitoba
Volunteers**
Number of volunteers: 312,000
Volunteer rate: 36%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	36	43.7	100	140	66
Age					
15–24	36	6.2*	14*	115	51
25–34	33	5.5*	13*	115*	55*
35–44	40	10.6*	24*	152	80
45–54	40	8.6	20	142	73
55–64	36	3.9*	9*	113	60
65 and older	32	8.9*	20*	195*	90*
Sex					
Male	31	20.4	47	156	72
Female	42	23.3	53	128	60
Marital status					
Married or common-law	39	30.6	70	147	70
Single	32	8.3	19	119	55
Widowed	29	2.8*	7*	173*	104*
Separated or divorced	38	1.9*	4*	103*	54*
Education level					
Less than high school	25	7.1*	16*	106*	43*
High school diploma	33	8.1	19	138	81
Some postsecondary	52	4.7*	11*	133*	70*
Postsecondary diploma	41	13.2	30	143	64
University degree	49	10.5	24	179	100
Labour force status					
Employed	38	29.9	69	140	72
Full-time	37	23.2	53	144	70
Part-time	45	6.7*	15*	129	75
Unemployed
Not in labour force	33	13.3	30	144	60
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	22	2.3*	5*	100*	64*
\$20,000–\$39,999	32	10.1	23	135	65
\$40,000–\$59,999	37	13.2	30	148	70
\$60,000–\$79,999	38	7.1*	16*	124*	49*
\$80,000 or more	51	11.0	25	160	81

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Saskatchewan
Donors
Number of Donors: 637,000
Donor Rate: 83%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	83	173.9	100	273	80
Age					
15–24	69	122*	27*
25–34	80	22.7*	13*	231*	68*
35–44	88	32.9	19	245	80
45–54	88	35.8	21	324	111
55–64	86	29.5	17	418	181
65 and older	90	40.7	23	331	100
Sex					
Male	79	80.2	46	270	80
Female	88	93.7	54	276	80
Marital status					
Married or common-law	90	119.0	68	292	105
Single	70	24.0*	14*	164*	35*
Widowed	86	14.9	9	352	100
Separated or divorced	82	16.0*	9*	397*	70*
Education level					
Less than high school	75	37.3*	21*	211	45
High school diploma	84	37.1*	21*	294	75
Some postsecondary	79	16.2	9	234	75
Postsecondary diploma	90	48.8	28	256	85
University degree	94	34.6	20	464	244
Labour force status					
Employed	85	110.0	63	268	85
Full-time	87	92.0	53	269	85
Part-time	77	18.0	10	264	80
Unemployed
Not in labour force	82	59.1	34	285	79
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	69	14.4*	8*	198*	40*
\$20,000–\$39,999	83	49.1	28	279	74
\$40,000–\$59,999	83	38.2	22	241	83
\$60,000–\$79,999	84	22.3*	13*	260	91
\$80,000 or more	94	49.9	29*	349	100

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

**Saskatchewan
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 323,000
Volunteer Rate: 42%**

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	42	49.7	100	154	83
Age					
15–24	46	7.6	15	115	52
25–34	38	6.6*	13*	142*	64*
35–44	48	9.9	20	137	92
45–54	48	10.4	21	171	82
55–64	38	5.7*	11*	183	126
65 and older	33	9.4	19	207	131
Sex					
Male	40	26.0	52	173	88
Female	45	23.7	48	137	77
Marital status					
Married or common-law	47	35.0	70	163	88
Single	37	9.4	19	121	64
Widowed	31	3.1*	6*	198	126
Separated or divorced	31	2.2*	4*	143*	81*
Education level					
Less than high school	31	11.2	22	152	70
High school diploma	44	8.4	17	128	64
Some postsecondary	42	6.0*	12*	163	96
Postsecondary diploma	45	15.8	32	165	92
University degree	64	8.2	17	163	97
Labour force status					
Employed	45	32.8	66	152	82
Full-time	42	25.2	51	152	77
Part-time	55	7.6	15	155	100
Unemployed
Not in labour force	40	16.1	32	160	96
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	30	4.0*	8*	127	48
\$20,000–\$39,999	37	11.3	23	144	80
\$40,000–\$59,999	40	13.3	27	173	96
\$60,000–\$79,999	59	10.7*	22*	177	80
\$80,000 or more	50	10.4	21	137	85

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Alberta
Donors
Number of donors: 1,976,000
Donor rate: 85%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	85	729.4	100	369	90
Age					
15–24	70
25–34	92	159.7*	22*	389*	85*
35–44	87	189.4	26	417	125
45–54	94	158.0*	22*	416*	117*
55–64	83	74.2*	10*	386*	125*
65 and older	82	81.3*	11*	350*	72*
Sex					
Male	82	379.9	52	396	85
Female	88	349.5	48	344	97
Marital status					
Married or common-law	89	562.8	77	425	100
Single	75	114.1*	16*	251*	50*
Widowed	91	25.6*	4*	317*	105*
Separated or divorced	79	26.9*	4*	232*	105*
Education level					
Less than high school	81
High school diploma	81	122.4*	17*	313*	70*
Some postsecondary	83	75.0*	10*	352*	100*
Postsecondary diploma	88	227.7	31	356	98
University degree	92	199.6*	27*	652*	180*
Labour force status					
Employed	86	555.7	76	390	100
Full-time	87	427.3	59	373	100
Part-time	84	463*	90*
Unemployed
Not in labour force	82	168.9	23	341	72
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	65	27.4*	4*	162*	70*
\$20,000–\$39,999	87	103.4*	14*	231*	65*
\$40,000–\$59,999	81	174.9	24	373	100
\$60,000–\$79,999	90
\$80,000 or more	93	298.9*	41*	627*	144*

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

Alberta
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 913,000
Volunteer Rate: 39%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	39	127.0	100	139	66
Age					
15–24	46	21.9*	17*	109	42
25–34	36	20.1*	16*	124*	60*
35–44	45	33.5	26	142	72
45–54	41	20.9*	16*	125	72
55–64	37	14.1*	11*	164*	72*
65 and older	21	16.5*	13*	273*	120*
Sex					
Male	38	66.5	52	149	67
Female	40	60.5	48	130	63
Marital status					
Married or common-law	39	75.5	59	131	66
Single	43	38.3*	30*	148	54
Widowed	23*	5.6*	4*	269*	188*
Separated or divorced	38	7.6*	6*	137*	54*
Education level					
Less than high school	24	19.4*	15*	150*	65*
High school diploma	35	22.4*	18*	130	64
Some postsecondary	52	19.3*	15*	143*	48*
Postsecondary diploma	40	37.9	30	131	66
University degree	56	28.1	22	150	90
Labour force status					
Employed	40	82.4	65	124	64
Full-time	38	63.9	50	127	60
Part-time	48	18.5*	15*	118	67
Unemployed
Not in labour force	36	37.7	30	172	72
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	20	14.6*	12*	286*	156*
\$20,000–\$39,999	30	25.3*	20*	164	64
\$40,000–\$59,999	37	28.5	22	131	67
\$60,000–\$79,999	43	28.8	23	146	68
\$80,000 or more	57	29.8	23	102	52

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

British Columbia
Donors
Number of Donors: 2,403,000
Donor Rate: 74%

Personal characteristic	Donor rate	Total donations	% of total donations	Average donation	Median donation
	%	\$'000,000		\$	\$
Total	74	613.6	100	255	70
Age					
15–24	60
25–34	73	102.2*	17*	246*	64*
35–44	83	122.2	20	214	80
45–54	85	209.9	34	415	120
55–64	64	74.4*	12*	312*	98*
65 and older	71	79.5	13	224	85
Sex					
Male	68	269.9	44	247	75
Female	79	343.7	56	262	68
Marital status					
Married or common-law	79	452.0	74	282	80
Single	61	87.5*	14*	170*	35*
Widowed	80	20.9*	3*	172*	70*
Separated or divorced	75	53.1*	9*	326*	85*
Education level					
Less than high school	56	43.9*	7*	111	30
High school diploma	80	109.2*	18*	183*	63*
Some postsecondary	75	51.9*	8*	177*	50*
Postsecondary diploma	80	194.1	32	278	90
University degree	78	214.6	35	511	142
Labour force status					
Employed	78	426.7	70	276	80
Full-time	78	318.8	52	274	100
Part-time	78	108.0*	18*	282*	63*
Unemployed	65	8.1*	1*	83*	35*
Not in labour force	67	178.8	29	235	64
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	61	55.9*	9*	204*	50*
\$20,000–\$39,999	64	117.7	19	199	63
\$40,000–\$59,999	80	116.7*	19*	211	60
\$60,000–\$79,999	78	71.3*	12*	199	68
\$80,000 or more	85	252.1	41	402	128

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.

British Columbia
Volunteers
Number of Volunteers: 845,000
Volunteer Rate: 26%

Personal characteristic	Volunteer rate	Total hours	% of total hours	Mean hours	Median hours
	%	'000,000			
Total	26	142.6	100	169	92
Age					
15–24	29	13.1*	9*	86	60
25–34	27	22.3*	16*	145*	47*
35–44	27	25.3*	18*	135*	60*
45–54	32	35.7	25	189	140
55–64	24	20.5*	14*	230	136
65 and older	15	25.7	18	351	160
Sex					
Male	23	60.6	42	165	96
Female	29	82.1	58	171	90
Marital status					
Married or common-law	27	105.4	74	193	112
Single	27	22.9*	16*	100	50
Widowed
Separated or divorced	22	11.0*	8*	231*	122*
Education level					
Less than high school	19	21.1*	15*	159*	60*
High school diploma	19	19.2*	13*	132*	44*
Some postsecondary	33	27.3*	19*	212*	123*
Postsecondary diploma	26	40.4	28	180	100
University degree	40	34.6	24	161	113
Labour force status					
Employed	29	83.7	59	148	80
Full-time	28	61.5	43	147	76
Part-time	30	22.1*	16*	151	90
Unemployed
Not in labour force	22	50.3	35	200	128
Household income level					
Less than \$20,000	19	18.3*	13*	212*	104*
\$20,000–\$39,999	18	30.0*	21*	181	96
\$40,000–\$59,999	24	30.8	22	187	120
\$60,000–\$79,999	30	19.3	14	140	60
\$80,000 or more	39	44.1	31	152	90

* Sample size limitations affect the reliability of these estimates.

... Amount too small to be expressed.



ISBN 0-66018-607-1



9 780660 186078