

“Social Capital and Philanthropy in Mexico:
A Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Social Capital on Philanthropic Behavior”

Michael D. Layton (layton@itam.mx)
Alejandro Moreno (amoreno@itam.mx)
Philanthropy and Civil Society Project (PSCP)
www.filantropia.itam.mx
www.enafi.itam.mx
ITAM
Mexico City, Mexico

Paper to be presented at the
9th International Conference of the
International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR)
Kadir Has University
Istanbul, Turkey
July 7-10, 2010

Abstract

In recent decades private and public funders, most notably US foundations, have invested millions of dollars to promote the creation of donor institutions in developing countries. The export of philanthropic models has had mixed success and has undergone serious rethinking. One key aspect of this re-thinking has been an examination of the cultural and institutional context in which philanthropic behavior occurs. The aim of the present paper is to examine some of the factors underlying philanthropic behavior in Mexico, and thereby offer an important comparative perspective of the relative explanatory power of social capital and various demographic factors to giving and volunteering in secular and religious organizations. The question underlying this paper is, how robust are the present models of philanthropic behavior based on research in United States when applied to Mexico? The major concept that informs the research is that of social capital, which includes both participation in social networks as well as norms of reciprocity and trust. While previous studies have distinguished giving to secular and religious causes, this is the first study identified by the authors where volunteering in these contexts is distinguished as well. This research is based upon a national public opinion survey conducted in 2005 and 2008. While prior research has distinguished between giving to secular and religious organizations, it has not distinguished between voluntary activities in the same manner. The authors find that the most important explanatory factor for secular giving and volunteering is membership in associations, and for religious giving and volunteering it is religiosity. In addition to membership three other aspects of social capital were tested: participation in informal networks and adherence to the norm of reciprocity were consistently significant, but interpersonal trust was not. Another important finding was that those who perceive themselves as belonging to the upper or middle classes were more likely to donate, while those of lesser social classes were more likely to volunteer. The relative importance of these factors differs between Mexico and the United States, thus highlighting the importance of the local context for philanthropic behavior in developing countries.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades private and public funders, most notably US foundations (Ford, Kellogg, Mott) and aid agencies (USAID, Inter-American Foundation), have invested millions of dollars to promote domestic philanthropy in developing countries. The export of various models of philanthropic institutions (community foundation, United Way, corporate giving) has had mixed success and has undergone serious rethinking and examination (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation 2001; Ford Foundation 2006). One key aspect of this re-thinking on the part of academics and practitioners has been an examination of the cultural and institutional context in which philanthropic behavior occurs (Moyo 2003; Oliver-Evans and Wilkinson-Maposa 2009; Thompson 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa 2005).

One important aspect of the context for the development of civil society and philanthropy is social capital. A growing body of empirical research, largely from the United States and based upon the Social Capital Benchmark Survey, has demonstrated an important and positive relationship between social capital and philanthropic behavior, particularly volunteerism and donations (Putnam 2000; Brooks 2005; Brown and Ferris 2007; Wang and Graddy 2008). The general question underlying this paper is, how robust are these models based on research in developed nations when applied to developing countries? More specifically, what is the relationship between social capital and philanthropic behavior in Mexico? The important flow of philanthropic resources between the developed and the developing world – both financial and conceptual – give this question important practical implications. To understand differences in philanthropic behavior one must appreciate the forms and expressions of social capital (Williams and Robinson 2004).

The analysis in this paper is based upon the National Philanthropy and Civil Society Survey (known by its acronym in Spanish, ENAFI), the first national public opinion survey in Mexico focused on the themes of giving, volunteering and social capital. (In fact the ENAFI survey was based upon the Social Capital Benchmark Survey, Independent Sector's giving and volunteering as well as the World Value Survey, although the instrument went through vigorous revision and field-testing to assure that it reflected the Mexican context.) Taking as a point of departure studies of social capital and philanthropic behavior derived from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey in the United States, the results of the analysis of the ENAFI data reveal important differences between the US and Mexico in terms of the explanatory power of the variables related to social capital and demographic characteristics.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The major concept that informs the research is that of social capital, which includes both (1) participation in social networks as well as (2) norms of reciprocity and trust (Putnam 2000). Recent research in the United States has utilized the large sample provided by the Social Capital Benchmark Survey to test hypotheses regarding the various forms of social capital and manifestations of philanthropic behavior. Brown and Ferris (2007) have demonstrated that adding social capital, via a factor analysis of associational networks and adherence to norms of reciprocity and trust, diminishes the significance of education as well as religiosity upon secular and religious giving as well as volunteering. Brooks (2005) and Wang and Graddy (2008) follow Brown and Ferris

(2007) in distinguishing giving to religious and secular causes but offer more disaggregated measures of social capitals. Both models uncover statistically significant but distinct levels of impact of distinct forms of social capital. While Brooks (2005) finds that all three of his measures (group involvement, social trust, and political engagement) are positive and achieve statistical significance, Wang and Graddy (2008) find that three of their measures (social trust, bridging networks, and civic engagement) are positive and significant for secular and religious giving, but activism is only significant for secular giving. In their results participation in informal networks does not have a statistically significant impact on either form of giving.

As Wang and Graddy (2008) point out, while these models are beginning to offer an empirically rigorous account of giving and volunteering in the United States, it is not clear how well they would hold up in other contexts. While this research has moved forward so too has a philanthropic agenda to support the development of local philanthropic institutions in the global south. Part of the rationale for this effort is that if civil society is to deepen and expand in developing nations, then its financial sustainability must be established locally (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. 2001; Ford Foundation 2006). The practical question then arises, how well can these models of philanthropic institutions – community foundations most prominent among them – prosper in diverse local contexts that differ dramatically from the US?

While studies have examined the issue of the “exportability” of these models in a number of contexts - including Mexico (Berger et al. 2009), South Africa (Moya 2003), Latin America (Thomson 2005) as well as globally (Sacks 2008) – these studies have looked at a wide range of elements in the enabling environment for philanthropy and civil society. These elements include: legal and fiscal framework, capacity of civil society organizations, accountability and transparency mechanisms (Gaberman 2003; Layton 2009a) as well as issues of local and institutional leadership (Ford 2006). While many reflect upon traditional expressions of solidarity none have examined in depth the issue of values and habits, specifically social capital measured quantitatively.

What do we know about philanthropy and social capital in these contexts? There is a small but growing number of public opinion surveys outside the US and Europe that examine giving and volunteering in countries as diverse as Brazil (Landim 2005), Chile (Fundación Trascender and Collect GFK. 2008), Korea (Center on Philanthropy at the Beautiful Foundation 2009) Peru (Portocarrero 2005; Portocarrero et al. 2004), and South Africa (Everatt et al. 2005). Academics and others have undertaken some of these studies by donor institutions or umbrella organizations for civil society but all with the common purpose of understanding the distinctive set of values and habits that underlies philanthropic behavior in a particular context.

What these studies have in common in terms of their finding that various forms of philanthropic behavior are quite widespread, especially support for religious institutions, mutual self-help, and giving alms directly to the poor. These coincide with previous research on Mexico conducted by the authors (Layton and Moreno 2010) and other researchers (Butcher 2006). While all offer sound survey techniques – including random samples and household interviews, very few move beyond reporting percentage results and perhaps cross tabulations or correlations between wealth and giving or volunteering and donating. None of the aforementioned studies have systematically

measured social capital, nor have they tested the more sophisticated statistical models recently advanced in the US.

The models tested in this paper are most closely based on those of Brown and Ferris (2007) and Wang and Graddy (2008) and will assess how well the factors identified by US researchers explain philanthropic behavior in Mexico.

3. DATA, METHODS, and VARIABLES

DATA: ENAFI 2005 and 2008

This section contains an analysis of the results of the first national public opinion survey on giving and volunteering in Mexico, the National Survey on Philanthropy and Civil Society (ENAFI). The survey examines a range of topics related to philanthropic behavior, including: donations, volunteer work, and social capital (interpersonal and institutional trust, norms of reciprocity, and organizational membership and participation). The survey was designed by the Philanthropy and Civil Society Project at the Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico, a private university in Mexico City best known by the acronym, ITAM. (This work was made possible with the generous support of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation).

This survey was conducted twice, in February 2005 and November 2008, with a probability sample of 1,500 respondents each year, a level of confidence of 95 percent, and a margin of error of +/-2.5. The interviews were conducted face-to-face rather than via telephone, which insures the inclusion of poorer households and heightens the representativeness of the results. For the purposes of this analysis the results of both surveys are being included in an aggregate dataset. Although there are some changes from 2005 to 2008 there is a great value in increasing the sample size to attain better results. It is important to bear in mind that methodological issues heavily influence results and that interpreting data should be done in a cautious manner (O'Neill 2001; Rooney, Schervish and Steinberg 2004).

METHODS

In this paper a statistical model is developed that analyzes donations to both secular and religious organizations, as well as voluntary work in both settings. Although it is now widely accepted that one should distinguish between donations to secular and religious organizations, the analysis of volunteer work has not made such a distinction. In the current model this distinction is maintained, based on the argument that the factors underlying the decision to volunteer in these two settings are as distinct as the decision to donate.

Because our dependent variables, which are described more fully below, were coded as a dichotomous variable with values 1 (where the respondent reported giving or volunteering) and 0 (otherwise), a logistic regression model is employed, which is appropriate for this type of binary variable. The variables included in the model are described below with a brief theoretical justification and the expected results. Appendix 1 provides the text of the questions used as the basis for the variables in the analysis and the ways in which they were coded.

Dependent Variables

We analyze four dependent variables. Two of them refer to donations (giving) to both secular and religious organizations, while the other two are indicators of self-reported voluntary work (volunteering), also in the secular and religious settings. While it has become standard practice to distinguish giving funds to secular and religious causes, previous studies reviewed by the authors did not make this distinction in volunteer work (Brown and Ferris 2007, Brooks 2005, Wang and Graddy 2008). Yet the reasoning would seem to be the same: that the populations that offer their time voluntarily in these two settings have distinctive characteristics and motivations for doing so. Both Brooks (2005) and Brown and Ferris (2007) have found that religiosity, while increasing giving to religious causes, decreases giving to secular causes; given this important impact on the philanthropic activity of donating money the current model also segregates volunteering into secular and religious. Wang and Graddy (2008) find religiosity robustly related to religious giving but not statistically significant for secular (although it has a negative coefficient).

The structure of the questions to measure giving and volunteering was the same: the survey participants were asked to review of a list of organizations and respond to the question of whether the individual had made a contribution or volunteered in the last 12 months. The use of such a list as a prompt enhances the accuracy of respondent recall (O'Neill 2001).

Independent Variables

The explanatory variables included in the model can be classified into two general categories. The first category refers to social capital and includes four different indicators: *membership*, *networks*, *reciprocity*, and *interpersonal trust*. The definition of social capital used in this study is that of Putnam (2000): (1) membership and participation and (2) norms of reciprocity and trust. Following the example of Brooks (2005) and Wang and Graddy (2008 and 2009) the various dimensions of social capital are differentiated as each one may impact philanthropic behavior differently. In the current analysis social capital is measured in four different ways. In terms of the element of participation two variables were used based on two different questions. The first question was regarding membership in a range of organizations was utilized – church affiliation was excluded. The second was related to informal networks that provide help in times of need. The second aspect of social capital, that of norms, included a variable related to reciprocity and another related to interpersonal trust.

The *membership* variable represents the number of organizations that the respondent belongs to. The survey included eight different types of associations or groups: neighbors, education, financial or credit, political or partisan, sports, social or cultural, religious, and non-government organizations. The variable is an additive index that scores from 0 to the highest number of organizations the respondent belongs to. Based on factor analysis (not shown in this paper), membership in religious organizations was excluded from this variable, as it is a very different membership from the rest. However, due to the importance of religious orientation in explaining patterns of giving and volunteering in Mexico, an indicator of religiosity was included in the model, which is described below. The hypothesis to be tested is that membership makes it more likely

that individuals will donate both money and time to secular causes. A similar effect is expected for religious philanthropy, although perhaps not as pronounced.

The *informal networks* variable reflects the number of people that the respondent can rely on if he or she needs support. This is used as a proxy for the extension of social ties. The way the question is asked does not refer so much to the number of friends or colleagues a person has but to the actual number of people that the respondent can count on when help is needed. Thus the hypothesis to be tested here is that giving and volunteering in both settings are also related positively to informal networks, as the latter offer connections of support and social ties.

The *reciprocity* variable might be considered the normative logic that flows from one's experience in networks of mutual support. The question asked respondents if they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: "By helping others, I help myself". The expectation is that giving and volunteering are more likely when individuals feel that they benefit when helping others. An adherence to the norm of reciprocity should relate positively to giving and volunteering.

Finally, the *interpersonal trust* variable is a conventional question about trust in others, more commonly known as social trust. Our expectation is that social or interpersonal trust should relate positively to giving and volunteering as it has in other settings.

The other set of independent variables are fairly standard demographic characteristics and religiosity. These characteristics included sex, marital status, having children, education, and age, along with age squared, as this variable tends to have non-linear relationships when modeled in this type of analyses. For example, volunteering could be higher among youth, then lower among the middle-aged, and then higher again among the elderly. The list of demographics also includes rural versus urban residence, as this is often an important divide in social activities in Mexico.

Religiosity was included as it is another important factor in explaining charitable activities. The variable was based on attendance at non-holiday church services. This variable is expected to have a strong positive relationship with both secular and especially religious giving and volunteering.

Rather than income – usually an important explanatory factor for philanthropy, this analysis included subjective social class instead. In survey research in Mexico, self-reported income tends not to be very reliable and it tends to cause a higher number of missing values based on item non-response. Subjective social class has many fewer missing cases and it captures where the respondent perceives him/herself in the socioeconomic strata. Other factors that have been used in the US, (such as citizenship status, race, years in residence), were not included, as these factors do not have the same importance in the Mexican context.

These demographic variables are control variables and generate mixed theoretical expectations. Education and social class should be positively related to formal giving, although giving in Mexico has proven to be more informal and this makes it difficult to establish an expectation *a priori*. Marital status also seems ambivalent, but we expect respondents with children to be more involved in giving and especially volunteering, as schools and other children activities tend to open up those opportunities to people. In

regards to urban-rural dwelling, Graddy and Wang (2009) found that increasing population density makes charitable giving to community foundations more likely and Brooks (2005) finds a negative relationship between rural residence and giving. The expectation here is that there are more organizations in urban settings so that opportunities to give both time and money would be more common.

4. RESULTS

The results of our statistical analyses are shown in Appendix 2. As expected various measures of social capital – but not all – achieve statistical significance. To begin with *membership* in secular organizations is highly significant across all four dependent variables of giving and volunteering. What is most notable is that for the secular giving and secular volunteering it is the single most important explanatory factor in terms of the magnitude of the Wald statistic: it is four times as important as the norm of reciprocity in giving and ten times more important than living in a rural area – the second most important factors for giving and volunteering respectively. (In terms of religious giving and volunteering it is a very distant third and second, a finding discussed more fully below.)

Participation in *informal networks* of mutual assistance is significant across all but one of the dependent variables – religious giving, but its relative influence in charitable behaviors is limited. Like membership, belief in the *norm of reciprocity* is also highly significant across all variables and is the second largest factor influencing both secular and religious giving. Based on these three factors, one could argue that social capital has a strong effect on giving and volunteering in Mexico. However, the statistically insignificant contribution of *interpersonal trust* does not fully support this claim. Mexico is often described as a low trust culture, and this may be part of the explanation. It could be that membership in organizations compensates for the generalized lack of interpersonal trust. This finding is discussed further below.

In summary, while generalized social trust does not have a statistically significant relationship to giving and volunteering among Mexicans, the other components of social capital do increase the likelihood of philanthropic behavior in the country: belonging to groups, participating in informal networks, and being guided by norms of reciprocity increase the probabilities of donations and volunteer work. Membership is particularly important in secular giving and volunteering and it seems to be the component of social capital that gives the strongest results. Aside from interpersonal trust, belonging to informal networks are a weaker component, as its contribution is clearly more modest across the four dependent variables—and insignificant in the case of religious giving.

These findings are somewhat at odds with the previous studies in the US. For example, Wang and Graddy (2008) found that social trust related significantly to both forms of giving; diversity of networks and civic engagement likewise related to more giving to secular and religious causes; more involvement in formal groups leads to more secular giving. In another study focused on support for community foundations in the US, Graddy and Wang (2009) produced a mirror image of the results reported here. They found that only social trust mattered in terms of promoting giving to community foundations: neither bridging social capital, informal networks, civic engagement, nor organized group activism were statistically significant. Brown and Ferris (2007) found

that networks mattered for secular giving as well as religious giving, but not volunteering, and that the norms of reciprocity and trust mattered for secular giving and volunteering, but not for religious giving.

In terms of demographic characteristics the single most significant attribute is religiosity. It is by far the most powerful explanatory factor for religious giving and volunteering, but is a much less important (although still statistically significant element) in explaining secular giving and volunteering. That religiosity is the most important determinant of religious giving is consistent with Brooks (2005) as well as Brown and Ferris (2007) and Wang and Graddy (2008). But the two pairs of researchers also found that while religiosity increased religious giving it diminished secular giving. An earlier analysis by Brooks (2003) is consistent with the ENAFI analysis, in that he found that religiosity was strongly related to increased giving and volunteering in secular settings.

Another interesting finding relates to the subjective assessment of social class: this characteristic is significant for both religious and secular giving but not for either type of volunteering. This finding would indicate the although most Mexicans engage in charitable activities, those who perceive themselves as more well-off give cash contributions while those less well-off give their time. This is contrary to the finding by Brown and Ferris (2007) that being higher or middle income is significantly related to volunteerism.

A third characteristic which achieved statistical significance in all but one of the measures is residence in a rural area, and it did so in a manner than would seem counter-intuitive. Living in a rural area makes it more likely to a respondent to give to a church or to be a volunteer either in a religious or a secular setting, but it does not result in a greater likelihood in giving to secular causes. (In fact the coefficient in this case is negative, i.e. that urban dwellers are more likely to give, but misses statistical significance.) This finding runs contrary to the findings of Graddy and Wang (2009) who identify a negative relationship between rural residence and giving. This finding would seem to confirm the persistence of traditional forms of mutual self-help and the importance of the church in rural settings, rather than supporting the notion that more densely populated urban areas encourage or facilitate more engagement with organizations.

Another characteristic that is consistently related to charitable activities is education. While this factor was the third most important for secular giving and achieved statistical significance in religious giving and secular volunteering as well, it was not significant for religious volunteering.

Few of the other demographic characteristics achieved statistical significance, which is also important. One exception is that women are a bit more likely than men to give to secular causes, but the genders are equally likely to engage in all other charitable activities. Although the findings among the researchers cited are no completely consistent, the expectation was that females in Mexico would be more likely to give and volunteer across the board. While being married did not achieve statistical significance in any activity, having children made it more likely for respondents to give – to both secular and religious organizations, but not to volunteer in either realm. Again this is a surprise given the importance of volunteering in educational settings (Layton and

Moreno 2010), which is commonly viewed in Mexico as something that mothers do more often than fathers. While age was not significant for any variable, age squared was significant only for secular volunteering.

5. CONCLUSIONS

How well do these models, based on those developed to explain philanthropic behavior in the United States, account for giving and volunteering in religious and secular contexts in Mexico? This section will examine the surprising lack of significance of social trust – an important difference from studies based in the United States – and then offer some thoughts on the model in general and how it might be improved by making it less like those in the US.

In a sense the only aspect of social capital that was not significant – social trust – is the dog that did not bark in the model. In their analysis Wang and Graddy (2008) found social trust to be one of the most important parameters and is statistically significant for both secular and religious donations, and in a study of giving to community foundations these same authors (Graddy and Wang 2009) found that was the only aspect of social capital that did matter – a mirror image result. Similarly Brooks (2005) found social trust very important in driving up both secular and religious donations. Why was this not the case in Mexico?

At least since the publication of *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Almond and Verba 1963), Mexico has been characterized as having a low trust culture. Yet the ENAFI results indicate that three-fifths of Mexicans give to secular causes and nearly three quarters give to the church. The survey also found that the church is the single most trusted institution and that the biggest, high profile national fundraising campaigns also enjoy high levels of public confidence (Layton and Moreno 2010). This finding could account for the great explanatory power of religiosity in religious giving and volunteering and membership in secular philanthropic behavior. Church attendance and organizational membership might compensate for the generalized lack of interpersonal trust and thereby facilitate donations.

The other factor to take into account is that the way in which Mexicans donate most frequently – via street collections by the Red Cross and *Teleton* (a telethon charity for handicapped children), rounding off pennies of change in the supermarket, or buying donation cards for about 80 cents. These charitable acts all involve very small amounts of money, given spontaneously in response to a direct petition. Larger contributions, via personal check or credit card, are few and far between. Hence the amount of trust needed to part with 80 cents is different than say 80 dollars.

An important statistical measure used to assess how well a model explains the phenomenon under study is the “percent of correct prediction”. Interestingly the most robust models are those for religious volunteering and giving, with 82.0 and 76.2 percent correct predicted respectively. The importance of religiosity in explaining giving and volunteering in those contexts most likely deserves the credit for the relatively high scores in those areas. The secular models are relatively low at 71.5 percent for volunteering and 65.3 for giving. While these contrasts underscore the difference between giving as well as volunteering in secular and religious contexts, they raise interesting questions about how to better explain secular philanthropic behavior.

The question remains, what is missing from the models that would enhance the percent of correct prediction? At least two possibilities emerge, one from alternative models from the US and the other related to the Mexican context. In terms of the US, Wang and Graddy (2008) included volunteering in their model for donating and found a significant and positive relationship to giving to both religious and secular causes. While including this variable might well improve the models of giving, it raises an important issue of causality: does volunteering encourage donating? Or, does donating funds make volunteerism more likely? Alternatively, do these actions go together?

In terms of the Mexican context the authors have encountered a strong preference among Mexicans to give directly to the needy rather than to institutions (Layton and Moreno 2010; Layton 2009b) When asked how they prefer to give, either directly to a needy person or to an institution, 60 percent of Mexicans stated their preference for giving directly to the needy, while only 16 percent prefer to give to institutions. Another 16 percent are indifferent between personal and institutional donations while seven percent answered they did not know. These results indicate that this preference for informal giving might be included as another variable in explaining charitable donations and perhaps even volunteering.

This discussion raises a larger issue about important contextual differences between not only the US and Mexico but also more generally between developed and developing nations. Just as statistical models must be adjusted (or “tropicalized”) to better account for giving and volunteering, so too must conceptual models be adapted if not re-thought when being exported (Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. 2005; Oliver-Evans and Wilkinson-Maposa 2009). An important point of departure for this study is the observation offered by Wang and Graddy at the end of their article (2008: 39): “Given the strong cultural aspect of philanthropic behavior, it is unlikely that these findings can be generalized to other countries. They may however be suggestive for efforts to understand the role of social connections on individual charitable behavior more generally”.

It is important to add that in addition to the impact of social capital and the cultural aspects of philanthropy there is an important institutional context that includes a nation’s fiscal and legal framework as well as the level of development of organized civil society (Gaberman 2003, Layton 2009a). The abundance or scarcity of organizations, the level of social trust in fundraising campaigns, and systems of transparency and accountability all help shape an individual’s decision to give and volunteer, or to decline to do so.

REFERENCES

- Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Berger, R., Bermúdez, D., Carrillo, P. and Tapia, M. (2009). *Mexico community foundations: A comprehensive profile*. Teamworks/Alternativas y Capacidades A.C., Mexico.
- Brown, E. and Ferris, J. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **36**(1), 85-99.
- Brooks, A. (2005). Does social capital make you generous? *Social Science Quarterly* **86**(1), 1-15.
- Brooks, A. (2003). Religious faith and charitable giving. *Policy Review* (121). Available at <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3447051.html>
- Butcher, J. (2008). *México solidario: Participación ciudadana y voluntariado*, Limusa, México.
- Center on Philanthropy at the Beautiful Foundation. (2009). *Giving Korea 2008*. The Center on Philanthropy at the Beautiful Foundation, Seoul.
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. (2001). *Sowing the Seeds of Local Philanthropy: Two Decades in the Field of Community Foundations*. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Flint, Michigan.
- Everatt, D., Habib, A., Maharaj, B., and Nyar, A. (2005). Patterns of giving in South Africa. *Voluntas* **16**(3), 275-291.
- Ford Foundation. (2006). *Funding Foundations: Report on Ford Foundation Support of Grantmaking Institutions, 1975 to 2001*. Ford Foundation.
- Fundación Trascender and Collect GFK. (2008). Estudio Nacional de Voluntariado 2008. Available at http://www.fundaciontrascender.cl/home/doc/EstudioNacionalVoluntariado_2008.pdf.
- Gaberman, B. (2003). Building the global infrastructure for philanthropy. Lecture, Waldemar Nielsen Seminar Series at Georgetown University. Washington, DC.
- Graddy, E. and Wang, L. (2009). Community foundation development and social capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **38** (3), 392-412.
- Landim, L. (2005). A 'new volunteering' in the Brazilian context. In: C. Sanborn and F. Portocarrero (eds.), *Philanthropy and Social Change in Latin America*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Layton, M. (2009a). Philanthropy and the third sector in Mexico: The enabling environment and its limitations. *Norteamérica Revista Académica*. **4**(1), 87-120.
- Layton, M. (2009b). A paradoxical generosity: Resolving the puzzle of community philanthropy in Mexico. *Giving. Thematic Issues on Philanthropy and Social Innovation - Issue on Community Philanthropy: an evolutionary framework* (1), 87-101.
- Layton, M. and Moreno, A. (2010). *Filantropía y sociedad civil en México: Análisis de la ENAFI 2005-2008*. Miguel Ángel Porrúa, Mexico City.
- Moyo, B. (2003). Community foundations, social capital and development in South Africa. Internal Fellowship Working Paper. Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York.
- Oliver-Evans, C. and Wilkinson-Maposa, S. (2009). Community philanthropy. *Giving. Thematic Issues on Philanthropy and Social Innovation - Issue on Community Philanthropy: an evolutionary framework* (1), 9-15.

- O'Neill, M. (2001). Research on giving and volunteering: Methodological considerations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **30**, 505-514.
- Patten, M., Kuzmin, A., Balakirev, V. (2006). *Russian Community Foundations Study Report*. Donors Forum. Moscow.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Portocarrero, F. (2005). Volunteers and donors: Patterns of civic engagement in contemporary Peru. In: C. Sanborn and F. Portocarrero (eds.), *Philanthropy and social change in Latin America*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Portocarrero, F., Sanborn, C., Millán, A. and Loveday, J. (2004). *Voluntarios, donantes y ciudadanos en el Perú: Reflexiones a partir de una encuesta*. Universidad del Pacífico, Lima. Available at http://www.lasociedadcivil.org/docs/ciberteca/voluntarios_donantes_y_ciudadanos.pdf
- Rooney, P., Schervish, P., and Steinberg, K. (2004). Methodology is destiny: The effect of survey prompts on reported levels of giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **33**, 628-654.
- Sacks, E. (2008). *2008 Community Foundation Global Status Report*. Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS). Available at: http://www.wingsweb.org/information/publications_community_2008_main.cfm
- Strečanský, B. (2006). Community foundations in Central Europe - Waiting for society to catch up. *Alliance* **11**(1).
- Thompson, A. (2006). Community Foundations in Latin America: Can the Concept be Adapted? *Alliance* **11**(1).
- Thompson, A. (2005) Local development, community capacity building and resource mobilization: Exploring the potential of “community foundations” in Latin America. *International Senior Fellow 2005: Center for the Study of Philanthropy and Civil Society*. The Graduate Center, City University of New York.
- Wang, L. and Graddy, E. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas* **19**, 23-42.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, S., et al. (2005). *The poor philanthropist: How and why the poor help each other*, South Africa: Compress, Cape Town.
- Williams, T. and Robinson, D. (2004). Social capital and philanthropy in Maori society. *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law* **6**(2), Available at http://www.icnl.org/knowledge/ijnl/vol6iss2/special_4.htm

APPENDIX 1
VARIABLES USED IN REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Dependents

- Giving: Secular: [P17] (a, b, c, e, f, h, i, j, k, m) Vea por favor con cuidado la siguiente lista de organizaciones ¿Me podría decir si en los últimos 12 meses hizo una donación a alguna de esas organizaciones?
(Please review carefully the following list of organizations. Have you made a donation to one of those organizations in the past 12 months?). Options included: Escolar/ educativas (School / education); Grupos ecologistas /protección a los animales (Environmental groups / animal protection); Organizaciones relacionadas con la salud (Healthcare organizations); Organización de ayuda a ancianos, personas de escasos recursos, etc. (The elderly, low income, etc.); Organizaciones humanitarias (Humanitarian organizations); Asociación de vecinos (Neighborhood Group); Grupos de jóvenes y clubes / deportes (Youth groups and clubs / sports; Asociaciones artísticas culturales (Culture and arts associations); Los damnificados por algún desastre natural (those affected by natural disasters).
- Giving: Religious [P17] (d, g, l) Vea por favor con cuidado la siguiente lista de organizaciones ¿Me podría decir si en los últimos 12 meses hizo una donación a alguna de esas organizaciones? (Please review carefully the following list of organizations. Have you made a donation to one of those organizations in the last 12 months?) Options included: La iglesia (campañas, obras, etc.). (The church – campaigns, renovations); Otras Organizaciones religiosas (Other Religious Organizations); Limosna en misa cuando asiste (Weekly collection in Mass)
- Volunteering: Secular [P5a1 al P5a11] [P5a13 a P5a17] Vea por favor con cuidado la siguiente lista donde se incluyen los distintos tipos de organizaciones y actividades voluntarias. Dígame en cuál de ellas realizó un trabajo voluntario en los últimos 12 meses.
(Please review carefully the following list of organizations that includes different types of organizations and volunteering activities. Please tell me in which one did you work as a volunteer in the last 12 months) Options included: Escolar/ educativas (School / education); Grupos ecologistas /protección a los animales (Environmental groups / animal protection);

Organizaciones relacionadas con la salud (Healthcare organizations); Desarrollo Comunitario/ Acción vecinal (Community development/neighborhood action); Grupos discapacitados (The disabled); Derechos humanos (Human Rights); Protección civil (Civil defense); Servicios Humanitarios (Humanitarian services); Actividades partidistas (Political party); Actividades no partidistas (Nonpartisan activism); Grupos de jóvenes, clubes / deportes (Youth groups and clubs ; Trabajo o profesional (médicos, ingenieros, contadores, etc.) Labor or professional organizations (doctors, engineers, accountants, etc.); Individual o informal (Individual or informal); Deportivas (Sports); Actividades culturales (Cultural activities); Productores / Ejidatarios (Agricultural cooperative)

Volunteering: Religious

[P5a12] Vea por favor con cuidado la siguiente lista donde se incluyen los distintos tipos de organizaciones y actividades voluntarias. Dígame en cuál de ellas realizó un trabajo voluntario en los últimos 12 meses. (Please review carefully the following list of organizations, which includes different types of organizations and volunteering activities. Please tell me in which one did you work as a volunteer in the last 12 months). The only option was religioso (religious).

Independents

Social capital (membership)

[P40] Le voy a leer una lista de organizaciones, conteste para cada una si actualmente es miembro y participa en ella (1), si es miembro pero no participa (2), si fue miembro o participó en el pasado pero no actualmente (3) o si nunca ha pertenecido (4)

From the next list of organizations, tell me for each if: 1) you are a current member and participant; 2) you are a member, but not a participant; 3) you were a member or you participated in the past but not currently; 4) you have never been a member.

Social capital (networks)

[P62] ¿Cuándo usted necesita ayuda usted diría que puede contar con muchas personas para apoyarlo, con algunas, con pocas o con casi ninguna persona para apoyarlo?

When you need any help, you can rely on many, some, few or none people for support you?

Social capital (reciprocity)	[P49d] Para cada una de las siguientes frases dígame sí esta usted de acuerdo o en desacuerdo en...Ayudando a los demás me ayudo a mi mismo. (For each of the next phrases, tell me if you agree or disagree... By helping others, I help myself.)
Social capital (Interpersonal trust)	[P31] En términos generales, ¿diría usted que se puede confiar en la mayoría de las personas o que no se puede ser tan confiado al tratar con la gente? (Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?)
Sex	[P2] Sexo del entrevistado (ANOTAR SIN PREGUNTAR) (Sex of the person interviewed).
Age, Age ²	[P3] ¿Qué edad tiene usted? (How old are you?)
Education	[P72] ¿Hasta qué grado de educación estudió? (Básica, Media y Superior) (What is the highest educational degree you have completed?)
Subjective social class	[P80] ¿Usted se considera de clase...? (Of which social class do you consider yourself?)
Married	[P73] Actualmente está usted es... (What is your civil status?)
With kids	[P74] ¿Tiene hijos? (SÍ) ¿Cuántos? (Do you have children? If so, how many?)
Rural/Urban (Rural=1)	[px6] Tipo (Rural or urban area?)
Religiosity	[P46] Sin incluir FESTEJOS ni servicios funerarios, ¿qué tan seguido asiste a servicios religiosos? (Aside from holidays and funerals, how often do you attend church?)

APPENDIX 2: ENAFI: Results of Logistical Regression Analysis (Pooled 2005 and 2008 Surveys)

	Giving: Secular			Giving: Religious			Volunteering: Secular			Volunteering: Religious		
	B	Wald	Sig.	B	Wald	Sig.	B	Wald	Sig.	B	Wald	Sig.
<i>Social capital</i>												
Membership	0.589	104.0	0.000	0.240	20.5	0.000	0.661	196.4	0.000	0.331	59.7	0.000
Networks	0.129	7.0	0.008	0.017	0.1	0.754	0.162	10.1	0.002	0.151	6.1	0.014
Reciprocity	0.207	24.5	0.000	0.264	35.2	0.000	0.164	13.0	0.000	0.372	36.9	0.000
Interpersonal trust	-0.179	2.6	0.104	-0.158	1.7	0.194	-0.186	2.6	0.107	0.014	0.0	0.916
<i>Demographics</i>												
Sex (female=1)	0.190	4.8	0.028	0.155	2.7	0.102	-0.119	1.7	0.186	0.031	0.1	0.777
Age	0.018	1.6	0.205	-0.011	0.5	0.487	0.026	2.5	0.114	0.020	1.2	0.272
Age square	0.000	2.7	0.103	0.000	0.3	0.567	0.000	7.2	0.007	0.000	1.0	0.306
Education	0.279	14.3	0.000	-0.170	4.6	0.031	0.249	11.1	0.001	0.010	0.0	0.916
Subjective Social class	0.124	5.4	0.020	0.180	9.3	0.002	-0.040	0.5	0.467	-0.027	0.2	0.688
Married	0.054	0.4	0.549	0.127	1.6	0.205	0.091	0.9	0.338	0.117	1.1	0.305
With children	0.047	4.0	0.046	0.056	4.1	0.043	0.043	2.9	0.086	0.028	1.0	0.308
Rural residence	-0.174	2.9	0.088	0.340	8.6	0.003	0.441	18.5	0.000	0.846	52.2	0.000
Religiosity	0.049	5.6	0.018	0.279	164.3	0.000	0.082	13.9	0.000	0.310	91.3	0.000
Constant	-2.536	36.6	0.000	-1.604	12.7	0.000	-3.092	47.3	0.000	-5.996	107.4	0.000
c^2		274.245			349.750			437.687			357.327	
Significance		0.000			0.000			0.000			0.000	
R square (Cox y Snell)		0.098			0.118			0.145			0.120	
Percent of correct prediction		65.3			76.2			71.5			82.0	
Cases included in analysis		2,670			2,784			2,790			2,790	
Percent classified by 1		60.5			72.7			33.6			17.8	