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Summary

One of a series of five reports covering Canada’s principal regions, this report sets out the most recent detailed figures available from Statistics Canada about the levels of volunteering and donating by various types of individuals and for various types of nonprofit organizations in the four Atlantic provinces combined, based on the 1997 and 2000 National Survey(s) of Giving, Volunteering and Participating. To help nonprofit groups replenish their reserves, it then spells out the results of some sophisticated statistical analyses which reveal the distinguishing characteristics of the volunteers and donors who made the greatest contributions of their time or money in this region, and explores the significance of these findings from a target marketing perspective.

An Information Sourcebook is available separately as a supplement to this report on this website.
1) **Introduction**

This report provides a comprehensive picture of volunteering and donating in the Atlantic region. Various types of nonprofit organizations can make concrete use of this information, both to track the changes in volunteering and donating since the late-nineties and to find and retain more supportive donors and volunteers. It is one of five reports that have been prepared: one for each of Canada’s principal regions.

These reports are primarily based upon detailed examination of the 1997 and 2000 National Survey(s) of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (or ‘NSGVP’). The NSGVP’s are the result of a partnership of federal government departments and voluntary sector organizations that included the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Canadian Heritage, Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, Statistics Canada and Volunteer Canada. These surveys were conducted by Statistics Canada, and asked a large, random sample of Canadians a series of questions about how they: gave money and other resources to individuals and to charitable and non-profit organizations; volunteered time to charitable and voluntary organizations and directly to individuals; and participated in organizations by becoming members, over the course of the previous year.

Although some of the data presented in the current reports have already been explored in other studies, those have mainly been national-level reports, where the information about distinctive regional traits and patterns can easily be displaced by overall issues. Moreover, due to data quality considerations, the findings on the contributions of many individual demographic groups in the smaller provinces were suppressed in 2000, which impeded the ability to keep track of the changes since 1997. This will be the first time those breakdowns will be generally available at the regional level for the Atlantic and Prairie provinces, and also the first time that detailed comparisons are made on a per capita basis.

The five regional reports in this series and their accompanying Information Sourcebooks are also the richest source of detailed information on how volunteering and donating have been distributed among the voluntary subsectors in each region, which is likely to be of interest to many nonprofit organizations in Canada that are seeking public support. They not only provide the relative proportions of donations or volunteers to the largest subsectors as some previous ‘NSGVP Fact-Sheets’ have done, but they also furnish the actual figures for the totals, medians, averages (on both a per contributor and a per capita basis) and participation rates, for all main types of nonprofit organizations.

In addition, these reports are intended as “news you can use,” with strategic information geared directly to nonprofit managers, volunteer coordinators, and fundraisers, rather than for an academic or policy-oriented audience. They are the first regional-level reports that have taken a practical approach to linking the research findings derived from the NSGVP to concrete strategies for recruitment or fundraising.
This and the other four regional reports are based on comprehensive information contained in five *Information Sourcebooks for Community Organizations on Volunteering and Donating*, in the respective regions. Although considerable material will be presented in this report and in the corresponding Sourcebook for Atlantic Canada, there’s certainly no need to absorb it all. The various sections (and their corresponding Appendices with supplementary tables) are largely self-contained, and end users with various interests can simply pick and choose to read the parts which address their needs.

Following this introductory section, Section Two sets out the overall levels of volunteering and donating in the five principal regions of Canada as of 2000, using a variety of absolute and standardized measures, including number of volunteers or donors, participation rates, total amounts contributed, and average per contributor and per capita.

Section Three shows how volunteering and donating were distributed among the different subsectors or types of nonprofit organizations in the Atlantic region.

Sections Four and Five document how much volunteering and donating changed in this region between 1997 and 2000 (when the first two versions of the NSGVP were performed; the next one was conducted in the fall of 2004 and results are slated to be released sometime in 2005). The larger scale changes in both types of contributions as a whole are charted in Section Four, while Section Five focuses on the various levels and changes in giving by the various major demographic groups these surveys have been tracking.

Section Six offers information intended to help nonprofit organizations increase their volunteer and donor support, based on Drs. Reed and Selbee’s statistical analyses of the distinguishing characteristics of those who contribute more than the median amount. First, it describes the characteristics of those more likely to be among the “active” or upper half of volunteers, who put in at least sixty-six hours a year. They indicate that there are different sets of characteristics to look for in two main types of people (very religious and not-so), and in three different sizes of communities (rural, small urban, and large urban). Finally, it points out which demographic groups could be targeted for larger donations by identifying which characteristics were more prevalent among the upper half of donors.
2) **Overall Volunteering and Donating in Atlantic Canada and the Other Principal Regions of Canada**

All in all, Atlantic Canadians contributed about $353-M. of their money (or $220 each, among donors) and over 116 million hours of their time (or 192 hours each, among volunteers) to nonprofit organizations in 2000.

There were nearly one million link-ups between the region’s 606,000 individual volunteers and the particular agencies they helped out that year, and over 4.3 million relationships between the region’s 1.6 million donors and the individual agencies they supported.

That represented about ten percent or less of all the volunteering and donating which occurred in Canada, that year. The overall picture on the individual contributions to nonprofit organizations across the country and the levels and shares of it in each region is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Atlantic</th>
<th>Québec</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Prairies</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total household pop. of age 15 and up (in ‘000s)</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>9,421</td>
<td>4,088</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>24,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of 15+ population</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of volunteers (in thousands)</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>6,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total volunteers</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering rate (in %)</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among regions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours volunteered (in millions)</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>393.5</td>
<td>220.4</td>
<td>142.6</td>
<td>1,053.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total hours</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. hrs. per volunteer</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. hrs. per capita</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among regions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of donors (in thousands)</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>4,401</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>19,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total donors</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor rate (in %)</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among regions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount donated (in $-millions)</td>
<td>352.7</td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>2,275.7</td>
<td>1,181.1</td>
<td>613.6</td>
<td>4,938.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total donations</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. donation per donor</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. donation per capita</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among regions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2000
Clearly, Atlantic Canada provides far more volunteer support for nonprofit organizations on a per capita basis than all the other regions of Canada, as of the year 2000. Although its 32% participation rate is not as high as the Prairies’ (39%), the volunteers here put in more hours, which work out to sixty-one hours per year, when averaged over everyone aged 15 and over in the regular household-dwelling population. That’s 41% higher than the national average. Consequently, the total share of hours Atlantic Canadians volunteered for nonprofits in Canada (11%) exceeded their share of the applicable population (7.8%) considerably.

It’s quite a different story when it comes to donations. Even though Atlantic Canada was essentially tied with the Prairies for the highest participation rate (with 84% of the eligible population donating to nonprofits in 2000), it gave less on a per capita basis than all the other regions of Canada except Québec. Atlantic Canadians gave an average of $185 over the course of the year, averaged over everyone over the age of fifteen, which was about nine percent lower than the Canadian average ($203). Thus, their share of the total value of the individual donations made that year (7.1%) fell a little short of their share of the population (7.8%). Of course, this does not take people’s ability to pay into account, inasmuch as the average after-tax household income of Atlantic Canadians was about fourteen percent lower than that of Canadians as a whole in 2000, which could account for that discrepancy.

For small to medium-sized community organizations, perhaps the most important measure to look at is the medians. That’s what the ‘typical,’ ‘average,’ or ‘middle of the pack’ donor or volunteer in each region contributed, to however many organizations they supported that year. As it happens, the two sets of figures are remarkably close in range (no more than 30 units apart for any region), so they can easily be plotted together: see Figure 1. Compared to the other regions, the midlevel contributions from Atlantic Canadians were on the high side for volunteering, but on the low side for donations.

**Figure 1: Median amounts volunteered and donated to nonprofits by region, 2000**

![Figure 1: Median amounts volunteered and donated to nonprofits by region, 2000](image)

Source: Statistics Canada, National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2000
3) Distribution of Volunteering and Donating among the Different Subsectors

So where did all those philanthropic contributions end up? Let’s start with the big picture on where the bulk of the volunteering and donations by Atlantic Canadians went to. This is shown in Figure 2, which combines a number of less well-supported subsectors into a single “All Others” category, because the most favoured subsectors received such disproportionate shares of support that the others barely register on a chart with a scale large enough to encompass them all on an ordinary page.

Figure 2: Relative shares of the volunteers, volunteers hours, and total number and value of donations contributed to major types of nonprofits by Atlantic Canadians in 2000

Religious organizations, which are certainly among the most prevalent types of nonprofit organizations, clearly got the lion’s share of the Atlantic Canadians’ total donations: nearly two-thirds (63%) of the total value. They only received one-sixth of the total hours volunteered, however. In contrast, the two greatest recipients of the volunteer contributions – Social Services and Arts, Recreation, & Sports – each received over a quarter of the hours, but only about ten percent of the total amount of donations, between them.

This chart may seem to understate the extent of the popular support for some subsectors, however. For example, even though religious organizations only had about one-fifth of the donor engagements or supportive relationships in the region, they were supported by slightly
over half of the region’s actual donors. The reason for this is that so many people gave to several different agencies that there were nearly three times as many donor engagements altogether as there were donors, and so the shares of each differs, depending upon whether one divides each subsector’s total number of donor engagements by the total number of donors, or by the total number of engagements (which is the only data we have to work with). Table 2 clarifies these matters, and also gives the more precise values on the other variables depicted above and expands the range of types covered to all twelve standard types.

Table 2: Percent of Atlantic Canadians’ volunteers, volunteer engagements and hours, and donors, donor engagements, and amount of donations by type of nonprofit, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of nonprofit organization</th>
<th>Possible(^5) share of volunteers</th>
<th>Share of volunteer engagements</th>
<th>Share of volunteer hours</th>
<th>Possible(^5) share of donors</th>
<th>Share of donor engagements</th>
<th>Share of value of donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arts &amp; Recreation (including Sports)</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education &amp; Research</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Services</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Environmental &amp; Animal protection</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing &amp; Development</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Law, Advocacy, Politics</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Foundations or Volunteer Centres</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. International</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Religion</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Business or Prof. assoc’s, Unions</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other / N.E.C. (Not Elsewhere Classified)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Out of how many in each category) / 605,685 volunteers | 997,878 engagements | 114,568,813 hours | 1,600,551 donors | 4,330,273 engagements | 352,662,896 dollars

Source: Statistics Canada, National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2000

Another main area of interest is, “How much did each volunteer or donor contribute to each type?” This is shown in Table 3: the averages, both on a per contributor basis (among those Atlantic Canadians who actually gave their time or money to nonprofits), and on a per capita basis (among the entire household-dwelling population aged fifteen and up, including non-contributors).

With regard to volunteering, even though some types received considerably more hours from those who actually volunteered for them, they had so few volunteers altogether that they
received very little on a per capita basis. If we keep both those measures in mind, then the Social Services were the clear favourites in the Atlantic, with the highest average per capita and the third highest on a per volunteer placement basis. These were also the highest averages for this type compared to the other regions of Canada. Arts and Recreation also did very well, gleaning the second highest averages per posting and the second highest averages on a per capita basis (although was mainly due to the popularity of Service Clubs or Fraternal Organizations in this region, rather than to Arts and Culture organizations, *per se*). Religious organizations also received a lot of volunteer support, with the fourth highest average per volunteer, and the third highest per capita.

There was a very large drop-off in overall support after that. The three types receiving the least amount of volunteer support in the Atlantic region on a per capita basis were: Environment or Animal Protection; International; and Foundations or Volunteer Centres. Housing & Development was in the middle of the pack compared to the Atlantic’s other subsectors, but it had higher averages of both types in Atlantic Canada than in any other region.

Table 3: Average hours and donations contributed by Atlantic Canadians to each type of nonprofit organization in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of nonprofit organization</th>
<th>Ave. ann. hours per volunteer placement</th>
<th>Average ann. hours per capita (among age-15+ pop.)</th>
<th>Rank among 12 types in Atlantic for per cap. ave.</th>
<th>Ave. ann. donation to individual types ($)</th>
<th>Average ann. donations per capita among 15+ pop. ($)</th>
<th>Rank among 12 types in Atlantic for per cap. ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Recreation (including Sports)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Research</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Development</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Advocacy, Politics</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations, Vol. Ctrs., International</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>115.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, professional associations, Unions</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / N.E.C.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals, for individual subsectors</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>$ 81</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2000

Regarding donations, religious organizations clearly dominated the field, capturing Atlantic Canadians’ highest average contributions on both a per donor and a per capita basis. All the other types received fairly small average donations from Atlantic Canadians (well under $50), except for International organizations (which received $76 per donor), and philanthropic intermediaries such as such as community foundations or United Ways (which received $85).
On a per capita basis, besides Religion ($116), only Health ($28) and Social Services ($15) received more than ten dollars per person aged fifteen and up; several types received under a dollar per person.
4) Overall Changes in Volunteering and Donating in Atlantic Canada

As with the other regions, there were some fairly major changes in the overall levels of volunteer and donor support in the Atlantic Provinces between 1997 and 2000. The large-scale changes for Atlantic Canada are portrayed here first, in Figure 3.

Figure 3: General changes in the voluntary and monetary contributions to nonprofit organizations by the residents of Atlantic Canada in 2000 in comparison to 1997

There was nearly an eleven percent reduction in the actual number of volunteers helping nonprofits out (74,000 fewer, in absolute terms). Despite that, there was nearly a 17% increase in the average hours volunteered on a per capita basis. That means many of the remaining volunteers were putting in a lot more hours, each, which poses a serious risk of burning out many of them out.

There was also a slight (1.1%) increase in the number of Atlantic Canadians making donations to charities and nonprofit organizations between 1997 and 2000, and an 8.5% increase in the value of the average donations on a per capita basis. Of course, much of that increase would be eaten up by inflation, but it still amounted to a 2.6% increase in purchasing power when adjusted for a weighted average of the cumulative annual inflation rate for the four Atlantic Provinces combined.

Regarding how well Atlantic Canada did in comparison with the other principal regions of Canada with respect to these overall changes in contributions, the answer is mixed. (Table 4)
Table 4: Relative changes in the number of contributors and total and per capita amounts volunteered and donated in each region in 2000 in comparison to 1997 (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Atlantic</th>
<th>Québec</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Prairies</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in number of volunteers</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in total hours volunteered</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-15.8</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in hours per capita</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in number of donors</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in total amounts donated</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in donations per capita</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; adjusting for regional inflation</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Atlantic region’s relative improvements in donations were not quite as strong as they were in some other regions of Canada in this interval. But the Atlantic provinces certainly had the largest relative increases in volunteer hours, both in total and per capita. Indeed, this was the only principal region of Canada to show increases in those measures, at all, and it ended up with the highest level of volunteering on a per capita basis. (Figure 4)

Figure 4: Annual hours volunteered per capita among the household-dwelling population aged 15 or over in 1987, 1997, and 2000, by region

5) Contributions from the Individual Demographic Groups

There were some major changes in both the absolute and relative levels of giving by many demographic groups in this (and indeed every other) region of Canada, compared to when the first NSGVP survey was conducted in 1997.

The good news is mainly that the donor participation rates went up for ten of the twenty-seven major demographic groups in Atlantic Canada that the Caring Canadians NSGVP highlight reports have been tracking, and the total and average amounts of donations and volunteering went up for about two-thirds of the groups, in each case.

The bad news is that there were also many reductions in Atlantic Canadians’ contributions: particularly in their overall participation. The donor rates went down at least slightly for sixteen demographic groups. And the participation rates for volunteering decreased for every group except the unemployed, and not by trivial amounts either: it decreased by at least 10% in relative terms for eighteen groups. That represented losses of between three and fourteen percentage points in absolute terms (e.g., from almost two-thirds of those with university degrees volunteering in 1997 to just a little over a half of them doing so in 2000). In addition, several groups had relative reductions of 10% or more in their total and average donations or hours.

The most effective way to track all these changes at once is on a per capita basis, ranging over the entire household-dwelling population over the age of fifteen who might have contributed to nonprofits. That incorporates the participation rates, averages and totals while also taking into account the changes in the number of people falling into each group. Table 5 below does this for volunteering and donating simultaneously, for all the main demographic groups. It also shows how much these averages had changed since the first survey was conducted, and the rankings for which groups showed the best (1) or worst (27) relative changes.

It shows that nineteen demographic groups increased their donations on a per capita basis. Of these, sixteen increased their giving by at least 6% (the minimum threshold for actual gains, considering that the overall cumulative inflation rate for this region in the three intervening years was about 5.7%); about a dozen of them by at least 10%, and nine by 20% or more. There was a similar pattern for the per capita increases in volunteering.

The best changes in relative terms were for the 55-64 year-old age group for volunteering, and the 15-24 year-old bracket for donating. There wasn’t a great deal of overlap between the groups showing the largest per capita increases of both types of contributions, however. Only four had at least a 10% increase in the average per capita donations and hours, alike: two age brackets (15-24, and 55-64); one total gross household income bracket ($40-$60,000); and those whose highest level of education was a high school diploma.

The worst relative changes from the $60-$80,000 gross household income bracket for donating, and the 25-34 year-old age group for volunteering (although they upped their donations by one-third, possibly because many more of them were working).
Table 5: Average hours and dollars contributed to nonprofit organizations in 2000 by major demographic groups in the Atlantic region, per capita, and how much that had changed from the 1997 levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristic</th>
<th>Ave. volunteering per capita</th>
<th>Ave. donations per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/common-law</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-sec. Diploma or some university</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labour force</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000–$39,999</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000–$59,999</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000–$79,999</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we weight these two types of contributions equally, the three demographic groups with the worst combined decreases in the amounts of time and money they contributed to nonprofit organizations per capita were:

- People from households grossing between $60-$80,000 – the only major demographic group in the Atlantic to show a per capita decline in both types of contributions: a 29% relative decrease in donations, and a 4% decrease in hours, for a 16% combined decrease.

But this probably wasn’t because most of the same people had become less generous in the space of a few years; rather, it appears to be a function of ‘bracket creep.’ Thanks to the improvements in the Atlantic region’s economy between 1997 and 2000, there were nearly fifty percent more people falling into this income bracket by the end of 2000. But the newly-swelled category ended up with a much lower volunteer participation rate and about a twenty-five percent drop average donations. One possible explanation for this is that many of its new members were working full-time, now, but they had so much debt accumulated from their years of hardship that they couldn’t afford to give as much time or money as those who’d occupied that class all along.

- People from households grossing over $80,000, who showed a 3% relative decrease in the average hours volunteered per capita, and a 16% decrease in donations, for a 6% combined decrease.

This, too, might be an artifact of ‘bracket creep,’ because the total donations by this group actually increased phenomenally (by over forty percent, in relative terms). It’s just that there were now about a hundred thousand more people falling into this category, as well, and even though a comparable percentage of them were still donating, many were understandably donating at, say, the only-just-barely-$80,000 in gross income level, rather than at the six figure income level which may have been more typical of the more long-standing members of this bracket.

- Those in the 45-54 year-old age bracket increased their per capita hours by 18%, but their per capita donations decreased a whopping 28% – for a loss of eighteen million dollars, relative to the 1997 levels from that age bracket – for a 6% combined decrease.

This may be a real cause for concern, even though the contributions by the next bracket (55-64) actually increased by that much. This suggests those born in the early 1940s are giving as much as ever, but the cohort immediately after them (those born in the late forties and early fifties) are not nearly as generous. If so, total donations are likely to decrease over the next ten years or so, when the War Babies and earliest Boomers’ prime earning years are over and their donations drop off, if their younger siblings or cousins don’t give to the same degree, in their stead.
In addition, the median donations were down by at least five percent for over two-thirds of the demographic groups, resulting in between two and fifty-four dollars less in annual donations from the typical Atlantic Canadian donor. Those drops were bound to have hurt local agencies, considering that almost every type of nonprofit only received about ten or twenty dollars from half their donors in the Atlantic, to begin with.\(^7\)

Nor should we overlook the fact that the average and/or median amounts of time that the remaining volunteers put in increased quite a bit for many demographic groups, which may actually be bad news. Over two-thirds of the Atlantic’s demographic groups increased the average and/or median number of hours their volunteers put in that year by twenty percent or more, and there were a handful (especially adults between 55 and 64 years old; those not in the labour force; and those with less than a full high school education) who averaged at least fifty percent more hours than their compatriots had a few years earlier. In effect, they are carrying the additional load left from the net loss of over seventy thousand volunteers in the region and putting in an extra hour or two a week, because of that. This could become a real problem if they feel overburdened and put upon because of that, or if they become burned out by the extra work for health or other reasons.
6) Targeting the Most Active Volunteers and Donors

To help community organizations stem or reverse those losses, these reports address how a more in-depth examination of the NSGVP’s results can inform recruitment and fundraising initiatives which target those more likely to contribute more than just nominal amounts of time or money.

The distinguishing characteristics of the Atlantic region’s most active volunteers

We begin by taking up the results of some statistical analyses by Drs. Reed and Selbee which identified the characteristics of those who volunteered at least 66 hours a year in this region. That was adopted as the minimum threshold of “active” volunteers because it was the national median time volunteered in 1997 (the year of the NSGVP data they were using when they completed their analysis).

It turns out there are six main profiles or clusters of traits for recruiters to make use of; with two distinct sets applying to three different sizes of communities where the potential volunteers live: large urban (with populations of 100,000+); small urban (15,000-100,000); and rural (under 15,000). One set applies to those who would identify themselves as very religious, and the other to those who don’t consider religious beliefs to be particularly important to how they live their life. (Those two degrees of “religiosity” were such important predictors that they had to be separated out to get a better read on the possible influence of all the other traits being examined.)

To maximize the chances of finding someone with a heightened likelihood to volunteer many hours in the larger urban areas of Atlantic Canada, nonprofit agencies should strive to find:

a) People who aren’t particularly religious, and especially who aren’t Protestant, but who are involved in or members of various types of civic, recreational, or social groups; and who already help others out in various unassuming ways, on their own (by babysitting for their neighbours or shovelling their walk, e.g.); and who have also donated at least some money to nonprofits or charities in the past year.

Or,

b) People who are at least somewhat or very religious, and who, like the first group, also help others out in various ways on their own, and are involved in various types of civic, recreational, or social groups. But they probably also donate a lot to charities, and have a fair bit of education.
In the small urban areas of Atlantic Canada, there’s a very small number of characteristics to look for when targeting those most apt to become active volunteers:

a) Someone who’s not particularly religious, but who is involved in or a member of various types of civic, recreational, or social groups. *Or,*

b) Someone who *is* more religious, and involved in various types of civic, recreational, or social groups, and who also gives money or goods to others, quite apart from what they may have formally donated to nonprofits (whether it’s giving loose change to collection boxes or street people; donating food, or used clothes or furniture; helping relatives out, or even strangers they might have heard about who were in a bad way; or including charities their will).

And in the less populated areas of Atlantic Canada, recruiters should try to find:

a) Someone who’s not particularly religious, but who is involved in or a member of various types of civic, recreational, or social groups; who already helps others out in various unassuming ways on their own in several different types of “informal” volunteering; and who served in student government when growing up.

*Or,*

b) Someone who *is* quite religious (but it could well be something other than the Protestant or Catholic religion), and who, like the first group, is also involved in various types of civic, recreational, or social groups, and helps others out in various ways on their own. But they probably also donate a lot to charities; have several family members or other people sharing their household; and engage in several types of common social activities (visiting family and friends, and either participating in sports or recreation events themselves, or going to watch their children or grandchildren do so). They probably don’t work full-time, though, even though they have many years of education.

**The Atlantic region’s larger donors**

We also present here some strategic information on the most generous donors in Canada and its individual regions, based on some analyses by Reed and Selbee. They noticed that those who donated below the national median in 2000 ($73) contributed just 5.4% of the total amount of direct financial donations in Canada, altogether, for an average of $22, each. The other half, the larger donors (those giving $73 or more), accounted for nearly ninety-five percent of the net donations that year, and averaged $489 each. Similarly, in the Atlantic region, the larger (above the national median) donors made up 48% of its donor base, and contributed 93.6% of the amount of its donations, for an average of $429, each.

Given the wealth of demographic and lifestyle information about the survey respondents available to them, they examined whether there were some traits which set these larger donors apart, especially from those who did not give at all. And there were.
In fact, although Reed and Selbee are still finalizing their work in this area, they have two slightly different sets of findings on this issue.

In one version, they confined the analysis to those who are at least twenty-five years-old (since only 15% of the country’s youth between the ages of 15 and 24 donated more than the median amount, compared to 44% of those 25 and over), and they classified the larger donors in each principal region of Canada according to the median for that region.

In this analysis, only four characteristics stand out as strong predictors of who’s most likely to be a larger donor. The first two are almost equally important predictors:

1) Informal volunteering: specifically, the number of types of unpaid helping that people had engaged in over the past year on their own initiative, not through a nonprofit organization or government agency. Those who help family, friends and neighbours out in more of these more direct ways are also more likely to donate more than is typical in their region.

2) Household income: the likelihood of giving more than the median amount increases with the size of one’s total household income. Consider the $80,000-plus gross household income bracket. If we look at their share of the total amount of donations they account for in the Atlantic region (22.2%) in proportion to their share of the applicable population (12.5%), they had a donation ‘premium’ of 77%. In the other regions, the total donations from that highest income bracket exceeded their share of the population by 131% in Québec, 72% in Ontario, 83% in the Prairies, and 81% in B.C.

The next two strongest predictors of who’s apt to be among the upper half of donors are:

3) How frequently someone attends religious services (apart from special occasions such as weddings or funerals). The chances of being a larger donor rise with the frequency of church attendance, in these five main categories: not at all; once or twice a year; three or four times a year; monthly; or more or less weekly. There will be more information on this under the next set of findings, below.

4) Age: Canadians tend to become increasingly generous with their charitable support as they get older. The two older age-brackets in the Atlantic region had donation premiums of 62% for those between 55 and 64, and 55% for the 65+, when we consider their share of the total amount of donations they account for in proportion to their share of the applicable population. In the other regions, the total donations from the 55-64 year-old bracket exceeded their share of the population by 42% in Québec, 32% in Ontario, 14% in the Prairies, and 6% in British Columbia. For the 65+ category, the donation premiums were 36% in Québec, 18% in Ontario, and 13% in the Prairies, but B.C. was an anomaly, inasmuch as its seniors’ share of the province’s total donations (13.0%) was actually 15% smaller than their share of the population (15.3%).

In their other analysis, Reed and Selbee included every age group, and they selected all the larger donors using a common, national median. In doing so, they discovered that five main socio-demographic categories stood out in every region in terms of having higher concen-
trations of larger donors who were collectively responsible for very large proportions of the total amount of donations from each region. When all the statistically significant options in each category are included, there were twenty-one sub-groupings of larger donors in all.

Of course, not every adult with these particular characteristics was necessarily a larger donor. Like the rest of the population, some were smaller donors, and some did not give at all. But in many cases, the odds were about 50/50 that they were, so these are the richest veins to mine in terms of providing the greatest probability of success in obtaining larger annual donations from them.

These five categories and twenty-one sub-groupings, and the concentrations and levels of giving by the larger donors within them are:

1. The **ethnic heritage** or background the respondents classified themselves as hailing from, with the statistically significant options being collapsed into four types: British (including Scottish, Irish, etc.); French; Canadian (which could encompass anything from a First Nations background to any type of second-generation Canadian); and Other.

The ‘larger donor participation rates’ and the levels of giving by the larger donors among these groups as of 2000 were as follows:

- 46% of Atlantic Canadians indicating a **British** heritage donated more than the median amount ($73) in 2000. The larger donors among them gave an average of $440, that year, and accounted for 48% of Atlantic Canada’s total donations, even though they only comprised 22% of the applicable (household-dwelling, age 15+) population.

- 34% of Atlantic Canadians indicating a **French** heritage were larger donors. The larger donors among them gave an average of $272, that year, and accounted for 6.1% of Atlantic Canada’s total donations, although they only comprised 4.6% of the applicable population.

- 31% of those classifying themselves as of **Canadian** extraction were larger donors; and those who did give more than the median amount averaged $390, for 11.1% of the region’s total donations, from 5.8% of its population.

- 47% of the Atlantic Canadians with all **Other** ethnic backgrounds were among the upper half of Canada’s donors, averaging $464 for 21.2% of the Atlantic region’s donations, from 9.3% of its population.

2. Their **religious affiliation**, with the types that were statistically important for identifying larger donors being: Catholic, Protestant, Other, and ‘None.’ The corresponding statistics on the larger donors among these groups are:

- The ‘larger donor rate’ for **Catholics** in Atlantic Canada was 41%, and their larger donors averaged $375, for 29% of the region’s total donations, from 15% of its population.
49% of Atlantic Canada’s Protestants were larger donors, and those larger donors averaged $455, for 48.5% of the region’s total donations, from 21% of its (15+) population. This was the largest larger donor group, in terms of total donations.

32% of those indicating they have some other religious affiliation in Atlantic Canada gave above the national median. They averaged $600, for 2.4% of the region’s total donations, from 0.8% of its population base.

23% of Atlantic Canadians who said they had no religious affiliation were among the upper half of Canada’s donors. They averaged $328, for 6.5% of Atlantic Canada’s donations, from 3.9% of its population.

3. The frequency of their church attendance, with the significant options being, as before: not at all; once or twice a year; three or four times a year; monthly; or more or less weekly. The breakdowns on these sub-groups are:

- 25% of Atlantic Canadians who do not attend church at all (apart from special occasions such as weddings or funerals) were larger donors, averaging $303, for 12.3% of the region’s donations, from 7.8% of its population base.

- 24% of Atlantic Canadians who attended religious services once or twice a year were larger donors: averaging $215, for 3.4% of the donations, from 3.1% of its population.

- 36% of those who attended three or four times a year gave above the median, averaging $313, for 8.6% of the donations, from 5.4% of the population.

- 57% of Atlantic Canadians attending church monthly were larger donors in 2000: averaging $343, for 16.4% of the region’s total donations, from 9.2% of its population.

- 63% of the region’s weekly church attenders gave above the median: averaging $602, for 47.7% of the region’s donations, from just 15.4% of the applicable population.

4. Their main occupational class was another important category to identify larger donors:

- 58% of Atlantic Canadians with a professional occupation were larger donors, averaging $583 annually, for 23.6% of the region’s total donations, from 9.4% of the aged 15 and over population.

- 73% of Atlantic Canada’s managers and administrators gave above the median, averaging $653, for 9.4% of the region’s donations, from 2.7% of its population.

- 38% of those with some other white-collar occupation (mainly in sales and service) were larger donors, averaging $301, for 18.2% of Atlantic Canada’s donations, from 11.2% of its applicable population.

- 34% of Atlantic Canadians with blue-collar jobs (including skilled trades people as well as labourers) donated more than $73 in 2000: they averaged $368, for 13.6% of the region’s total donations, from 6.8% of its population base.
• 36% of Atlantic Canadians **not in the labour force** (which includes the retired, but not the unemployed actively seeking work) were among the upper half of donors, averaging $439, for 28.8% of this region’s donations, from 12.2% of its population.

5. Finally, the extent of someone’s **civic participation** could also pick out those more likely to donate above the median. Specifically, how many of these six types of civic organizations someone either participated in or was a member of: i) cultural, education, or hobby organizations (theatre groups, book clubs, bridge clubs, etc); ii) neighbourhood, civic or community associations or school groups (such as Parent/Teachers Associations); iii) political organizations; iv) religiously affiliated groups; v) service clubs or fraternal associations; and vi) sports or recreation organizations.

The significant options here were simply whether one participated in **none** of those six types, **one** of them, or **two or more**. Note, though, that work-related affiliations such as being members of a union or professional association are not included here, and donations and volunteer work are not counted as types of participation, for this purpose. The corresponding data on the ‘larger donor rates’ and levels for these sub-groups:

• 29% of Atlantic Canadians who weren’t members or participants of **any** of those types gave above the median. The larger donors with **no** civic participation (so defined) averaged $331, for 28.8% of the region’s donations, from 16.6% of its population.

• 51% of Atlantic Canadians involved in **one** of those types of civic organizations were larger donors, averaging $426, for 30% of the region’s total amount of donations, from 14% of its populace.

• 62% of those Atlantic Canadians with **two or more types** of civic participation were among the top half of Canada’s donors, and they averaged $548, for 30% of the region’s total donations, from 10% of its aged fifteen and over population.

So, how can organizations use this information to do **targeted** fundraising, to try to connect with the above the median donors? First, review the various characteristics which have been flagged above as being good indicators of who is more likely to be a larger donor, and consider whether some of these groups are apt to have more affinity for your particular cause.

Then, consider how you might zero in on people with those characteristics to approach them for donations, possibly via one of these main ways:

1) Face to face, which almost every fundraising practitioner or authority agrees is by far and away the most effective method: particularly for very large donations for “capital campaign” (for new buildings, for example), but also as the principal sales or marketing method for category (3) below.

2) Through some other form of personal contact (be it e-mail, traditional mail, or a phone call) by someone known to the target.
3) Through sponsorship events (such as marathons) or special events (such as auctions or dinners).

4) Through direct mail.

Obviously, some of these methods may be more suitable to some target groups than others. Fancy charity dinners or balls and silent auctions might appeal more to professionals than to blue-collar workers, for example. And if you want to organize a ‘fun run’ or similar sponsorship event geared to the latter and you hope to get the participation and support from a lot of larger donors active in the mainstream Christian faiths, then avoid holding it on a Sunday.

But how can your group identify potential donors with the relevant characteristics? In many cases, it will have come down to personal knowledge and social networks, as it does with recruiting active volunteers. This is particularly true for identifying people in the region with characteristics such as: their frequency of church attendance; the number of types of non-work-related civic organizations they’re involved in; and how many ways they help others out informally. Often, people only know this about their immediate friends, relatives, neighbours, or fellow church members. So everyone involved with your organization – including staff, board members, other members (if applicable), volunteers, and other supporters – should brainstorm on who they know with the relevant characteristics, and then contact them on the organization’s behalf to garner their support.

The companion Information Sourcebook reports have some references in their Appendices 7 and 15 to assist with that process. Their Appendix 12 also has a series of tables on how much each target group gives, how prevalent they are in the population, and the overall odds of finding them, in each region.

Some of the other characteristics can be tapped using local knowledge. You likely know which local neighbourhoods have greater concentrations of professional or white- or blue-collar occupations, for example; or lots of retirees; or people with higher incomes. Similarly, you can use the yellow pages to find the names and addresses of many professionals such as doctors and lawyers.

In addition, for those contemplating direct mail campaigns, some of those characteristics can be targeted using commercial list brokers. A number of companies (including Canada Post) use Census data to identify which neighbourhoods across Canada have large concentrations of seniors or people with high incomes, for example, or what mixture of ethnic backgrounds and occupational categories are found in the different neighbourhoods. You can buy addresses from them in the thousands for bulk mailings; or names, as well, for addressed mail. There are even some companies that sell mailing lists of people who have bought certain religious products (such as Bibles or religious magazine subscriptions), for those who want to tap into that potential donor base. A listing of some of these firms is provided in Appendix 15 of the Sourcebook.

*Good luck!*
Glossary

These definitions of key terms used in this report are all excerpted from Caring Canadians (Hall, McKeown, and Roberts, 2001), except where indicated with an asterisk.

Donors [and Donations]
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 [and the purchase of fundraising items which may benefit them, such as cookies, chocolates, or raffle tickets*].

Donor Engagements*
A donor ‘engagement’ is when someone donates to a particular organization in the reference year – regardless of how much or how many times they give to it. Particular instances of this may include being a “Friend Of,” a “Patron,” or a “Sponsor” of a cultural, health, or relief organization.

Donor Rate*
The percentage of the target population who made at least one donation to at least one nonprofit group or organization in the 12-month reference period.

Employment Categories
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…. Full-time workers are defined as those who usually work 30 or more hours a week…. Unemployed people are those who, during the week preceding the survey …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…. [Those] Not in the labour force …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.

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.

Organization classification[s]
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 [and if it wasn’t already on the survey’s list, they were] 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…. [It] groups organizations into 12 major activity groups…:

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 grantmaking
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**…[a catch-all category for everything remaining].

**Per capita**
A Latin phrase, which translates into “by (or for) each head,” and generally means “average per person.” In this context, it involves calculating the average among the entire household-dwelling population aged fifteen and up – including non-contributors.

**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….from October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000, for the 2000 NSGVP; or from November 1, 1996 to October 31, 1997, for the 1997 NSGVP.

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

**Volunteer Engagements**
A volunteering ‘engagement’ is something like a ‘job’: it is when someone actually volunteers for an individual organization in the reference year – regardless of how long or how many times they serve for that organization. It is usually referred to as a volunteering ‘event,’ in other NSGVP reports.

**Volunteer Rate**
The percentage of the target population who volunteered at least once for a nonprofit group or organization in the 12-month reference period.
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Notes

1 That is, from Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, combined. Due to sample size limitations, many of the analyses in this report could not be applied to those individual provinces.

2 As a special instance of the regular monthly Labour Force Survey, the 1997 and 2000 NSGVPs were administered to between about fifteen and eighteen thousand household-dwelling Canadians over the age of fifteen, including about three or four thousand from the Atlantic provinces (3,684 in 1997 and 2,981 in 2000). The surveys exclude people living in the Territories and on Indian Reserves, full-time members of the Canadian Armed Forces and inmates of institutions. These groups together represent an exclusion of approximately 2% of the population aged 15 or over.

3 Other data from Statistics Canada (from Spending Patterns in Canada, 2000 cat. no. 62-202-XIE, July 2002) indicate that the average net household income (after personal taxes, insurance payments and pension contributions) in the Atlantic provinces in 2000 was about $34,000 ($34,034 for NF/Lab., $33,956, $36,989 for NS, and $35,123 in NB). It was $39,649 for Canada as a whole.

4 Note, the “number of donations” here actually refers to the number of overall engagements or relationships between individual donors and particular agencies, that year. Even if a donor was giving in monthly or quarterly installments, that would only be counted as a single donor engagement or event, in this sense. Similarly for the volunteer engagements, which refer to the number of postings of individual volunteers at particular agencies that year.

5 Unfortunately, given the nature of the survey and the way the information has been recorded, these variables – the total number of volunteers or donors engaged in a given region and the number of engagements with individual organizations they’ve reported having that year – are the only data we have to work with, here. Thus, strictly speaking, we cannot actually determine the percentage of discrete volunteers or donors contributing to each subsector with any accuracy: we can only estimate them, by dividing each subsector’s total number of reported volunteer or donor engagements for that region by the total number of contributors in that region. These figures should be treated with caution, though, because they assume that the same proportion of people who contribute to several different organizations of the same type holds true for every subsector.

6 In 1997, there was high unemployment (nearly 14%) and modest earnings (about $24,900 annually for all earners) in this region. But by the end of 2000, even though there was almost zero net change in the adult population, the unemployment rate had dropped to slightly over 11%; there were over 9% more people in the workforce; nearly 50,000 or 8.6% more workers with full-year, full-time jobs, and average earnings were up more than 12%, to over $28,000.

7 The median donations from donors in Atlantic Canada in 2000 were between ten and twenty dollars for every type except Foundations or Volunteer Centres ($48) and Religion ($75).

8 The NSGVP survey asked Canadians which of these seven types of civic organizations they were members of or participated in (aside from donating to or volunteering for them): i) cultural, education, or hobby organizations; ii) neighbourhood, civic or community associations or school groups; iii) political organizations; iv) religiously affiliated groups; v) service clubs or fraternal associations; vi) sports or recreation organizations; and vii) work-related organizations such as unions or professional associations.

9 The NSGVP asked how many of these ten types of informal, unpaid help people gave to others, including friends, neighbours, and even relatives (but excluding those living in the person’s own household) – doing or providing: housework such as cooking or cleaning; yard or maintenance work such as gardening, painting or snow shovelling; shopping, or driving someone to appointments or stores; care or support to the sick or elderly; visits to the elderly; babysitting; teaching or coaching; or helping others to write letters, solve problems, find information or fill out forms; operate a business or farm; or help in some other way, not counting financial help.