



The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Institute for the Study of Civil Society and Philanthropy in Israel
Founded by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC)
and the Hebrew University
The Paul Baerwald School of Social Work and Social Welfare

Donation of money, volunteering, and civic engagement:

How do they relate to intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values?

Hillel Schmid, Michal Almog-Bar & Ronit Nirel
Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2022



Abstract

This paper presents an analysis of the relationships between intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values and prosocial behavior in three areas: monetary donation of money, volunteering, and civic engagement. Using a multivariable analysis for each area, while controlling for socio-demographic and social environment variables, this study found that the main intergenerational transmission variables are the family as the nuclear unit, the parents as role models, and discourse in the parents' home. Together these create a family environment that supports philanthropic values of donating money and volunteering and at the same time engaging in civic activities. The relationships between the three areas reflecting prosocial behavior are complementary rather than substitutional. Explanations of these relationships are provided and discussed.



Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between socio-demographic background variables, intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values and prosocial behavior expressed in giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement. While studies in the past investigated each aspect of these areas separately the current paper suggests a broader and more comprehensive perspective of analyzing the relationships between the variables mentioned above as well as the relationships between them.

Intergenerational transmission involves the transfer of values, norms, attitudes, and behaviors from parents to their children. The expression “charity begins at home” expresses more than the concept of giving money to the public good. The expression demonstrates the fact that children grow up with a family background, tradition, and unique family culture along with experiences that affect their empathy and consideration of others. The understanding of giving - both in making donations of money and in the giving of one’s time and energy in volunteering and civic engagement - is a process that begins with an individual’s experience in his or her family and continues with the next generation.

Intergenerational transmission occurs in various realms of life, religious beliefs, lifestyles, civic responsibilities, values, and more: for example, a sport-related lifestyle (Hayoz et al., 2017) or environmental values (Greenspan et al., 2021, Handy, et al., 2021). Even when families face challenges such as divorced spouses (Fisher, 1997), parents who became addicted to drugs and alcohol (Dunlop et al., 2002; Pears, Capaldi, & Owen, 2007), family violence (Gartland, 2019), or abuse of children (Gartland, 2019), there is intergenerational transmission.

The process of intergenerational transmission is influenced by various factors including socio-demographic characteristics of the population, the nuclear family, and the environment in which families and individuals live and are active (Andolina et al., 2003). The continuity of giving money to those in need, volunteering to promote and achieve social goals, and civic engagement are of great importance in educating future generations to maintain and sustain a liberal and democratic society based on equality.



Intergenerational transmission of prosocial behavior: Current state of knowledge

Theories of intergenerational transmission focus on prosocial behavior while emphasizing the socialization process in which individuals absorb and internalize universal, social, cultural, and ethical values. The theories that describe and explain these processes can be divided into two groups.

The first group describes the socialization and learning processes of prosocial behavior. These theories present the family and the environment's roles in shaping prosocial behavior, in general, and of the next generation, in particular. This group includes the following theories: "Social Learning Theory" (Bandura, 1986, 1977), "Socialization Theory" (Grusek & Hastings, 2008; Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Janoski, Musick, & Wilson, 1998; Wilson & Musick, 1998) and "Resource Theory" (Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Wilson & Musick, 1998). The second group includes theories that focus primarily on the family's role in shaping its offspring's prosocial behavior. These theories are: "Family Socialization theory" (Janoski & Wilson, 1995), "Family Status Transmission Theory" (Mustilo et al., 2004) and "Family Systems Theory" (Bowen, 1966).

The first group, "socialization theory" and "social learning theory," emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others. These theories explain human behavior in terms of the continuous interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences. Social and economic factors are part of socialization and continuous learning, which influence children's behavior, beliefs, and actions (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Wilson & Musick, 1998). Social, political, cultural, and religious values are expressed in civic behavior and social commitment (Albanesi et al., 2007). Transmission of values and norms can be shaped by social and educational institutions such as schools, youth movements, and voluntary organizations (Jennings & Stoker, 2001, 2009; Jennings, Stoker & Bowers, 2009; McDougale et al., 2017). School and political involvement have an impact on children's political interest and altruistic behavior, as well as their civic engagement (Andolina et al., 2003; Matthews



et al., 2010). In addition, the first group of theories focuses on the role of prosocial values and beliefs about socially desirable behavior. Differences between the prosocial behaviors between social groups are related to differences in social values and beliefs about the desirability of contributions of time and money to voluntary associations. Parents that view contributions of time and money to voluntary associations as more desirable will invest more in teaching their family members prosocial values in order to motivate them to also make contributions and volunteer.

“Resource Theory” sheds light on another aspect of intergenerational transmission with regards to philanthropic and altruistic values. According to this theory, intergenerational transmission is often portrayed as an indirect genetic effect and as an important form of shifting resources between age groups over time (Lee, 2014). Resource theory assumes that people at higher social status positions have more resources at their disposal in the form of human, financial, and social capital, which makes their participation and involvement in giving money and time less costly for them (Wilson & Musick, 1998). Indeed, social-economic status that derives, amongst other factors, from control of both material (money) and non-material resources (reputation and personal prestige), has been found to impact the intergenerational transmission of parents to their children in terms of giving money (Wilhelm, Brown, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2008).

The second group of theories, “Family Socialization Theory” (Janoski & Wilson, 1995), “Family Status Transmission Theory” (Mustilo et al., 2004), and “Family Systems Theory” (Bowen, 1966), emphasize the role the family plays in intergenerational transmission among all family members. Parents communicate values such as prosocial behavior and generosity to their children. Prosocial behavior involves actions that benefit others, including care, warmth, love, concern, helping, and sharing. Parents influence their children’s prosocial behavior early in life. Methods may include modeling, instructions, reinforcement, empathy, positive and responsive caring, and conversations (Brown et al., 2012).

Children learn, imitate, and implement their parents’ behaviors and values. Parents serve as their children’s role models, who in turn implement their parent’s behaviors



in their personality and conduct (Andolina et al., 2003). Thus, it was found that parents who demonstrate greater empathy towards their children and provide them with love and warmth reinforce their prosocial behavior (Bekkers, 2007; Musick & Wilson, 2008). Furthermore, if a child imitates modeled behavior and the consequences are rewarding, the child is likely to continue performing the modeled behavior (Albanesi et al., 2007).

The theories above, which are associated with acquiring prosocial behavior, complement one another. Whereas one group of theories emphasizes the socialization process of the offspring through different ways, the second group largely highlights the role of the family as a meaningful socializing agent and in educating towards prosocial values. In this regard studies have shown that parents' influence on their offspring is strongest during early childhood (Bekkers, 2003). Parents positively influence their children's decision to give to charity and that influence is stronger for certain types of giving, such as to religious congregations or international relief organizations (Osili, Clark, & Bergdoll, 2016). Parents who donate money to charitable organizations are likely to have children who also donate to charitable organizations (Britt, 2016; Brown et al., 2015; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011, 2012). Parents who are wealthy, generous, and religiously observant have a stronger impact on their children's giving than non-religiously observant parents (Herzog & Mitchell, 2016; Wilhelm et al., 2008). In addition, it has been found that religious giving by parents in male-headed households has a stronger influence on their children's religious giving than that of female-headed households (Bandy & Ottoni-Wilhelm, 2012; Britt, 2016). Religious giving by college-educated parents has been found to have a stronger influence on their children's religious giving than that of non-college educated parents (Caputo, 2009). Parents' income and wealth also impact their offspring's giving (Bandy & Ottoni-Wilhelm, 2012). Religious giving by parents with a high-net-worth has been found to have a stronger influence on their children's religious giving than that of those without a high net-worth (Brown, Srivastava, & Taylor, 2012). Also, for children of parents who are actively participatory in religious life (rituals, services, etc), the likelihood they will give to religious causes increases if their parents give to religious causes while it decreases if their parents give to secular



causes (Herzog & Mitchell, 2016). As for family structure, it has been found that overall giving by parents from families who had not experienced divorce or marital transition, has a stronger influence on their children's overall giving than overall giving by parents from families where a marital transition had occurred (Jennings, Stoker, & Bowers, 2009). Age also matters as to the influence on intergenerational transmission of giving. Young parents (ages 30-40) have more influence on their offspring's giving and volunteering than older families (with parents ages 40-50 and above) (Osili, Clark, & Bergdoll, 2016).

Studies also refer to the differences between boys and girls in the process of intergenerational transmission. While adult children, both sons and daughters, whose parents gave to charity, were found to be more likely to give to charity (Adriani & Sonderegger, 2009), relationships between parents and adult daughters' giving were found to be stronger than the relationships between giving by parents and their adult sons (Dotti-Sani & Quaranta, 2015). Specifically, parental frequency of giving mattered more for daughters, and adult daughters' giving had a stronger relationship with parental giving as parental wealth increased (Women Give 18, 2018; Dotti-Sani & Quaranta, 2015). Females and males were equally likely to give money to charity, but females were more likely than males to volunteer (Mesh et al., 2011; Mesh et al., 2013). In this regard, Larson and Hansen (2005) claimed that parents offered their sons more autonomy in choosing and shaping their prosocial behavior.

Regarding discussion among family members about charitable giving, it was found that talking to children about charity has a greater impact on children's giving than role modeling alone (Mesh et al., 2013). However, there are gender differences: role modeling was found to have a stronger effect on girls' giving (Ottoni-Wilhelm et al., 2017).

The intergenerational transmission of values associated with volunteering has also been studied. Studies show a connection between parents' volunteering and their children's participation in volunteering (Bekkers, 2003, 2007; Hill, 2012; Janoski & Wilson, 2003; Jones, 2006; Mersiyanova, 2019; Mustillo, Wilson, & Lynch, 2008; Roker et al., 1999). The parents' level of income also influenced intergenerational



transmission of volunteering. Accordingly, findings show that the higher the parents' income, as well as their socio-economic status, the greater the influence they had on their offspring's volunteering (Deb, Okten, & Osili, 2010; Wilhelm et al., 2008). Interestingly, instability in a family's income at certain points throughout their offspring's childhood and adolescence influenced their readiness to volunteer and give as they matured (Bandy & Ottoni-Wilhelm, 2012). In addition, findings show that affluent, educated parents tend to have highly educated children who, in turn, are more likely to volunteer (Bekkers, 2005; Mustillo et al., 2008; Rosenthal, Feiring, & Lewis, 1998, 2004).

The parents' level of religiosity was also found to influence their offspring's volunteering. Religiously observant parents had greater influence than secular parents on their children's volunteering (Brown et al., 2012; Caputo, 2009; Nesbit, 2012; Wilhelm, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2008). A family's status also impacted their offspring's volunteering. Married couples had a greater influence on their offspring than single-parent families (divorcees, widowers, separated couples) (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Wiepking, & Bekkers, 2012).

The parents' personality, the children's perception of their parents as role models, the empathy they demonstrate towards others, the supportive interpersonal relationships they maintain with others, their personal integrity, the help with which they provide their children, such as driving them to social activities, as well as involving them in events and ceremonies in which the parents participate, all influence the offspring's volunteering and giving (Bekkers, 2005; Nesbit, 2012; Wilhelm et al., 2002). To summarize, children raised in a social context that promotes volunteering will be more likely to volunteer as adults (Dotti-Sani & Quaranta, 2015; Quaranta & Dotti-Sani, 2016; Rosenthal, Feiring, & Lewis, 1998).

As for civic engagement, defined as "a process in which people take collective action to address issues of public concern and is instrumental to democracy" (Checkoway & Aldana, 2013) research is somewhat limited compared to research on the intergenerational transmission of giving money and volunteering. However, findings show that individuals whose parents engaged in civic activities such as participating



in public protest, writing letters to the newspaper or submitting a petition to a government agency showed higher levels of civic and political participation of the offspring. As such, they expressed a greater interest in news and politics, and were more likely to engage in consumer activism, join protests and demonstrations, be active on social media networks, and write letters to and articles for newspapers (Cicognani et al., 2011; Cornejo et al., 2020; Matthews, Hempel & Howell, 2010; Quintelier & Hooghe 2013; Zukin et al., 2006).

More specifically, relationships with both mothers and grandparents were identified as predictors of meaningful civic participation, suggesting that positive intergenerational relationships with female family members are meaningful to civic engagement. Mothers and grandmothers were the most important agents of influence on offspring's civic engagement, a result that was highly significant (Fraser, 1997). Higher educated mothers were more likely to transfer their higher levels of participation to their children (Verba, Schlozman, & Burns, 2005).

Parents also served as role models and inspired their children to be engaged in civic activities (Binder, 2020; Jennings & Stoker, 2001; Kirlin, 2002). The offspring of parents who had participated in demonstrations and political movements were more inclined to participate in similar activities (Necker & Voskort, 2014; Quaranta & Dotti-Sani, 2016; Settle et al., 2011).

Parents' income, socio-economic status, level of education and level of religiosity were found to have had a significant impact on the offspring's civic engagement (Akee, et al., 2018; Nesbit, 2012; Quintelier & Hooghe, 2013). The higher the parents' socio-economic status, level of education and level of religiosity, the greater an influence they had on their offspring's civic engagement (Caputo, 2008; Suanet, Van Groenou, & Braam, 2009). This was expressed in higher levels of political knowledge, interest, efficacy, and tolerance to engage in political discussion, as well as become independent and express themselves fully in family discussions (Anderson, 2009, Cornejo et al., 2020; Fuks, 2011). Research has also distinctly shown that more political discussion and family conversations led to more effective transmission.



Adolescents who discussed politics more often with their parents were more civically engaged (Cornejo et al., 2020; Diemer & Li, 2011).

Finally, studies are not ignoring the role of the environment and the community in influencing the offspring's civic engagement. Findings indicate that both political and school involvement had an impact on a child's political interest. Furthermore, studies found that adult community and school involvement, participation in youth movements, and volunteering had a positive impact on the level of the child's civic engagement and involvement in community activities (Andolina et al., 2003; Binder, 2020; Fletcher, Elder, & Mekos, 2000; Larson & Hansen, 2005; Matthews et al., 2010; McDougle et al., 2017).

A comparison between the factors that influenced intergenerational transmission in terms of giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement showed they have much in common (Hill, 2012; Osili et al., 2016). Findings clearly indicated that parents have had a significant impact on the intergenerational transmission of these altruistic values to their offspring. A family's tradition and culture of giving, environment and community service organizations, as well as discourse between family members also affected this process, as do the parents' socio-economic status, levels of education and religiosity, and parents as role models. All of the above serve as a basis for the conceptual framework of the study presented in this manuscript.

The conceptual framework

The conceptual framework of this study is based on the theories discussing prosocial behavior and its impact on intergenerational transmission. The framework suggests an analysis of the relationships between demographic background variables and intergenerational transmission variables, and giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement.

Table 1: A conceptual framework for analyzing the relationships between demographic background variables and intergenerational transmission variables and giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement



Outcome variables	Intergenerational transmission variables	Other explanatory variables
Giving money	Parents' as role model (separately for each area)	Sociodemographic variables (gender, age, ethnicity, level of religiosity, employment, income)
Volunteering	Discourse at the parents' home (separately for each area)	Discourse at participant's home (separately for each area)
Civic engagement	Parents' overall influence	Social environment

Unlike other studies (Herzog & Mitchell, 2016) which focused on each area (giving, volunteering, and civic engagement) separately, this study explores the relationship between background variables and intergenerational transmission variables and the above-mentioned outcome variables as well as the relationship between them employing a multivariate logistic model.

The following were the research questions:

1. Do the parents' behavior and personalities have an impact on donating money to social causes, volunteering, and civic engagement?
2. To what extent do family discussions about giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement affect the giving of money, volunteering, and civic engagement?
3. To what extent do the environment's institutional, social, and communal factors have an impact on giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement?
4. What are the relationships between demographic background variables (such as age, gender, income, education, employment, religion, and ethnicity) and intergenerational transmission variables (such as family's education of the offspring, parents as a role model, family discourse, and the environment) and giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement?
5. What are the reciprocal relationships between giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement?



The Research Method

Research Population

This research consists of a representative sample of the adult population in Israel (18 years old and above), with a total of 1141 participants. Complete questionnaires (phone interviews) were gathered from 427 interviewees: 339 from the Jewish sector and 88 from the Arab sector (37% response rate). Among non-responders, 627 participants refused to answer without giving a reason, 72 did not answer the phone, and 15 had incomplete questionnaires.

The sample of 18-year-olds was selected from a database of all households in Israel. The representativeness of the sample was reviewed according to gender, age, education, religion, and level of religious observance. An effort was made to obtain phone numbers for at least 70-80% of the sample. Interviewees who were not interviewed without giving any reason were recorded in a log, which served to eliminate calling again. A complex control system enabled us to vary the time of calls to contacts and to coordinate convenient interview times with participants, thus minimizing the number of non-responders.

At the end of the interview, each interviewee was asked to provide a family member's phone number (a parent or a child aged 18 years or older) with the goal of creating parent-child pairs. Seventy-five participants provided a family member's phone number. Of these, 60 family members were interviewed. Of those 75 contacted, 9 were not eligible to participate, 4 were non-responders, and 2 refused to answer the questionnaire.

The majority of the interviews were conducted in Hebrew. Those from the Arab sector were interviewed in Arabic by interviewers whose first language is Arabic, using an Arabic translation of the questionnaire. The primary interviews were conducted between January 12th and March 11th, 2020. The data of the family members were collected between March 20th and May 21st, 2020.



Research Instrument

The quantitative instrument was a closed-ended questionnaire, which included socio-demographic information and the participants' perceptions of their family legacy in three areas: giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement. The questionnaire probed the extent to which the participants continued their parents' and grandparents' activities in the above-mentioned areas, their recollection of the grandparents' and parents' involvement in philanthropic giving, their motives and areas of giving, the extent to which they volunteered, and the extent to which they participated and were engaged in civic activities. The questionnaire also included questions about the parents' role modeling and attributes, as well as questions on how they perceived the influence of the environment (e.g., school, youth movements, voluntary organizations, the community) on their prosocial behavior. Family members answered the same questionnaire.

Using a unique personal identification number, we were able to link the participants and the members of their family, which allowed us to validate the answers of the primary study participants by comparing them to the respective response of their family member. For example, parents were asked if they contributed to social causes during the last three years or whether they volunteered for any organization while the family member was asked if his or her parents had contributed to any social causes or volunteered for any organization.

Data Analysis

To assess the relationships between intergenerational transmission of values and prosocial behavior we constructed three separate logistic regression models – one for each outcome (giving, volunteering, and civic engagement). Accordingly, we defined three binary outcome variables. An indicator for giving money was created by combining the 3 “Yes” options suggested in the questionnaire (“Yes, during the last year”, “Yes, >1 year and ≤ 3 years” and “Yes, >3 years”) into a single “Yes” category



which is contrasted with the “No” (never donated money) option. Similarly, an indicator for volunteering was defined by combining the three “Yes” options (“Yes, volunteered at least once a month in the last year”, “Yes, volunteered several times in the last years” and “Yes, volunteered at least once in the last year”) into a single “Yes” category versus the “No” (did not volunteer in the last 12 months) option. To capture civic engagement participants were given a list of 8 activities and were asked to rank each one as 1- never participated, 2- participated more than 3 years ago and 3- participated in the last 3 years. A binary outcome was defined as “Yes” if the value of the measure based on the 8 activities was greater than the 75th percentile of the measure distribution. Otherwise it was defined as “No.” The 75th percentile was chosen as the cutoff point, since for most activities about 25% of the participants chose options 2 or 3.

Our main explanatory variables related to intergenerational transmission: Parents’ overall influence measured the extent to which the participant’s prosocial behavior in all areas was influenced by his or her parents; parents as a role model measured the parents’ activity in each area separately; and discourse at the parents’ home measured the extent to which there were discussions on each of the prosocial activities between family members.

A primary interest of this study is the relationship between intergenerational transmission of values and prosocial behavior. However, as existing research indicates, it is also important to explore the impact of socio-demographic characteristics, influences of the social environment, and the atmosphere at the participant’s home. We considered the following socioeconomic factors: sex (female, male), age (≤ 30 y, 31-65 y, > 65 y), education (academic, nonacademic), ethnicity (Jew, Arab), level of religious observance (ultra-orthodox, religious, secular), employment (employed, not employed) and income (average or higher, below average). To assess the influence of the social environment, participants ranked the influence of 7 factors on their overall prosocial behavior (school, youth group, volunteering organization, community center, work place, army, higher education institute) and the atmosphere at home was evaluated by the extent of discourse about each area at the participant’s home.



Many of the socioeconomic variables are correlated. We therefore constructed the logistic models for each area in two stages. First, all explanatory variables (intergenerational transmission, socioeconomic, environment, discourse at participant's home) were considered for the model using a backward elimination procedure (p-value for removal 0.10). The only significant socioeconomic variables across the 3 models were ethnicity and education. This stage allowed us to select, in a multivariate setting, a subset of the socioeconomic variables and thus reduce possible multicollinearity. Applying a stepwise selection procedure instead of backward elimination resulted in similar results. Second, to assess the relative importance of all factors affecting prosocial behavior, we fit a model including all intergenerational variables, environment measure, discourse at participant's home, ethnicity and education, without any further variable selection. We have not found any significant interaction terms between socioeconomic and intergeneration variables. Results are reported as B coefficients and standard errors (SE).

To evaluate associations between two categorical variables we applied the Fisher exact test. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to assess associations between continuous and categorical variables. All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS software (version 9.3; SAS Institute Inc.) and R (version 3.4.4; R Development Core Team).

Findings

First we present the demographic characteristics of the primary population of study participants and their families. Appendix 1 aims to provide information about the two main research populations (see Appendix 1).

Secondly, a comparative analysis of the primary study participants' answers and the answers given by the family members is presented in Table 2. The goal of the comparison was to validate the answers given by the two parties in order to reveal the congruity between them in all three areas investigated in the study.



Table 2: A comparative analysis of the primary study participants' answers and the answers of the family's members

For 42 parents whose children also answered the family questionnaire	A question in the study participant's questionnaire Parent	A question in the family member questionnaire	
For 17 children whose parents answered the questionnaire	A question in the family questionnaire Parent	A question in the study participant's questionnaire Child	
Topic			Value P
Donating money	You donated money	Your parents donated money	0.02
	Do you discuss donating money with your child	Your parents would discuss with you about donating money	0.03
Volunteering	To what extent does your volunteering impact your children's willingness to volunteer	To what extent does your parents' volunteering impact your willingness to volunteer	0.11
	In your home, you talked about the importance and need to volunteer	In your parents' home there are discussions about the importance and need to volunteer	0.09
	Do your children volunteer	Have you volunteered over the last 12 months	0.45
	Have you volunteered over the last 12 months	Do your parents volunteer	0.03
Civic engagement	Your participation in a demonstration, march or public protest impacts your children's participation	Your parents' home influenced your desire to contribute, volunteer and participate in activities of a civic and political nature	0.47
	When you sign a public petition, it impacts your children's willingness to sign petitions	Your parents' home influenced your desire to contribute, volunteer and participate in activities of a civic and political action	0.92
	Are you active within your community or neighborhood	Are your parents, or were your parents, active in the community or neighborhood	<0.01
	You were involved in the activities of civic organizations	Are your parents involved in the activities of civic	0.08



		organizations and political frameworks	
	You initiated or participated in a demonstration	Have your parents participated in a demonstration, march or public protest	<0.01
	You signed a petition	Did your parents sign a petition	0.16
	You wrote to newspapers	Did your parents express their opinion about public interest matters through an article in a newspaper	0.71
	Are you a member of an organization of any kind	Were your parents members of an organization that seeks to have a public impact	0.15
	You donated money or volunteered for a political candidate	Do your parents donate, or have they donated, money or volunteered for a political candidate	0.18
	In your home you discuss civic engagement	Would you discuss civic engagement in your parents' home	0.03
	Your participation in a demonstration, march or public protest impacts your children's participation	You initiated or participated in a demonstration	0.94
	When you sign a public petition, it impacts your children's willingness to sign petitions	You signed a petition	0.03

The findings presented in the table show similarities between the answers of the primary participants and their family members in several items for which the correlation were statistically significant: donating money, discourse on donating money in the parents' home, volunteering over the last twelve months, participating within a community or neighborhood organization, initiation and participation in a demonstration, and discourse in the parents' home about civic engagement. Congruity was found in other items as well but those associations were not significant.



Table3: Multivariate logistic model for giving money^a (n=325).

Variable	B	SE
Academic education (ref: Non-academic)	0.511**	0.245
Jewish ethnicity (ref: Arab)	0.936***	0.267
Environment	-0.346	0.218
Discourse at participant's home	0.708***	0.192
Parents overall influence Moderate ^b (ref: Low)	0.184	0.276
Parents as educators	0.112	0.216
Parents as role models (parents' money donation)	0.475	0.362
Discourse at parents' home	0.019	0.240
Constant	0.152	0.606
Pseudo R ²	0.26	

*p< .10 **p<.05 ***p<.01, all two-tailed

^aA binary outcome variable was created to indicate giving money by combining 3 categories of a “Yes” response (“Yes, last year”, “Yes, >1 year and ≤3 years” and “Yes, >3 years”) into one “Yes” category versus the “No” response.

^bResponses included only the categories “Low” and “Moderate”.

In the multivariate logistic model for giving money (Table 3) the main findings are:

Positive and significant associations were found between giving money and academic education (in comparison to non-academic education), and between giving money and ethnicity (Jews vs. Arabs), and between giving money and discourse held in the participant's home about giving money.

Positive but not significant associations were found between the parents' overall influence, their education towards giving, being role models for their children, and discourse in the parents' home. Finally a negative and not significant association (p=0.346) was found between the environment's influence and giving money.



Table 4: Multivariate logistic model for volunteering^a (n=304).

Variable	B	SE
Academic education (ref: Non-academic)	0.281*	0.144
Jewish ethnicity (ref: Arab)	0.359**	0.178
Environment	0.054	0.119
Discourse at participant's home (ref: None)		
Low	-0.465*	0.273
Moderate	-0.114	0.233
High	0.918***	0.243
Parents overall influence Moderate ^b (ref: Low)	0.250*	0.144
Parents as role models (parents' volunteering, ref: No)		
More than 3 years	0.297	0.205
3 years or less	0.289	0.234
Discourse at parents' home Moderate ^b (ref: Low)	0.038	0.178
Constant	-0.655**	0.272
Pseudo R ²	0.16	

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.01, all two-tailed

^aA binary outcome variable was created to indicate volunteering by combining 3 categories of a “Yes” response (“Yes, at least once a month in the last year”, “Yes, several times in the last years” and “Yes, at least once in the last year”) into one “Yes” category versus the “No” response.

^bResponses included only the categories “Low” and “Moderate”.

The results of a logistic model for volunteering (Table 4) indicate: Significant positive relationship between volunteering and academic education (in comparison to not completing academic education), ethnicity (Jews more than Arabs), a high level of discourse at the participant's parents' home, and parents' overall influence. Positive and insignificant correlations were found between volunteering and the environment's impact, the parents' volunteering, and discourse in the parents' home.

A significant negative association was found between a low level of discourse in the participant's home and volunteering and an insignificant negative association was found between moderate levels of discourse in the participant's home and volunteering.



Table 5: Multivariate logistic model for civic engagement^a (n=364).

Variable	B	SE
Academic education (ref: Non-academic)	0.135	0.146
Jewish ethnicity (ref: Arab)	0.080	0.176
Environment	0.187*	0.115
Discourse at participant's home (ref: None)		
Low	-0.68***	0.260
Moderate	0.348	0.250
High	0.605**	0.263
Parents overall influence Moderate ^b (ref: Low)	0.190	0.141
Parents as role models (parents' civic engagement)	1.369**	0.541
Discourse at parents' home (ref: None)		
Low	0.43*	0.234
Moderate	-0.126	0.268
High	0.253	0.292
Constant	-3.01***	0.675
Pseudo R ²	0.15	

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $P < .01$, all two-tailed.

^aA binary outcome was defined as “Yes” if the value of the measure was greater than the 75th percentile of the measure distribution and otherwise it was defined as “No”.

^bResponses included only the categories “Low” and “Moderate”.

Table 5 reports results of a logistic model for civic engagement. This table revealed the following relationships:

Significant positive correlations were found between civic engagement and the impact of environmental institutions (schools, community centers, voluntary organizations, army service, studying in an institute for higher education), high level of discourse in the participants' home, parents' past civic engagement and low level of discourse in the parents' home. A significant negative correlation was found between a low level of discourse in the participants' home and civic engagement. The relationships suggested between civic engagement and the following factors: positive: academic education, ethnicity, a medium level of discourse in the offspring's home, the parents' influence, and a high level of discourse in the parents' home and civic engagement were not significant. A medium level of discourse in the parents' home and civic engagement was found to be a non-significant negative.



Finally, we sought to study the relationships between the 3 areas of prosocial behavior (giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement) with regard to the participant’s involvement (our outcome variables) and the area-specific explanatory variables. For example, we wished to examine whether those who give money to social causes also volunteer and whether these volunteers also participate in civic activities (joining protests, writing articles to the newspaper, actively participating in social media platforms, and so forth).

Table 6: Relationships between giving money, volunteering and civic engagement presented by p-values of association tests. A fisher exact test (F) was conducted to assess association between two categorical variables and a Kruskal-Wallis test (KW) was used to evaluate relations between categorical and continuous variables.

	Giving and volunteering Test (p value) N	Giving and civic engagement Test (p value) N	Volunteering and civic engagement Test (p value) N
Outcome	F (0.09) N=415	KW (0.02) N=417	KW (<0.01) N=422
Discourse at participant’s home	KW (<0.01) N=363	KW (<0.01) N=373	F (<0.01) N=377
Discourse at parents’ home	KW (<0.01) N=387	KW (<0.01) N=397	F (<0.01) N=402
Parents as role models	F (<0.01) N=339	KW (<0.01)* N=380	KW (<0.01) N=340

* The Spearman correlation coefficient was 0.29

Table 6 shows results of bivariate tests of association. Regarding the outcome variables, we found a significant positive association between the participant’s civic engagement and both giving money and volunteering. In other words, those who participated in civic engagement activities also volunteered and donated money. The association between giving and volunteering was weaker (p=0.09). We found strong associations (p<0.01) between all pairs of the area-specific explanatory variables. High levels of discourse on all areas were observed simultaneously, both in the participant’s home and with his/her parents. Similarly, high impact of parents as role models in the three areas were also congruent. The table shows the importance of



discussions held in the parents' home about giving, volunteering, and civic engagement, as well as the perception of the parents as role models who impact the relationships between the different areas studied in this research.

Discussion and analysis

The uniqueness of the study presented in this paper is in its exploration of the intergenerational transmission of prosocial values and behavior in three areas defined as giving money, volunteering, and civic engagement, while most previous studies examined each of these separately.

The main contribution of this paper is that that we have simultaneously included in the same model several aspects that may relate to prosocial behavior: background variables, social environment, atmosphere at the participant's home, and intergenerational transmission variables. This approach enabled us to identify aspects that were independently associated with the outcomes. Specifically, we were able to assess the relative importance of each factor while controlling for the other factors.

The findings of table 2 comparing the answers of the study's primary participants and their family members provides us an important information about the congruity between the answers of both parties to the same questions, thus supporting the validation of the findings presented in the paper. However, it is important to note that there were also differences in the parties' answers to several question and not all of them were statistically significant.

The findings in table 3 show that the variables of ethnicity, education, and family discourse have a significant positive association with giving money. Even though both Jewish and Muslim religions command one to give (in Judaism "*tzedakah*" and in Islam "*zakat*", which is one of the five pillars of Islam, along with the *shahada* [the testimony], *alsalaa* [the prayer], *sawm* or *s'yaam*[the fast] and *alhajj* [the pilgrimage]), it seems that giving money is more substantial among Jews in Israel which is also expressed in the transmission process of this value from parents to their children. One possible explanation for this finding is the inequality between Jews and



Arabs income in Israel. The Jews' level of income is higher than the level of income among Arabs, who have a far greater percentage of poverty than Jews (approximately 50% of Arab families live below the poverty line, while the percentage of poverty among Jewish families is 15%). In addition, research has shown that informal donation is more common in the Arab-society. This means that Arab people donate more through informal means and hence do not necessarily perceive and report this activity as donation (Ashkar, 2019). Level of education was also found to be a variable that impacts giving money and the transmission of this value to the second-third generations. Thus it was found that religious giving by college educated parents has a stronger influence on their children's religious giving than non-college-educated parents (Bekkers, 2005). It is possible that those who have academic education are more aware of the need for giving money than those who lack academic education. They may be aware of the needs of various populations, as opposed to those who lack this level of education, who also seem to have a lower level of income in comparison to those with academic education. In view of the well-known positive correlation between higher education and higher income, a low level of income appears to impact the motivation and willingness to give money to others (Mustillo et al., 2008). In this connection it was found that high-net-worth parents have a stronger influence on their children's religious giving than religious giving by non-high- not -worth parents (Bekkers, 2005; Wilhelm et al., 2008; Deb et al., 2010).

Another variable that had a significant positive correlation with giving money is family discourse about the need to donate money to social causes. Families that hold such conversations create an organizational family environment, which encourages giving to social causes (Schmid, Shaul Bar Nisim, & Nirel, 2020). The family environment and unique climate is the product of a family tradition of giving to others, which passes from generation to generation (Schmid, Shaul Bar Nisim, & Nirel, 2020). Parents who discuss the importance of giving with their offspring influence them to continue practicing this tradition (Britt, 2016).

Another finding worth noting is the negative correlation (albeit insignificant) between the impact of environmental factors and giving money. Although the association is insignificant, there is a visible tendency regarding the impact of environmental factors



on giving money. Indeed, the research findings show that the participants and their families report that environmental factors such as schools, community centers, or voluntary organizations in which they volunteered had less impact on giving money. This might indicate insufficient efforts on behalf of schools to educate towards philanthropy, as well as a lack of suitable educational activities within communal and voluntary frameworks resulting in very minimal impact on the transmission of these values to the younger generation.

As for the correlations with volunteering, here too it seems that academic educational levels, ethnicity, and family discourse have a significant positive relationship with volunteering and the intergenerational transmission of this value from parents to their children. One possible explanation for this finding is that those with academic education are more aware of the need to volunteer as a social, ideological, and altruistic value. With the potential to expose individuals to social problems, it appears the awareness of participants with higher education about various populations' social needs is much greater than those who have not acquired academic education. Academic education expands one's knowledge and social awareness, and provides tools, abilities, and life skills, which expose those with an education to the needs of modern society, in which volunteering is a social value that demonstrates one's personal giving of time and skills for the public good. In addition, academic education is often associated with higher levels of income and perhaps more free time to devote to volunteering. In this connection it should be noted that studies have shown that parents with high and steady income and higher education have more educated children who are also more motivated to volunteer than those who lack such an income and education (Steinberg & Wilhelm, 2003).

As for the ethnicity variable, it seems Jews volunteer more than Arabs. One possible explanation for this is the fact that Arabs volunteer to a greater extent within informal frameworks relating to family and clan life, and seldom volunteer in the formal frameworks in which Jews volunteer. Research has shown that while formal volunteering has grown over the years in the Arab society, it is highly correlated to academic education (Ashkar, 2019). This, in turn, is expressed in the process of



intergenerational transmission of the value of volunteering for the benefit of the public.

An analysis of the findings relating to civic engagement shows there was a significant positive relationship with environmental factors. The positive relationship reported here points to the potential of environmental factors to encourage and support civic engagement, which manifests itself in activities like participating in social protests, demonstrations, submitting petitions, writing articles to the newspaper, or being active on social media platforms. Schools and voluntary or communal organizations have an important potential to fill a role in educating towards civic involvement and engagement, as well as maintaining and advancing civic and democratic values.

Other notable findings regarding civic engagement are the family discourse and parents' participation in activities of civic engagement. Family discourse was found to be significantly correlated with civic engagement of parents and their children. It seems that the more a family holds these types of discussions, in any shape or form and at different levels of intensity, the stronger the association with civic engagement. Furthermore, parents' own participation in civic engagement is correlated with high civic engagement of their offspring. Sons and daughters whose parents are civically engaged also become active in this area (Copeland, et al., 2018). Research clearly shows that more political discussion leads to more effective transmission. Adolescents who discuss politics more often with their parents are more civically engaged (Diemer & Li, 2011). Also it was found that adults who are advantaged in terms of social-economic status are known to be more likely to have high levels of political knowledge, interest, efficacy, and tolerance, to engage in political discussion, to be politically active, and to encourage their children to become independent and to express themselves fully in the family discussion (Fuks, 2011). Also high socio-economic status parents are more likely to create a politically rich home environment in which there are frequently political discussions and politically active parents serve as role models. Children who grow up in such an environment are distinctive in their political orientation (Verba et al., 1995).



Lastly, the analysis of the relationships between the different areas shows significant and positive associations. People who are involved in activities reflecting civic engagement tend also to donate their money and to volunteer (see also: Handy & Katz, 2008). This means that investment in one of these areas, such as strengthening the education on philanthropy in schools or youth organizations could help in extending other giving behaviors such as volunteering and civic engagement. Studies have shown that civic engagement increases the amount of giving to both religious and secular causes. Also volunteering positively affects both religious and secular causes (Amornrat et al., 2009; Graddy & Wang, 2008). People with an awareness and willingness to give to others make their financial resources, personal skills, and time available to the public. Volunteer frameworks complete and add to the well-being of people in areas that are not addressed by the government and society. Such populations require not only instrumental assistance but expressive and empathic assistance as well, which can improve their socio-economic status. People who volunteer for others also have a better understanding of the importance of active civic engagement, which promotes the values of equality and democracy, while giving voice to those whose voice is not sufficiently heard, or not heard at all.

In conclusion, the strength of this paper is in its contribution to theory and practice as well as the methodology which is recommended for studies that investigate pro-social behavior in general and intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values specifically. Therefore, we recommend expanding this research to other countries and in different contexts. This will enable us to analyze and compare different factors that impact the three areas and the relationships between themselves as been done in this paper.

As for theories dealing with intergenerational transmission this study provides additional advanced perspective of the meaning of transmitting philanthropic values in three areas simultaneously. Pro-social behavior as reflected in this paper is not associated only with three different areas that express pro-social values. The associations between themselves are not less important in understanding the dynamics between the different perspectives of transmitting philanthropic values from parents to their offspring.



As for practice the study identifies major variables which are critical for intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values. These variables are defined as the level of education, ethnicity, family tradition and atmosphere, role modeling, discourse, and the influence of the environment on the process of intergenerational transmission. Thus, for example, a discourse in the parents' home and in the adult children's home about giving and volunteering is a major factor that inspires the continuity of transmitting philanthropic values from parents to their children. In addition, role modeling by parents and the family atmosphere encourage giving of money for public causes and volunteering as well as being engaged in civic activities. All of them are major components in the intergenerational transmission.

Another major contribution of the paper is the methodology employed in the study. The multivariate logistical model presented in this paper was found to be effective in analyzing the information gathered and more specifically the associations between three areas of pro-social behavior and intergenerational transmission of philanthropic values. Using this model in additional studies investigating intergenerational transmission in different countries will add important information about the process and will support our efforts to overcome the limitation of the generalizability of this paper to different socio-political and economic contexts.



References

- Adriani, F., & Sonderegger, S. (2009). Why do parents socialize their children to behave pro-socially? An information-based theory. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93, 1119-1124.
- Albanesi, C., Cicognani, E., & Zani, B. (2007). Sense of community, civic engagement and social well-being in Italian adolescents. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 387 - 406.
- Akee, R., Copeland, W., Costello, E.J., Holbein, J.B., & Simeonova, E. (2018). Family income and the intergenerational transmission of voting behavior: Evidence from an income intervention. *National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Papers*: 24770. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w24770>
- Amornrat, A., Barham, V., & Devin, R.A. (2009). Charitable giving, volunteering, and the paid labor market. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(1), 77-94.
- Anderson, M. R. (2009). Beyond membership: A sense of community and political behavior. *Political Behavior*, 31(4), 603 - 627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-009-9089-x>
- Andolina, M. W., Jenkins, K., Zukin, C., & Keeter, S. (2003). Habits from home, lessons from school: Influences on youth civic engagement. *Political Science and Politics*, 36, 275 - 280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909650300221X>
- Ashkar, A. (2019). Giving among minorities-The case of the Arab minority in Israel. Unpublished Ph. D dissertation, Jerusalem, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Bakker, T. P., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Good news for the future? Young people, internet use, and political participation. *Communication Research*, 38, 451 - 470. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093650210381738>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandy, R., & Ottoni-Wilhelm, M. (2012). Family structure and income during the stages of childhood and subsequent prosocial behavior in young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 1023-134. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.adolescence.2012.02.010>



- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32, 596 - 615.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764003258102>
- Bekkers, R. (2007). Intergenerational transmission of volunteering. *Acta Sociologica*, 50 (2), 99 - 114. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0001699307077653>
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part one: Religion, education, age and socialization. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part two: Gender, family composition and income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 217-245.
- Binder, M. (2020). (Home-)Schools of democracy? On the intergenerational transmission of civic engagement. *Social Indicators Research*, 149, 911 - 945.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02278-y>
- Bowen, M., (1966). The use of family theory in clinical practices. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 7, 345 - 374. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X\(66\)80065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X(66)80065-2)
- Britt, S. L. (2016). The intergenerational transference of money attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50, 539 - 556.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12113>
- Brown, S., Srivastava, P., & Taylor, K. (2012). Preach what you practice? Donating behavior of parents and their offspring. *Working paper*. Department of Economics, University of Sheffield. ISSN 1749 8368.
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/shf/wpaper/2012018.html>
- Caputo, R. K. (2009). Religious capital and intergenerational transmission of volunteering as correlates of civic engagement. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38, 983 - 1002. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764008323990>
- Checkoway, B., & Aldana, (2013). Four forms of youth civic engagement for diverse democracy. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35(11), 1894-1899.
- Cicognani, E., Zani, B., Fournier, B., Gavray, C., & Born, N. (2012). Gender differences in youths' political engagement and participation: The role of parents and



of adolescents' social and civic participation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 561 - 576.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.10.002>

Cornejo, M., Rocha, C., Castro, D., Varela, M., Manzi, J., González, R., Jiménez-Moya, G., Carvacho, H., Álvarez, B., Valdenegro, D., Cheyre, M., & Livingstone, A. G. (2021). The intergenerational transmission of participation in collective action: The role of conversation and political practices in the family. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60, 29 - 49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12420>

Deb, P., Okten, C., & Osili, U.O. (2010). Giving to family versus giving to community within and across generations. *Journal of Population Economy*, 23, 1091-1115.

Diemer, M. A., & Li, C.-H. (2011). Critical consciousness development and political participation among marginalized youth. *Child Development*, 82(6), 1815 - 1833. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01650.x>

Dottori Sani, G. M., & Quaranta, M. (2015). Chips off the old blocks? The political participation patterns of parents and children in Italy. *Social Science Research*, 50, 264 - 276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.12.002>

Dunlop, E., Golub, A., Johnson, B. D., & Wesley, D. (2002). Intergenerational transmission of conduct norms for drugs, sexual exploitation and violence: A case study. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42, 1-20.

Fisher, R.M. (1997). Analyzing the effects of father's antisocial behavior on mothers and children: A longitudinal study of single parent's families. *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/11835>

Fletcher, A. C., Elder, G. H. Jr., & Mekos, D. (2000). Parental influences on adolescent involvement in community activities. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 10(1), 29 - 48. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1207/SJRA1001_2

Fuks, M. (2011). Direct, indirect and late effects: Paths of the intergenerational transmission of political participation. *Lua Nova (online)* 83, 145 - 178. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-64452011000200006> (Portuguese)

Gartland, D. (2019). Intergenerational impacts of family violence-mothers and children in a large prospective cohort study. *Eclinical Medicine*, 15, 51-61.



Gniewosz, B., Noack, P., & Buhl, M. (2009). Political alienation in adolescence: Associations with parental role models, parenting styles, and classroom climate.

International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33, 337 - 346.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0165025409103137>

Graddy, E., & Wang, L. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas*, 19(1), 23-42.

Greenspan, I., Katz-Gerro, T., Handy, F., & Park, S. (2021). Intergenerational transmission of environmental household practices among South Korean families: Continuity and change. *Families, Relationships, and Societies*.

<https://doi.org/10.1332/204674321X16172729233053>

Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P.D. (2008). *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research*. Guilford Press.

Handy, F., & Katz, E. (2008). Donating behavior: If time is money, which to give. A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 35(4), 323-332.

Handy, F., Katz Gerro, T., Greenspan, I., & Vered, Y. (2021). Intergenerational disenchantment? Environmental behaviors and motivations across generations in Korea. *Geoforum*, 121, 53 - 64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.02.020>

Hayoz, C., Klostermann, C., Schmid, J., Sclesinger, T., & Nagel, S.(2017).

Intergenerational transfer of a sport-related kifestyle within the family. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. Advance online publication.<http://doi:10.1177/1012690217702525>.

Herzog, P. S., & Mitchell, S. (2016). Intergenerational transmission of religious giving: Instilling giving habits across the life course. *Religions*, 7(7), 93.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel7070093>

Hill, M. (2012). *The relationships between volunteering and charitable giving: Review of evidence* (CGAP working paper). ESRC Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy. CGAP working paper.

https://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/366983/wp-volunteering-and-charitable-giving-mh.pdf



Janoski, T., & Wilson, J. (1995). Pathways to voluntarism: Family socialization and status transmission models. *Social Forces*, 74(1), 271 - 292.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2580632>

Janoski, T., Musick, M., & Wilson, J. (1998). Being volunteered? The impact of social participation and pro social attitudes on volunteering. *Sociological Forum*, 13, 495 - 520. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022131525828>

Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, R. (2001). Generations and civic engagement: A longitudinal multi generation analysis. [Paper presented]. Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA, United States.

Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, R. (2009). Continuities in political participation across multiple generations. [Paper presented]. The 2009 Midwest Political Science Association Convention, Chicago, IL, United States.

Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782 - 799.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381609090719>

Larson, R., & Hansen, D. (2005). The development of strategic thinking: Learning to impact human systems in youth activist program. *Human Development*, 48, 327 - 349.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1159%2F000088251>

Lee, R. (2014). Intergenerational transfers, social movements, life histories, and the elderly. In M. Weinstein & M. A. Lane (Eds.), *Sociality, hierarchy, health: Comparative biodemography: A collection of papers*. (Chpt.10). Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press (US).

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK242460/#_ncbi_dlg_citbx_NBK242460

Matthews, T. L., Hempel, L. M., & Howell, F.M. (2010). Gender and the transmission of civic engagement: Assessing the influences on youth civic activity. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80, 448 - 474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682x.2010.00342.x>

McDougle, L., McDonald, D., Li, H., McIntyre Miller, W., & Xu, C. (2017). Can philanthropy be taught? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46, 330 - 351.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764016662355>

Mersianova, I., Malakhov, D., & Ivanova, N. (2019). The role of family as a channel of intergenerational transmission of volunteer traditions in contemporary Russia.



Economic Sociology, 20(3), 66 - 89. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2019-3-66-89>

Mesch, D., Brown, M.S., Moore, Z.I., & Hayat, A.D., (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 342-355.

Mesch, D., Osili, U. O., Hayat, A. D., Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Zhang, Y., & Pactor, A. (2013). Women Give 2013: New research on charitable giving by boys and girls. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (Report).

https://archives.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/2450/7676/women_give_2013.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Mesch, D., Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Osili, U. O., Bergdoll, J., Han, X., Pactor, A., & Ackerman, J. (2018). Women Give 2018: Transmitting generosity to daughters and sons. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (Report).

<https://www.ncfp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Transmitting-Generosity-Women-Give-2018.pdf>

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mustillo, S., Wilson, J., & Lynch, S. M. (2004). Legacy volunteering: A test of two theories of intergenerational volunteering. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 530 - 541. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00036.x>

Necker, S., & Voskort, A. (2014). Politics and parents — Intergenerational transmission of values after a regime shift. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 36, 177 - 194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2014.08.002>

Nesbit, R. (2013). The influence of family and household members on individual volunteer choices. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42, 1134 - 1154. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764012450365>

Osili, U., Clark, C., Bergdoll, J., Keeler, A., Kalugyer, A., & St.Claire, M. (2016). *A tradition of giving. New research on giving and volunteering within families*. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (Report).

https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/9599/A%20tradition%20of%20giving_Final.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y



- Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Brown, E., Rooney, P. M., & Steinberg, R. (2008). The intergenerational transmission of generosity. *Journal of Public Economy*, 92(10-11), 2146 - 2156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.04.004>
- Ottoni Wilhelm, M., Estell, D.B., & Perdue, N.H. (2014). Role-modeling and conversations about giving in the socialization of adolescent charitable giving and volunteering. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37(1), 53 - 66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.10.010>
- Partha, D., Okten, C., & Osili, U. O. (2010). Giving to family versus giving to community within and across generations. *Journal of Population Economy*, 23, 963-987. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-008-0206-7>
- Pears, K.C., Capaldi, D. M. & Owen, L.D. (2007). Substance use risk across three generations: The role of parent discipline practices and inhibitory control. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 21(3), 373-386. <https://content.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0893-164X.21.3.373>
- Quaranta, M., & Dotti Sani, G.M. (2016). The relationship between the civic engagement of parents and children: A cross-national analysis of 18 European countries. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45, 1091 - 1112. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764016628677>
- Quintelier, E. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of political participation intention. *Acta Politica*, 50, 279 - 296. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2014.19>
- Quintelier, E., & Hooghe, M. (2018). The impact of socio-economic status on political participation. In: K.N. Demetriou (Ed.). *Democracy in transition*. Political participation in European Union, (pp. 273 - 289). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30068-4_14
- Roker, D., Player, K., & Coleman, J. (1999). Young people's voluntary and campaigning activities as sources of political education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25, 185 - 198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030549899104206>
- Rosenthal, S., Feiring, C., & Lewis, M. (1998). Political volunteering from late adolescence to young adulthood: Patterns and predictors. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 477 - 493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01231.x>



- Settle, J.E., Bond, R., & Levitt, J. (2011). The social origins of adult political behavior. *American Politics Research*, 39, 239 - 263.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1532673X10382195>
- Sleeper, J. (2007). A civic decline but from what? America's exceptional understanding of civil society. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30, 671 - 682. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690701216043>
- Suanet, B., van Groenou, B. M., & Braam, A. W. (2009). Changes in volunteering among young old in the Netherlands between 1992 and 2002: The impact of religion, age-norms, and intergenerational transmission. *European Journal of Aging*, 6, 157 - 165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-009-0119-7>
- Steinberg, R., & Wilhelm, M. (2003). Giving: The next generation-Parental effects on donation. Working paper No. CPN21. Brisbane Avi Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies, Queensland University of Technology.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wiepking, P. & Bekkers, R. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part two: Gender, marital status, income, and wealth. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3, 217 - 245. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080512X649379>
- Wilhelm, M. O., Brown, E., Rooney, P.M., & Steinberg, R. (2008). The intergenerational transmission of generosity. *Journal of Public Economy*, 92(10-11), 2146-2156.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1998). The contribution of social resources to volunteering. *Social Science Quarterly*, 79, 799 - 814. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42863848>
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M.X. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life and the changing American citizen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



Appendix 1: The population of the primary participants:

Demographic information (n=427)

Age group	18-30 20%	31-50 35%	51-65 25%	66-75 15%	76-80 5%	
Gender	Female 52%	Male 48%				
Education level	Elementary school or less 3%	Partial high school 5%	Complete high school without matriculation exam certificate 13%	Complete high school with matriculation exam certificate 16%	Tertiary education (teachers' training college, nursing school, post high school yeshiva) 18%	Partial or complete academic degree 45%
Family status	Single 18%	Married or living with a partner 70%	Divorced or separated 5%	Widower 6%		
Ethnicity	Jewish 80%	Arab 20%				
Country of birth	Israel 80%	Other countries 20%				
Religiosity	Ultra-Orthodox 11%	Religious 16%	Traditional-religious 14%	Traditional and not very religious 17%	Secular 42%	
Employment	Full time 55%	Part time 14%	Unemployed or looking for a job 4%	Unemployed and not looking for a job 7%	Retired 20%	



Income	Significantly under average 20%	Slightly under average 18%	Similar to the average 24%	Slightly above the average 16%	Significantly above the average 10%	Refused to respond 12%
--------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------



Demographic information for family members (n=60)

Age group	18-34 50%	35-52 23%	53-65 17%	65+ 10%		
gender	Female 63%	Male 37%				
Education level	Elementary school or less 3%	Partial high school 5%	Complete high school without matriculation exam certificate 12%	Complete high school with matriculation exam certificate 18%	Tertiary education (teachers' training college, nursing school, post high school yeshiva) 10%	Partial and complete academic degree 52%
Family status	Single 28%	Married or living with a partner 62%	Divorced or separated 6%	Widower 6%		
Ethnicity/Religion	Jewish 93%	Muslim 7%				
Religiosity	Ultra-Orthodox 13%	Religious 15%	Traditional-religious 12%	Traditional and not very religious 13%	Secular 47%	
Employment	Full time 57%	Part time 17%	Unemployed or looking for a job 3%	Unemployed and not looking for a job 5%	Pensioner 20%	
Income	Significantly under average 25%	Slightly under average 22%	Similar to the average 16%	Slightly above the average 23%	Significantly above the average 12%	Refused to respond 2%