CHARITY: THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOSITY AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERITY*

VALERIA SALINAS-LOPEZ

CHARITY: THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOSITY AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERITY*

ABSTRACT

This study looks into the effect that religiosity and political affiliation have on the willingness of students at the University of Texas Dallas have in giving charity, whether it be money or time spent serving a cause. The study will test whether level of religiosity truly effects the willingness of someone to participate in giving. The study will also test whether conservatism effects willingness to give charity, and if conservatives are likely to be more religious. This all will be done in order to see if previous research can be applied to an American college campus population. The study found that those who have a low level of religiosity, have a high level of religiosity. This was not the case with previous research. The study also found that those who have a low level of religiosity are also more liberal in their political ideology. Lastly, the study found that that being more liberal does not mean you are more likely to give charity as compared to those who are conservative in their political ideology. Since time and sample size were limitations to this study, there is a push to learn more about American college students as compared to the previous research on religiosity, charitability, and political affiliation.

Keywords: Charity, Religiosity, Political Affiliation

CHARITY: THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOSITY AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERITY*

INTRODUCTION

There has been much research done regarding how religiosity, and even how political affiliation affect the willingness for people to partake in charity, whether that be through monetary donations or just through time spent volunteering and serving a particular organization (Heineck, 2017; de Abreu, Madalena, Laureano, Da Silva, & Dionisio, 2015; Margolis, & Sances, 2017; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2018; Yen, & Zampelli, 2014). However, these variables have not been tested in the college population. Most of the studies are also done in other nations, not the United States (de Abreu et al., 2015; Heineck, 2017; Van Leeuwen, 1993). For that reason, this study will be run to test whether similar findings can be seen in an American college population, specifically the University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) located in Richardson, Texas.

The research question in this case is whether the level of religiosity in the university's students affect their willingness to partake in charity, and whether their political affiliation can be an indicator of their level of religiosity and charitability. The importance of charity is clear, there are people in need who require the assistance of other's time and money (Van Leeuwen, 1993). If there was a way to figure out who would be more likely to give their time and money, organizations would be able to target the right people for that help. This study looks into religiosity and political affiliation as potential indicators of the willingness for one to give their services or resources. Organizations would be able to spend their time more wisely and be more efficient in receiving help from others (de Abreu et al., 2015). Much like the past, there are many women and men who are in the bottom of the economic social classes here in the United States, whose livelihood is heavily reliant upon help from others (Van Leeuwen, 1993).

We believed that depending on level of religiosity, the willingness to partake in charity would be similar to previous research done in this area (de Abreu et al., 2015). With that in mind, we proposed the first hypothesis:

> *H1: UTD students who have a higher level of religiosity will be more charitable than UTD students with a lower level of religiosity.*

Before testing whether political affiliation effects charitability, we wanted to test whether political affiliation was a good indicator of religiosity. Past research has looked into this relationship and found that those who were conservative were more likely to be religious than were their liberal counterparts (Hirsh, 2013; Ozmen et al., 2018). Through that, we came through to the next hypothesis:

> *H2: UTD students who identify as conservative are more religious than UTD students who identify as liberal.*

Past research has also looked into the relationship between political ideology and their willingness to give. There were some that found that conservatives tend to give more than liberals (Margolis & Sances, 2017). However, there was a study that showed there was not enough data to prove that conservatives gave more in terms of charity (Yen et al., 2014). We believe that these results will be different in the American college population. With that in mind, we propose the final hypothesis:

> *H3: UTD students who identify as more conservative politically, are less likely to give to charity than UTD students who consider themselves more liberal politically.*

CHARITY: THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOSITY AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERITY*

LITERATURE REVIEW

MISSING FROM PAPER. WAS UNABLE TO RECOVER

METHODS

In order to obtain our data, we used a convenience sample. We used this sampling method for the sake of time and efficiency. The sampling frame was derived from the eLearning list of students who are currently enrolled in a couple of Sociology classes. Everyone on that list will be emailed and asked to participate in the questionnaire. The survey was also posted on social media sites such as Facebook, and Reddit. The survey was sent around in the GroupMe chatting application as well to reach as many people as we could.

There are three concepts that we looked into in this study. The concepts were: religiosity, charitability, and political affiliation. These concepts alone can be confusing, they need further explanation as to what is meant by them. For the purpose of the study, religiosity will be defined as how much a person partakes in any religious activity, practice or ritual. This concept is not trying to identify the faith of a person, but much rather the intensity of their participation of that particular faith. This concept will be measured this way due to the fact that in modern times there are certain people who are agnostic; people who believe in a supreme being, but who do not identify a being part of a certain faith. The next concept of charitability will be defined as the amount of charity that a person partakes in. Lastly, the concept of political affiliation will be defined, not by the actual belief in a specific political party, but it should be thought of more as being on a spectrum; whether a person is more conservative, or liberal in their beliefs. The reason for this is because there are some who are Republican who are more liberal in some of their views, and some Democrats who are more conservative in some of their views. It would therefore not be logical to think that political affiliation, as it is defined in society, to be an indicator of charitability on its own. In that case, certain Republicans and Democrats who are equally as liberal, let's say in immigration policy, would be scored the same on charitability. All three concepts can be thought as ratio variables because they all have a clear zero.

The dependent variables that were tested in the questionnaire were religiosity and charity. Religiosity was defined as how much a person partakes in any religious activity, practice or ritual. This concept is not trying to identify the faith of a person, but much rather the intensity of their participation of that faith. The next concept of charitability was defined as the amount of charity that a person partakes in. In the questionnaire, there were many multiple single answer questions, and a Likert scale to measure the dependent variables. The three types of questions were used because you can make a scale for the answer choices and better analyze the data that way.

The following questions were asked to measure religiosity: "Do you believe in a higher power?" The three answer choices given were the following numerical values: No=0, Undecided=1, and Yes=2. This was followed by a Likert scale that asked participants to "Please choose the answer that best fits" them on the following statements: "It is important to attend a religious service...It is important to read a sacred text...It is important to pray every day." This question was then coded as follows: Strongly Disagree=0, Somewhat Disagree=1, Neither Agree nor Disagree=2, Somewhat Agree=3, and Strongly Agree=4. According to Stefan and Odilo W. Huber's article written in 2012, the elements asked about through the statements are the major components to measuring someone's religiosity. This is all based off the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). Those questions were followed by single answer questions asking about the quantity of time spent participating in the activities asked about in the Likert scale. They were asked about

their attendance to a "religious service," and given the answer choices of: Never=0, Only on holidays=1, Monthly=2, Once a week=3, Twice a week=4, and 3+ days a week=4. They were asked how much they "read a sacred text," and given the answer choices of: Never=0, Yearly=1, Monthly=2, Weekly=3, and Daily=4. Lastly, they were asked how much they "pray," and given the following answer choices: Never=0, Once a day=1, Twice a day=2, and 3+ a day=3. The answers to the questions in the single answer questions and the Likert scale, were added together to create a composite number that was labeled "Religiosity."

In order to measure someone's charitability, there were some statements regarding charity in the Likert scale mentioned before. The participant was asked to "Please choose the answer that best fits" them on the following statements: "It is important to donate money to charitable organizations...It is important to donate money to individuals...It is important to donate to other organizations...It is important to serve others." The answers to these questions were coded as follows: Strongly Disagree=0, Somewhat Disagree=1, Neither Agree nor Disagree=2, Somewhat Agree=3, and Strongly Agree=4. Participants were then asked, "How do you participate in charity?" The answers were coded as such: I do not donate money, nor volunteer my time=0, I donate money=1, I volunteer my time=2, and I donate and volunteer my time=3. They were then asked to specify where they donate their money; Do not donate=0, Other Organizations=1, Individuals=2, and Charitable organizations=3. They were asked to specify where their money was donated because according to Chang-Jiang Liu and Fang Hao's article written in 2017, says that a person's charity cannot be simply measured by asking if they donate in general, but they must ask where they donate to truly measure their charitability. Lastly, the participants were asked the quantity of money they donate to the three categories specified above. Their answers will be coded as follows: $0=0, $1-$100=1, $101-$250=2, $251-$500=3, and $501+=4. The answers to the questions in the single answer questions and the Likert scale, were added together to create a composite number that was labeled "Charitability."

The independent variables in the study were political affiliation and religiosity. Political affiliation was defined previously as not by the actual belief in a specific political party, but it should be thought of more as being on a spectrum; whether a person is more conservative, or liberal in their beliefs. Religiosity again, refers to how much a person partakes in any religious activity, practice or ritual; meaning the intensity which they participate in their faith. For religiosity, single answer questions, and a Likert scale were utilized. For political affiliation, there was a semantic differential scale used. The three types of questions were used because you can make a scale for the answer choices and better analyze the data once it is received.

The following questions were asked to measure religiosity: "Do you believe in a higher power?" The three answer choices were given the following numerical values: No=0, Undecided=1, and Yes=2. This was followed by a Likert scale that asks participants to "Please choose the answer that best fits" them on the following statements: "It is important to attend a religious service...It is important to read a sacred text...It is important to pray every day." This question was coded as follows: Strongly Disagree=0, Somewhat Disagree=1, Neither Agree nor Disagree=2, Somewhat Agree=3, and Strongly Agree=4. According to Stefan and Odilo W. Huber's article written in 2012, the elements asked about through the statements are the major components to measuring someone's religiosity. This is all based off the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). This was then followed by single answer questions asking about the quantity of time spent participating in the activities asked about in the Likert scale. They were asked about their attendance to a "religious service," and given the answer choices of: Never=0, Only on holidays=1, Monthly=2, Once a week=3, Twice a week=4, and 3+ days a week=4. They were asked how much

they "read a sacred text," and given the answer choices of: Never=0, Yearly=1, Monthly=2, Weekly=3, and Daily=4. Lastly, they were asked how much they "pray," and given the following answer choices: Never=0, Once a day=1, Twice a day=2, and 3+ a day=3. The answers to the questions in the single answer questions and the Likert scale, were added together to create a composite number that was labeled "Religiosity."

The semantic differential scale used to measure political affiliation was a scale from 0 to 10. 0 being Extremely Negative, and 10 being Extremely Positive. The participants were asked to rate their feeling towards specific political issues such as: Tax Cuts, Limited Government, Military and National Security, Religion, Gun Ownership, Traditional Marriage, Immigration, Welfare Benefits, and Abortion. These topics were used because according to Jim Everett's article written in 2013 these are the most important issues to ask about in order to measure someone's political ideology. These issues are part of the Social Economic Conservatism Scale (SECS). These issues were coded separately using the number from the scale; from 0 to 10. The numbers for each response were added together to create a composite number labeled as "Political Affiliation."

Participants were also asked a series of demographic questions to have control variables to look at and see if there are any other elements that can affect one's religiosity and participation in charity. Most of the questions asked were single answer responses apart from the question asked about age. Participants are asked to input their age in a "numerical value." Next, they were asked, "What is your sex?" Male=0, and Female=1. The next two questions asked about the participant's race. They were first asked if they are "Hispanic or Latino or of Spanish origin," which was coded as: No=0, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano=1, Puerto Rican=2, Cuban=3, and Other=4. Then they were asked to specify their race. This was coded as follows: White=0, Black=1, American Indian or Alaska Native=2, Asian Indian=3, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander=4, Filipino=5, Vietnamese=6, Chinese=7, Japanese=8, Guamanian or Chamorro=9, Samoan=10, Other Pacific Islander=11, and I do not Identify=12. These options were taken from the United States Census, and therefore are the best way to categorized people by race. They were asked about their "current relationship status;" Single=0, In a Relationship=1, Married=2, Widowed=3, Divorced=4, and Separated=5. They were also asked about their classification in school, "What year are you?" Freshman=0, Sophomore=1, Junior=2, Senior=3, and Other=4. Lastly, they were asked to choose their "GPA" based on the ranges given: 1.99 or below=0, 2.0-2.49=1, 2.5-2.99=2, 3.0-3.49=3, and 3.5-4.0=4. Participants were also asked a few questions about their parents. The first question was regarding their parents "combined income." The responses given were assigned the following numerical values: Less than $20,000=0, $20,000-$34,999=1, $35,000-$49,999=2, $50,000-$74,999=3, and >$75,000=4. They were also asked about each their mother's and father's "highest level of education." This was coded as such: I don't know=0, Less than high school=1, High school graduate=2, Some college=3, 2-year degree=4, 4-year degree=5, Professional degree=6, and Doctorate=7.

The first tests run were used to find the correlation coefficients and their significance to the variables chosen. The purpose of this was to find which variables, including the control variables, were the most significant to the two dependent variables that this study focuses on; religiosity and charitability in order to incorporate them into the linear regression alongside the control variables. In this study, there were bivariate and multivariate regressions run in order to identify if religiosity could be explained by the independent variable of political affiliation or the control variables, and if charitability could be explained by political affiliation or religiosity and again the control variables. The three linear regression models will test the relationship between religiosity and

charitability, political affiliation and religiosity, and political affiliation and charitability. The control variables will be added in order to see if there are any spurious relationships.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Covariates, N = 165.

	Valid N	Mean/Proportion	Range
Religiosity	165	9.345	0-25
Believer	165	1.224	0-2
Importance to Attend Service	165	1.769	0-4
Importance to Read Religious Text	165	1.806	0-4
Importance to Pray	165	1.673	0-4
Attendance of Religious Service	165	1.255	0-5
Read Religious Text	165	1.055	0-4
Pray	165	0.564	0-3
Charitability	165	16.224	0-29
Importance to Donate to Charity Orgs.	165	2.897	0-4
Importance to Donate to Individuals	165	2.291	0-4
Importance to Donate to Other Orgs.	165	2.612	0-4
Importance to Volunteer	165	3.358	0-4
Donation Location	165	1.103	0-3
Participation in Charity	165	1.921	0-3
Donation Amount to Charity Orgs.	165	0.982	0-4
Donation Amount to Individuals	165	0.509	0-4
Donation Amount to Other Orgs.	165	0.552	0-4
Political Affiliation	165	38.006	12-66
Feelings towards Taxes	165	3.752	0-9
Feelings towards a Limited Government	165	3.691	0-9

Feelings towards a Military/National Security	165	3.485	0-9
Feelings towards Religion	165	4.139	0-9
Feelings towards Guns	165	2.788	0-9
Feelings towards Traditional Marriage	165	3.376	0-9
Feelings towards Immigration	165	5.969	0-9
Feelings towards Welfare Benefits	165	5.569	0-9
Feelings towards Abortion	165	5.236	0-9
Control Variables			
Age	165	22.563	18-69
Race (Hispanic, Latino, Spanish Origin)	165	0.242	0-4
Sex	165	0.673	0-1
Race	165	2.236	0-13
Parent's Income	165	3.230	0-4
Father's Education	165	4.133	0-7
Mother's Education	165	3.994	0-7
Classification	165	1.873	0-5
Relationship Status	165	0.545	0-4
GPA	165	3.327	0-4

Table 1 shows the frequency, mean, and range of the three main variables and the control variables. The variables under the three main variables, were the variables used to create the composite score for religiosity, charitability, and political affiliation.

Bivariate and Multivariate Regression

Table 2. Stepwise Regression of Charitability (N=165)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Religiosity	0.283***	0.274***	0.260***	0.262***
Race		0.174ɨ	0.173	0.177ɨ
Age			0.017	0.118ɨ
Sex			0.843	0.913
Relationship Status				-1.603*
Parent's Income				0.616ɨ
R^2	0.1462	0.1607	0.1666	0.2174

Note: ɨ<.1 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

In Table 2, there is a stepwise regression of charitability. The coefficient between charitability and religiosity indicates a positive association due to the 0.283 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level, and as indicated by the r-squared, religiosity explains 14.62% of charitability's variance. On Model 2, the coefficient between charitability and religiosity, with race now being part of the regression, indicates a positive association due to the 0.274 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The coefficient between charitability and race, with religiosity being part of the regression, indicates a positive association due to the 0.174 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 2, both religiosity and race help to explain 16.07% of charitability's variance. The r-squared has increased in Model 2 meaning that religiosity alone is not a good enough indicator of charitability. In Model 3, age and sex were added to the regression model. The coefficient between charitability and religiosity indicates a positive association due to the 0.260 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The coefficient between charitability and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.173 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.017 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and sex indicates a positive association due to the 0.843 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. As indicated by the r-squared of Model 3, religiosity, race, age, and sex help to explain 16.66% of charitability's variance. This is only a slight increase of the r-squared, which means that age and sex do not do much to help explain charitability like religiosity and race do. In Model 4, relationship status and parent's income were added to the regression model. The coefficient between charitability and religiosity indicates a positive association due to the 0.262 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The coefficient between charitability and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.177 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.118 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and sex indicates a positive association due to the 0.913 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and relationship status indicates a negative association due to the -1.603 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between charitability and parent's income indicates a positive association due to the 0.616

regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. As indicated by the r-squared of Model 4, religiosity, race, age, sex, relationship status, and parent's income helps to explain 21.74% of charitability's variance. This is a great increase from Model 3. This means that relationship status and parent's income, together with the other variables, are better at indicating someone's level of charitability than the other variables alone.

Table 3. Stepwise Regression of Religiosity (N=165)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Political Affiliation	0.235***	0.231***	0.228***	0.232***
Race		0.191	0.185	0.187
Age			0.014	0.055
Sex			3.339**	2.927**
Relationship Status				-1.744*
Parent's Income				-0.763*
Mother's Education				-0.709**
R^2	0.0895	0.0991	0.1474	0.2272

Note: ɻ<.1 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

In Table 3, there is a stepwise regression of religiosity. The coefficient between religiosity and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.235 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level, and as indicated by the r-squared, political affiliation only explains 8.95% of religiosity's variance. On Model 2, the coefficient between religiosity and political affiliation, with race now being part of the regression, indicates a positive association due to the 0.231 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The coefficient between religiosity and race, with political affiliation being part of the regression, indicates a positive association due to the 0.191 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 2, both political affiliation and race help to explain only 9.91% of religiosity's variance. The r-squared has increased in Model 2 meaning that political affiliation alone is not a good enough indicator of religiosity. In Model 3, age and sex were added to the regression model. The coefficient between religiosity and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.228 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The relationship between religiosity and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.185 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between religiosity and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.014 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between religiosity and sex indicates a positive association due to the 3.339 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.01 level. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 3, political affiliation, race, age, and sex help to explain 14.74% of religiosity's variance. This is an increase from the previous Model 2 meaning that political affiliation and race are not a good enough indicator of religiosity. In Model 4, relationship status, parent's income, and mother's education were added to the regression model. The coefficient between religiosity and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.232 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. The coefficient between religiosity and race shows a positive association due to the 0.187 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between religiosity and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.055 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between religiosity and sex indicates a positive association due to the 0.2.927 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.01 level. The coefficient between religiosity and relationship status indicates a negative association due to the -1.744

regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between religiosity and parent's income indicates a negative association due to the -0.763 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between religiosity and mother's education indicates a negative association due to the -0.709 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.001 level. As indicated by the r-squared of Model 4, these independent variables help to explain 22.72% of religiosity's variance. This is an extreme increase from the previous three regression models. This means that political affiliation, race, age, and sex are not good enough indicators of religiosity.

Table 4. Stepwise Regression of Charitability (N=165)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Political Affiliation	0.088†	0.0825†	0.086*	0.027
Race		0.219*	0.235*	0.178†
Age		0.018	0.141*	0.118†
Sex		1.708*	1.761*	0.946
Relationship Status			-2.042**	-1.636**
Parent's Income			0.309	0.596†
Religiosity				0.250***
R^2	0.0231	0.0711	0.1286	0.2193

Note: †<.1 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

In Table 4, there is a stepwise regression of charitability. The coefficient between charitability and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.088 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant at the; however, it is approaching significance. As indicated by the r-squared, political affiliation explains 2.31% of charitability's variance. On Model 2, race, age, and sex were added to the regression model. The coefficient between charitability and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.0825 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.219 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 2, both religiosity and race help to explain 16.07% of charitability's variance. The coefficient between charitability and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.018 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and sex indicates a positive association due to the 1.708 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 2, political affiliation, race, age, and sex help to explain 7.11% of charitability's variance. The r-squared has increased, meaning that political affiliation alone is not a good enough indicator of charitability. In Model 3, relationship status and parent's income were added to the regression model. The coefficient between charitability and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.086 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between charitability and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.235 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between charitability and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.141 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between charitability and sex indicates a positive association due to the 1.761 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.05 level. The coefficient between charitability and relationship status indicates a negative association due to the -2.042 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the p<.01 level. The coefficient between charitability and parent's income indicates a positive association due to the 0.309 regression coefficient. This

relationship is not significant. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 3, political affiliation, race, age, sex, relationship status, and parent's income helps to explain 12.86% of charitability's variance. This is an increase from Model 2 meaning that relationship status and parent's income, with the other variables, helps to indicate the level of charitability more than just the other variables alone. In Model 4, religiosity was added to the regression model. The coefficient between charitability and political affiliation indicates a positive association due to the 0.027 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and race indicates a positive association due to the 0.178 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and age indicates a positive association due to the 0.118 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and sex indicates a positive association due to the 0.946 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant. The coefficient between charitability and relationship status indicates a negative association due to the -1.636 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the $p<.01$ level. The coefficient between charitability and parent's income indicates a positive association due to the 0.596 regression coefficient. This relationship is not significant; however, it is approaching significance. The coefficient between charitability and religiosity indicates a positive association due to the 0.250 regression coefficient. This relationship is significant at the $p<.001$ level. As indicated by the r-squared in Model 4, political affiliation, race, age, sex, relationship status, parent's income, and religiosity help to explain 21.93% of charitability's variance. This is a great increase from Model 3 meaning that the other variables, alone without religiosity, are not good enough indicators of someone's level of charitability.

DISCUSSION

This study looked at the influence of religiosity and political affiliation on charitability and the influence of political affiliation on religiosity. More specifically, we hypothesized that (1) UTD students who have a higher level of religiosity will be more charitable than UTD students with a lower level of religiosity, (2) UTD students who identify as conservative are more religious than UTD students who identify as liberal, and (3) UTD students who identify as more conservative politically, are less likely to give to charity than UTD students who consider themselves more liberal politically.

The analysis found no support for hypothesis 1 as the level of religiosity was low and the level of charitability was high. The analysis finds support for hypothesis 2 as increase in liberalism there is a lower level of religiosity. The analysis provides no support for hypothesis 3 as there was not enough significance to state that political affiliation affects someone's level of charitability.

There are some limitations to this study. First, the sample used for the survey is not the most reliable, being that it was used for convenience of both time and nearness to respondents. Future research should try and survey people with different majors, from different American universities, and with different backgrounds and beliefs. The UTD student body surveyed seemed to have low levels of religiosity, high levels of charitability, and a liberal political affiliation. This is by no means a good representative sample of other universities' populations, or the state of Texas, and definitely not a representative sample of the United States population. The low number of responses affected the statistical analysis of the data received. The regression coefficients for many variables seemed to increase or decrease through the different models in each table. The change in regression coefficients shows that there is a suppressive effect within the variables and

the data. This can also be due to spurious relationship between the main variables and the control variables. The last, and perhaps the most interesting of all limitations is the mediating effect that religiosity has on political affiliation when trying to indicate someone's level of charitability. In Table 4, Model 1, political affiliation seems to be approaching significance with a positive regression coefficient of 0.088, and the regression coefficient stays nearly the same through to Model 3, even becoming significant at the $P<.05$ level. But then, in Model 4, the regression coefficient loses its significance, and drops all the way to 0.027. This shows that religiosity acts a mediator, ending the significant relationship between political affiliation and charitability.

Though policies cannot be made to make people give their money freely, this study raises questions on the influences on charitability that can allow for future research opportunities. For example, hypothesis 1 in this study did not agree with what other previous research stated regarding the influence of religiosity on charitability. Previous research stated that high levels of religiosity would increase the level of charitability, but this study shows that those with low levels of religiosity also have high levels of charitability. This means that religiosity might not be the best indicator of charitability, even if many studies have used religiosity as a reliable variable. Research should also be done in more American universities, since the sample used this study was not a representative sample. Further research would be a source to organizations who raise money for the many people who are in need in the country.

REFERENCES

de Abreu, M., Laureano, R., Da Silva, R., & Dionisio, P. (2015). Volunteerism, Compassion and Religiosity as Drivers of Donations Practices. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 20(3), 256–276.

Everett, J. A. C. (2013) The 12 Item Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (SECS). *PLoS ONE* 8(12), e82131.

Heineck, G. (2017). Love Thy Neighbor – Religion and Prosociality. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 44(7), 869–883.

Hirsh, J. B., Walberg, M. D., & Peterson, J. B. (2013). Spiritual Liberals and Religious Conservatives. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(1), 14–20.

Huber, S., & Huber, O. (2012). The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions*, 3(3), 710–724.

Liu, C., & Hao, F. (2017). Reciprocity Belief and Gratitude as Moderators of the Association Between Social Status and Charitable Giving. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 111, 46–50.

Margolis, M., & Sances, M. (2017). Partisan Differences in Nonpartisan Activity: The Case of Charitable Giving. *Political Behavior*, 39(4), 839–864.

Ozmen, C., Brelsford, G., & Danieu, C. (2018). Political Affiliation, Spirituality, and Religiosity: Links to Emerging Adults' Life Satisfaction and Optimism. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 57(2), 622–635.

Paarlberg, L. E., Nesbit, R., Clerkin, R. M., & Christensen, R. K. (2018). The Politics of Donations: Are Red Counties More Donative Than Blue Counties? *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*.

Van Leeuwen, M. H. D. (1993). Surviving with a Little Help : The Importance of Charity to the Poor of Amsterdam 1800–50, in a Comparative Perspective. *Social History*, 18(3), 319–338.

Yen, S. T., & Zampelli E. M. (2014). What Drives Charitable Donations of Time and Money? The Roles of Political Ideology, Religiosity, and Involvement. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 50, 58–67.