**Racialized Minorities and Support for Civil Rights**

**Abstract**

George Floyd’s murder, social justice protests, and COVID-related attacks against Asian Americans have exposed systemic racial disparities across America. These disparities extend to racialized, faith-based minorities. While civil rights organizations help protect minorities, limited research examines donor support for civil rights organizations.

This article fills this gap by exploring support for civil rights organizations among the general population and two racialized, faith-based minorities—Muslim Americans and Jewish Americans. The findings show that these racialized minorities are more likely than other groups to fund civil rights organizations that work both within and outside their faith-based communities, suggesting that linked fate may operate in the domain of philanthropy where minorities are helping not only themselves but also other communities suffering discrimination. The findings also indicate that political ideology affects giving, as liberals are more likely to donate to civil rights causes both within and outside their faith tradition. Overall, this article contributes to the existing literature on philanthropy by looking at how the effects of political ideology and the notion of linked fate among minority groups may influence giving.
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**Introduction**

Although more covert than in earlier times, discrimination still occurs in the United States between individuals, within institutions, and across diverse social groups (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999; Pager and Shepherd 2008). Public opinion clearly shows the level of discrimination faced by minorities. As an illustration, according to the Pew Research Center, more than 70 percent of Americans say that African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians face discrimination in the United States (Daniller 2021).

Discrimination and exclusion also persist for faith-based minorities. In the United States—where the majority identify as Christian—the largest faith-based minority groups include Latter-Day Saints, Muslims, Jews, Hindus, and Buddhists (Pew Research Center 2021). Faith-based minorities are often racialized, meaning they are deemed a potentially threatening “other” based on racial characteristics. Racial differentiation and othering may include labeling religious minorities by skin color and perceived cultural features such as distinct religious symbols, like a beard or head covering (Lajevardi 2020; Selod 2019).

Although the U.S. constitution and antidiscrimination laws prevent the government from establishing a religion and afford individuals the freedom to practice their religion, legal scholar Sahar Aziz argues that the racialization of faith-based groups can result in their exclusion from legal protection against religious discrimination (Aziz 2021). In fact, faith-based discrimination persists in elections (White, Poulsen, and Hyde 2017), education (Pfaff et al. 2020), and official state action (Lajevardi 2020). Beyond government-based discrimination, faith-based minorities face a variety of direct and indirect forms of religious intolerance, from verbal slurs, online harassment, or vandalism (Fox, Finke, and Mataic 2021). These practices and perception appear to be matched. For example, according to a Pew Research study, 82 percent of Americans believe Muslims face discrimination, while 64 percent believe the same is true for Jews (Masci 2019).

Violence and intimidation often accompany racialized, faith-based discrimination and result in hate crimes. In fact, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) recorded 2020 as the year with the highest number of reported incidents of anti-Semitic events in U.S. history (Maza 2021). Although many hate crimes remain unreported, FBI data provide a benchmark for understanding reporting patterns. For example, 2019 FBI hate crime data showed that 2,391 Black or African Americans, 231 Asian Americans, 1,032 Jews, and 227 Muslims were victims of hate crimes. When adjusted for the 2019 population size—and [3.45 million Muslims](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/03/new-estimates-show-u-s-muslim-population-continues-to-grow/)—the hate crime victimization rates per 100,000 were 13.8 percent for Jews, 6.3 percent for Muslims, 5.4 percent for African Americans, and 1.2 percent for Asian Americans. Reporting trends indicate that Muslims and Jews are more likely to be a target of hate crimes than African Americans. Despite the prevalence of hate crimes and discrimination, civil rights organizations seeking to respond have historically faced chronic underfunding (Cheever and deLeon 2001).

Civil rights organizations have received tremendous public support during moments of highly publicized discrimination and hate crimes. For example, in 2017 when the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) sued the Trump administration for the controversial Muslim ban, the ACLU raised an unprecedented $24 million through more than 350,000 online donations in a matter of days (Matthews 2020) compared with a typical year of about $4 million in online giving. Furthermore, in 2020 in the aftermath of George Floyd’s murder and during the pandemic, a similar trend occurred. A *Financial Times* report found that leading U.S. companies had pledged more than $450 million to organizations directed at civil rights in 2020. Similarly, the Asian American Foundation raised more than $1 billion to fight anti-Asian hate after the increase of anti-Asian hate crimes in 2020 (Edgecliffe-Johnson and Weaver 2020).

Giving trends indicate that donor awareness of and contributions to civil rights causes have increased, at least during peak moments of civil unrest. According to *Giving USA 2021*, overall giving to public social benefits has increased for eleven consecutive years, up by 15.7 percent in 2020 from the prior year (GUSA 2021). The public and societal benefit nonprofits lump together organizations that focus on civil rights and liberties alongside community improvement, mutual benefits, and philanthropy and volunteerism.

However, a strong sense of polarization continues to exist along partisan lines in the United States on the issues of civil rights. In particular, Republicans and Democrats are sharply divided over solutions to civil right issues, including questions of immigration, U.S. borders, and police reform (Broockman and Kalla 2022). Likewise, public affairs, philanthropic, and nonprofit literature on civil rights organizations remains minimal thus far (Cheever and DeLeon 2001; Harvey 2016; Hua, Hou, and Deng 2016; Minkoff 2002). A deeper analysis of civil rights organizations is warranted given the rise in discrimination, the racialization of minorities, public concern, and the responses of civil rights organizations. Moreover, the literature has not looked at how this deep polarization in the United States may affect giving to civil rights organizations.

This article addresses this gap using an original survey of the U.S. general population with oversamples of Muslim and Jewish Americans, the two U.S. faith-based minorities with the highest rates of documented discrimination. These two distinct communities have developed literature on the effects of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, but less often have these distinct kinds of literature been studied together. The survey finds that support for civil rights is also deeply partisan with liberals more likely to support civil rights causes. The survey also finds that Muslims and Jews are more likely than other groups to support organizations that address their faith-based civil rights while, at the same time, supporting organizations outside the realm of their faith-based civil rights. Additionally, it finds that political ideology has a strong influence on giving to civil rights organizations, while finding no support for the impact of religiosity.

This article enhances the existing literature in several ways. First, it extends the literature on donor motivations (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011a, 2011b) to show how political ideology influences support for civil rights organizations. It also deepens what we know about the nature of religious giving (Berger 2006; Siddiqui 2010; Wasif and Prakash 2017) and racial minority and diaspora studies (Brinkerhoff 2014; Najam 2007) by examining whether religious minorities express distinctive support for civil rights causes. Additionally, it supports the literature on identity-based giving, especially for in-groups (Tremblay‐Boire and Prakash 2019; White, Poulsen, and Hyde 2017) by testing whether religious minorities are more likely to support causes that champion their distinct identity or whether shared experiences foster allyship with others facing discrimination for a common cause. Simultaneously, it contributes to the literature by indicating that minorities also support causes that are outside their distinct group identity. This finding suggests that there may be a certain level of linked fate among racialized minorities and raises questions about what minority groups may consider as an in-group as part of their social identity (Gershon et al. 2019; Sanchez and Masuoka 2010). Other fields have explored how the ideas of linked fate can influence behavior of minorities between similar groups and other groups. However, research has not looked at how this linked fate mechanism may also influence philanthropic giving.

**Civil Rights Organizations**

The field of nonprofit studies increasingly recognizes the importance of studying social equity. COVID-19 has further accentuated and highlighted the social equity challenges that the United States and the world faces (Frederickson 2010; Moorer 2021; Rauhaus and Johnson 2021). Some existing research highlights the intersections of gender, place, and race within the administration of criminal justice in Alabama (see Moorer 2021).

There is also increasing recognition in the nonprofit sector about the importance of tackling social equity challenges. Racial diversity in nonprofit leadership presents a variety of benefits crucial for responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although leadership remains predominantly White, research suggests that more racially diverse voices not only increase financial resilience but also improve targeted programming to specific racially diverse communities (Mumford 2022).

In addition, very limited research exists on organizations that promote social equity through their staunch advocacy of civil rights. Today, U.S. civil rights organizations individually and via alliances counter specific forms of oppression, such as against race, ethnicity, disability, and gender. Large national advocacy organizations often draw together local service providers and advocate to form broad policy networks to address issues and legislation with a unified, popular voice.

Research highlights both successes and challenges faced by civil rights organizations. For instance, Hua, Hou, and Deng. (2016) studied nonprofits working on civil rights with farmers in China. Similarly, Minkoff (2002) examined organizations that fought for civil rights and provided services to their constituents, thus turning into hybrid advocacy and service-oriented organizations. Cheever and DeLeon (2001) looked at the successes and failures of fair housing councils in litigation matters that advanced housing equity.

Despite widespread media and public attention on civil rights and social justice, civil rights organizations are still in short supply, especially compared with the tremendous growth of organizations providing social services for these same constituencies (Matthews 2020; Edgecliffe-Johnson and Weaver 2020). Furthermore, little research has explored decision-making by donors to civil rights causes. Most research on charitable options focuses on a specific cause, such as international development (Micklewright and Schnepf 2009; Tremblay‐Boire and Prakash 2019; Wei, Wang, and Wang 2019), specific disaster appeals (Zagefka et al. 2012), or education nonprofits (Wasif and Prakash 2017). To the best of the authors’ knowledge, civil rights organizations’ donation decisions have been overlooked in research and literature.

**Donor Choice and Motivations to Donate**

Donor choice refers to a donor’s preference for one cause or one charity over another, which raises two questions: Why might a donor be inclined to give to a specific cause, such as international relief or civil rights; more specifically, how do motivations and other factors affect donors’ preference for one cause over another? While donor motivations are a developed area of research, less research focuses on donor choice (Bennett 2003; Breeze 2013; Casale and Baumann 2015; Micklewright and Schnepf 2009). The limited literature on donor choice suggests that demographic factors influence decisions to donate to a specific charity. Individuals with higher socioeconomic status donate more to art and culture than others do (Wiepking 2007). Older people give more to healthcare systems, and young parents give more to childhood cancer research. People who are born abroad, are females, and have higher levels of education and religiosity are more likely to support international causes than domestic causes (Casale and Baumann 2015; Neumayr and Handy 2019). Political beliefs also influence outgroup giving, as left-leaning individuals are more likely to donate abroad (Wiepking 2010).

Several psychological factors also influence donor choice. For example, individuals are more inclined to support causes that are more likely to impact them directly. For instance, donors close to a homeless population are more likely to support a nonprofit assisting the neighborhood’s homeless population. Similarly, elites are more likely to support philanthropic organizations that represent their culture (e.g., exemplary works of art) and that enable them to network with other elites (Odendahl 1990; Ostrower 2007).

However, there is limited literature on the impact of ideology on giving. Political ideology plays a prominent role in political behavior in today's world, including voting, life choices, immigration, housing, and shelter perspectives (Stewart and Morris 2021). Differing political ideologies may influence the causes to which individuals and groups donate. Conservatives may be more apt to volunteer within their respective faith traditions. Liberals may be more likely to volunteer for causes like housing and shelter.

There is, however, mixed evidence with regard to the role of political ideology on generous behavior. In the case of giving, some research suggests conservatives give more to charity (Kaikati et al. 2017); other studies find liberals more likely to donate (Yen and Zampelli 2014). Other research (Luccasen, Thomas, and Grossman 2017) indicates no significant impact. Research similarly shows conflicting conclusions regarding the role of political leanings on volunteerism. Forbes and Zampelli (2014), for example, found no significant impact on volunteerism. However, limited research suggests that political leanings may also affect the types of causes donors support. For instance, some research suggests that conservatives are more likely to volunteer for causes aligning with their political ideology (Hjort and Beswick 2021). Generally, for liberals, social causes they support align with their political ideology. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H1a: Individuals expressing a higher level of liberal ideology are more likely to donate to a civil rights organization within their faith tradition.**

Similarly, we expect them to be more supportive of civil rights causes outside their faith tradition. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H1b: Individuals expressing a higher level of liberal ideology are more likely to donate to a civil rights organization within their faith tradition.**

**Religion and Giving**

Religiosity also serves as a critical predictor of prosocial behaviors such as giving or volunteering. Individuals who identify with a religious tradition are more likely to give and to give in higher amounts than those who are not religious (Stewart and Morris 2021). In a behavioral economics experiment, Everett Haq and Rand (2016) also found that religious individuals are more generous than people without a religion. Moreover, the literature indicates that those with greater religious intensity have more willingness to give in higher amounts, whether measured by levels of religious practice or by degree of importance placed on beliefs and affiliation (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011b; Berger 2006; Herzog et al. 2020; Herzog and Price 2016).

For some faith-based minorities, religious identity fuses into a separate racialized identity (Hjort and Beswick 2021; Kaikati et al. 2017). As a result, markers such as religious dress (e.g., hijab and yamaka), religious practices (e.g., dietary restrictions), and public religious accommodations (e.g., holidays or time for prayer) mark a religious group as a racialized “other.” For instance, a White woman may become racialized when she wears a hijab (Franks 2000; Selod 2019). Thus, society may stereotype religious individuals based on religious identity markers like the hijab, and a religious identity may morph into a different racial category of its own. Recent research suggests that religious minorities such as Jews and Muslims are often considered racialized rather than a religious minority (GhaneaBassiri 2017; Lajevardi 2020). Consequently, Muslims have expressed greater concern about racial discrimination rather than religious discrimination(Noor et al. 2021).

Religious identity is a critical consideration for faith-based minorities. Ample evidence suggests that systemic discrimination exists against religious minorities at all levels of society (Alesina and La Ferrara 2014; Lajevardi 2020; Pfaff et al. 2020; Pfaff and Gill 2006). Muslims and Jews are the two largest minority faith-based groups in the United States, and they have faced significant discrimination and increasing numbers of hate crimes in recent years. According to a 2019 Pew survey, most American adults (82 percent) say Muslims face discrimination in the United States. Muslims were more than twice as likely as Jews, Catholics, and Protestants to say they had experienced such discrimination in the past year. Nearly half of Muslims (48 percent) said they had experienced racial or religious discrimination in the past year (Masci 2019). Similarly, in a 2020 Pew study, 43 percent of Jews self-reported experiencing racial or religious discrimination (Pew Research Center 2021). In fact, Muslim Americans and Jewish Americans experience racialization similarly.

An emotional bond with one’s own ethnic, religious, or cultural group represents one of the primary drivers for charitable giving (Hutcheson and Dominguez 2016). Donors supporting a primary in-group cause may believe that they may personally know a beneficiary of their donations (Small and Simonsohn 2008). They may feel more obligated to support their in-group members, but they may have less commitment to people outside their group (Baron, Ritov, and Greene 2013; Erlandsson, Björklund, and Bäckström 2017). Fundraising literature indicates that people are more likely to give money to people of their race and ethnicity and that implicit color biases affect donation decisions (Bhati 2020; Fong and Luttmer 2009; Tremblay‐Boire and Prakash 2019).

Several global surveys have also come to the same conclusion. For instance, both Canadian donors and U.K. donors (Rajan, Pink and Dow 2009) are more likely to donate to their in-group (domestic causes) than to an outgroup (international charity) (Micklewright and Schnepf 2009). Likewise, minorities such as Asian Americans, Jewish Americans, and African Americans are more likely to donate to causes that benefit their ethnicity or religious tradition (Kosmin 1995; Brinkerhoff 2014; Hamilton, Ilchman, and Fairfax 1995; Shao 1995)**.**

September 11, 2001, was a turning point for Muslim Americans. Many Muslims felt that antiterrorism laws like the Patriot Act overwhelmingly targeted them. Public and government interactions were increasingly hostile (Khan 2013; Thaut, Stein, and Barnett 2012; Tremblay‐Boire and Prakash 2019; Wasif 2020). The government froze assets at several leading Islamic charities, including the most prominent Muslim charity—the Holy Land Foundation—over alleged, and later unfounded, ties to terrorism (Wasif 2021).

The Trump administration further augmented Muslims’ perception of exclusion and discrimination and exacerbated Muslim distrust of the government (Lajevardi 2020). Trump loudly expressed Islamophobic and xenophobic rhetoric while in office. Several Muslim nonprofit civil rights organizations publicly criticized Trump’s Islamophobia. CAIR, a leading Muslim civil rights organization, stated, “Unfortunately, it is President Trump’s policies, appointments, and statements that have contributed to the mainstreaming of Islamophobia and anti-immigrant rhetoric. It is time for him to clearly state that he is the president of all Americans, including American Muslims, and that he rejects Islamophobia, antisemitism and all other forms of bigotry” (CAIR 2017). Muslims face other forms of government discrimination, including state-level legislators’ responses and street-level bureaucrats such as public school educators and local government employees (Lajevardi 2020; Pfaff et al. 2020). As a result, a 2018 survey showed that nearly two-thirds of Muslims are unhappy with the direction of the United States (Lajevardi et al. 2020).

In addition to perceptions of government discrimination, Muslims have constantly faced societal and religious discrimination (SRD). For instance, according to 2019 FBI statistics, while Muslims accounted for around 1 percent of the U.S. population, 13 percent of the hate crimes explicitly targeted Muslims, including attempted burnings of mosques, attacking Muslim women and removing their hijabs, and even hate attacks against Sikhs in the mistaken belief that they belong to the Muslim faith. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H2a: Donor belonging to a Muslim identity is more likely to donate to a faith-based civil rights cause than a donor not belonging to a racialized religious minority.**

Literature on identity-based giving suggests that donors support causes that promote their identity. However, recent research expands the idea that the fates of minority groups are linked. Dawson (1994) introduced the concept of linked fate in the case of African Americans, which he defined as the extent to which individuals consider that their life conditions are connected to the fate of their racial group. Subsequent research has demonstrated that Latina/os and Asian Americans also feel a sense of linked fate (Sanchez and Masuoka 2010; Masuoka 2006). Furthermore, Gershon et al. (2019) advanced the concept of a “minority linked fate,” which they defined as “the idea that ethno-racial minorities might share a sense of commonality that extends beyond their particular ethno-racial group to other ethno-racial groups.”

Substantial evidence of interracial linked faith exists. For instance, in 2020, the Black Lives Matter movement galvanized racial minorities to come together out of a sense of solidarity with the African American communities. Similarly, in the 1960s and 1970s, Latin and Asian Americans joined African Americans in solidarity, expressing a shared experience as “people of color”(Pérez 2015; Pan 2020). In fact, individual minority groups have supported one another due to a sense of interconnectedness that sees their individual group’s struggle as related to the challenges of other racial minorities.

Thus, it is plausible that individuals with the shared experience of discrimination may have a cause for solidarity (Bennett 2003; Tajfel 1979). Based on their experiences and fears, Muslims may think it is crucial to support civil rights causes that do not directly support their faith or identity. Moreover, the idea of linked fate or the notion that all minorities are connected based on their discrimination experiences can also influence minorities to think beyond their religious identity and, in fact, consider other discriminated minorities as part of their broader social identity (Masuoka 2006; Sanchez and Masuoka 2010). Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H2b: Donors belonging to a Muslim identity are more likely to donate to a civil rights cause outside their faith than a donor not belonging to a racialized religious minority.**

Jews in the United States have also faced anti-Semitism. FBI data have shown that every year since 1991, Jews have been the most likely group to be targeted for religiously motivated hate crimes (Breeze 2013). This trend has continued. Most notably, the 2017 “Unite The Right” rally in Charlottesville embodied the castigation of Jews by a group of white nationalists, neo-Nazis, and extremists. Right-wing political affiliates chanted, “Jews will not replace us.” The following year, anti-Semitic incidences rose by 57 percent—the largest annual increase in the forty years since data tracking began. In 2018, anti-Semitic incidences peaked with the deadliest attack on Jews on U.S. soil in which eleven individuals were murdered at the Tree of Life Synagogue. In 2019, 20 percent of the hate crimes targeted individuals based on religious identity. Of the 1,715 victims of antireligious hate crimes, 60.2 percent were victims of crimes motivated by anti-Jewish bias. While Jews account for less than 2 percent of the American population, the FBI hate crimes statistics on hate crimes showed that more than 60 percent of religious-based hate crimes in 2019 targeted Jews, an increase of 14 percent over 2018. In 2020 and 2021, 31 percent of the ADL’s documented 8,366 extremist incidences in the United States were explicitly anti-Semitic (Anti-Defamation League 2021).

Despite the overwhelming presence and increase of anti-Semitic activity, discussions of these acts of hatred remain limited (Levine et al. 2020). In some cases, citizens believe the United States exists in a post-anti-Semitic period, or they think that since most Jews appear to be white, they couldn’t possibly endure racialized hatred (Moshin 2018). Yet, the majority of Jewish Americans report that anti-Semitism has risen in the United States, with 60 percent “report[ing] having had a direct, personal experience with anti-Semitism in the past 12 months” (Pew Research Center 2021).

Thus, we would expect people with a Jewish background to donate to organizations that support their identity. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H4a: Donor belonging to a Jewish identity is more likely to donate to a faith-based civil rights cause than a donor not belonging to a racialized religious minority.**

At the same time, as we have mentioned, the notion of linked fate may influence individuals’ choices to give to causes that help others as well. Therefore, similar to Muslims, we would also expect Jews to give more to civil rights causes outside their faith. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

**H4b: Donors belonging to a Jewish identity are more likely to donate to a civil rights cause outside their faith tradition than a donor not belonging to a racialized religious minority.**

**Methods**

This study uses an original survey of Americans conducted by the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding (ISPU) from January 8 to January 24, 2018. The study investigates a sample of the U.S. populations’ opinions about the government, the most critical issues facing the country, faith customs and religion, race, and gender discrimination. For the survey, the authors oversampled Muslims and Jews. Most survey interviews and all Jewish interviews were conducted by phone. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the respondents. As we did not want to lump disparate minorities into one category, and acknowledging that Jewish and Muslim histories are highly different, we used separate variables for Muslims and Jews.

Insert Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

The survey asked respondents if they had donated to a civil rights cause within their faith group and separately asked if they had contributed to a civil rights group outside their faith group. The survey asked several demographic questions and opinions about the government and the importance of religion in their lives. The survey also asked the respondents about their views regarding the government.

We used binomial regression as the survey asked respondents if they had donated or not to a civil rights cause. We controlled for various factors. Support for civil rights can also be conditioned by an individual’s race. Therefore, we controlled for major racial groups, including Asians, African Americans, and Hispanics. We also controlled for other demographic factors, including gender, education, and income. We accounted for ideology by asking respondents on a scale of 1 to 5 about their ideology from conservative to liberal. We also controlled differences based on faith traditions by controlling for Muslims, Jews, and Nones, and various distinctions (racial, gender, and faith-based). Table 2 shows the regression results.

Insert Table 2: Regression Results

**Results and Discussion**

We found several interesting results. For instance, we found that age significantly affected giving to civil rights causes. Also, no clear evidence showed the impact of education or income on giving to either faith-based or non-faith-based civil rights groups. We also did not find any clear evidence that being more religious increased or decreased donations to either faith-based or non-faith-based civil rights causes.

Otherwise, the survey findings were nuanced. We found strong support that political ideology influenced the inclination to give to both faith-based (H1a) and non-faith-based causes (H1b). Similarly, we found separate, strong support among racialized groups for giving to civil rights causes. Our results suggest that Muslims support both faith-based causes (H2a) and non-faith-based causes outside their faith (H2b). Similarly, Jews are inclined to support both their faith-related causes (H3a) and non-faith-related causes (H3b).

These findings suggest strong allyship among religious minorities and other minorities facing discrimination. They also support the notion that a form of linked fate may exist among religious minorities, who may want to support causes that advance not only their but also other minorities’ interests. Religious minorities are working together for a broad range of civil rights causes rather than focusing specifically on their issue area, in contrast to what we would predict based on the literature of in-group giving. Overall, these findings suggest that fundraising by civil rights organizations needs to target religious minorities, even if they do not directly work with civil rights causes. Moreover, civil rights organizations may need to target more directly those individuals who may have been exposed in some way to direct or indirect discrimination.

This study has certain limitations. First, the survey took place in 2018 during the Trump presidency and before the George Floyd protests. As a result, present trends may have changed and may not capture more current attitudes toward civil rights, such as after the repeal of Trump’s Muslim ban. However, recent surveys do suggest similar findings in 2021. Second, this survey looked only at whether an individual gave to a civil rights cause, without asking about the exact amount directed to the cause. Finally, this survey was limited to two racialized minorities, Muslim Americans and Jewish Americans.

**Conclusion**

Ultimately, our findings suggest that partisanship shapes donor preferences toward giving to civil rights causes, as liberals give to these causes more often than conservatives, and also shapes giving and philanthropy in general (i.e., the kind of causes to which individuals donate). While extensive literature exists on partisanship and its effect on behavior in other fields, the field of philanthropy needs to look further at how it and nonprofit organizations may be influenced by the ideology of both the giver and the receiver.

The finding that racialized communities are more likely than others to fund civil rights causes that target their faith and also causes that are not directly related to their faith calls for further inquiry on whether and how linked fate may shape minorities’ support for each other’s causes. These findings complicate our understanding of how social identity may be influencing individuals’ philanthropy.

Long-established literature shows that individuals support their in-group more than they do other groups (Tajfel 1979). Moreover, social identity and philanthropic literature discusses how social identity shapes the giving behavior of individuals (Tremblay‐Boire and Prakash 2019). However, the literature has not looked at how other cues, such as similar experiences of marginalization, may be influencing the giving behavior of individuals, in particular, how the ideas of linked fate or solidarity may influence the giving preferences of individuals. Thus, further examination of how these giving preferences may be affected by similar experiences of discrimination and marginalization is needed.

Our study opens the potential for deeper research on social identity by blurring the distinction between in-group and outgroups. The continued upsurge in civil rights consciousness, political polarization, and ongoing documented religious and racial discrimination makes our understanding of philanthropy and civil rights organizations relevant today. Moreover, while we are finding minorities’ support for causes other than their own, it is important to study if and how the notion of linked fate may influence their giving, either through experiments or surveys that study these phenomena.

While previous literature suggests that individuals prefer in-groups rather than outgroups in their donations, this study suggests that racialized minorities may be more inclined to support both in-groups and outgroups, especially in the context of civil rights. However, civil rights are also a particular type of service where individuals can benefit from allyship, unlike service goods, which are substitute goods. Giving goods to one group reduces the goods for another good. Thus, it is vital to understand both in-groups and outgroups in the context of donor choice and the service provided. Also, it may be helpful for organizations and causes to fundraise with minorities while focusing on the allyship between them and the broader causes.

The implications of this study for practitioners are clear. In their fundraising, civil rights groups and other organizations need to focus more on racialized minorities and need to direct more effort toward majority groups in order to highlight the importance of civil rights, even if some of the causes do not affect them directly.

Finally, despite the increased media attention (which may well fade in the future) and donor support for civil rights, research on civil rights causes in the nonprofit sector remains limited. We, therefore, offer this study as a promising springboard for future research.
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**Table 1: Survey Demographics**

| **Characteristic** | **N = 839***1* |
| --- | --- |
| Gender |  |
| Male | 432 (51%) |
| Female | 407 (49%) |
| Importance of Religion |  |
| 1 | 2 (0.2%) |
| 2 | 34 (4.1%) |
| 3 | 70 (8.3%) |
| 4 | 225 (27%) |
| 5 | 508 (61%) |
| Income |  |
| Less than $15,000 | 40 (4.8%) |
| $15,000 but less than $25,000 | 41 (4.9%) |
| $25,000 but less than $30,000 | 50 (6.0%) |
| $30,000 but less than $40,000 | 66 (7.9%) |
| $40,000 but less than $50,000 | 82 (9.8%) |
| $50,000 but less than $75,000 | 118 (14%) |
| $75,000 but less than $100,000 | 111 (13%) |
| $100,000 and over | 331 (39%) |
| Jewish Americans | 207 (25%) |
| Muslim American | 279 (33%) |
| Faith-Based Civil Rights Donations |  |
| No | 468 (56%) |
| Yes | 371 (44%) |
| Non-Faith-Based Civil Rights Donations |  |
| No | 421 (50%) |
| Yes | 418 (50%) |
| Hispanic | 67 (8.0%) |
| Education |  |
| Graduated college (4 year/bachelor’s degree) | 120 (14%) |
| Some college (including associate degree) | 171 (20%) |
| Graduate school or more | 263 (31%) |
| Graduated college (4 year/bachelor's degree) | 142 (17%) |
| High school graduate | 105 (13%) |
| Less than high school graduate | 20 (2.4%) |
| Technical school/Other | 18 (2.1%) |
| Age | 26 (4, 52) |
| Race |  |
| Arab | 29 (3.5%) |
| Asian/Chinese/Japanese/Indian/Pakistani | 87 (10%) |
| Black or African American | 94 (11%) |
| Mixed | 42 (5.0%) |
| Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native | 12 (1.4%) |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 4 (0.5%) |
| Other | 29 (3.5%) |
| White | 542 (65%) |
| Conservative |  |
| 1 | 88 (10%) |
| 2 | 151 (18%) |
| 3 | 246 (29%) |
| 4 | 202 (24%) |
| 5 | 152 (18%) |
| *1* n (%); Median (IQR) | |

**Table 2: Regression Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
|  | Dependent variable | |
|  |  | |
|  | Donations to Faith-Based Civil Rights | Donations to Non-Faith-Based Civil Rights |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | | |
| Muslims | 0.844\*\*\* | 0.781\*\*\* |
|  | (0.278) | (0.281) |
|  |  |  |
| Jews | 0.514\* | 0.679\*\* |
|  | (0.270) | (0.272) |
|  |  |  |
| Religion Importance | 0.143 | 0.001 |
|  | (0.098) | (0.096) |
|  |  |  |
| Liberal | 0.240\*\*\* | 0.449\*\*\* |
|  | (0.068) | (0.069) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: Asian | -0.386 | -0.183 |
|  | (0.451) | (0.457) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: African American | 0.625 | 0.558 |
|  | (0.468) | (0.468) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: Mixed | 0.084 | 0.209 |
|  | (0.520) | (0.523) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native | 0.096 | -0.639 |
|  | (0.750) | (0.786) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | -1.313 | -1.278 |
|  | (1.306) | (1.279) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: Other | 0.058 | 0.625 |
|  | (0.582) | (0.598) |
|  |  |  |
| Race: White | -0.308 | 0.008 |
|  | (0.456) | (0.462) |
|  |  |  |
| Females | -0.022 | -0.017 |
|  | (0.158) | (0.157) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $15,000 but less than $25,000 | -0.244 | 0.080 |
|  | (0.294) | (0.294) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $25,000 but less than $30,000 | 0.046 | 0.045 |
|  | (0.266) | (0.264) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $30,000 but less than $40,000 | 0.367 | 0.590\*\* |
|  | (0.267) | (0.267) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $40,000 but less than $50,000 | -0.773\*\*\* | -0.655\*\* |
|  | (0.280) | (0.277) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $50,000 but less than $75,000 | 0.390 | 0.413 |
|  | (0.274) | (0.271) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $75,000 but less than $100,000 | -0.440 | -0.404 |
|  | (0.269) | (0.266) |
|  |  |  |
| Income: $100,000 and over | 0.101 | 0.306 |
|  | (0.263) | (0.259) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: Some college (including associate degree) | -0.001 | -0.071 |
|  | (0.290) | (0.279) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: Graduate school or more | 0.557\*\* | 0.357 |
|  | (0.274) | (0.264) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: High School graduate | -0.206 | -0.470 |
|  | (0.325) | (0.317) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: Less than High School graduate | 0.139 | 0.115 |
|  | (0.327) | (0.316) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: Refused | 0.272 | -0.001 |
|  | (0.580) | (0.574) |
|  |  |  |
| Education: Technical school/Other | -0.424 | -0.078 |
|  | (0.590) | (0.553) |
|  |  |  |
| Age | -0.003 | 0.004 |
|  | (0.004) | (0.004) |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | -3.213\*\*\* | -3.594\*\*\* |
|  | (0.959) | (0.963) |
|  |  |  |
|  | | |
| Observations | 839 | 839 |
| Log Likelihood | -518.455 | -522.153 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 1,090.910 | 1,098.306 |
|  | | |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | |