

Documentation Individual International Philanthropy Database (IIPD)
A Comparative Study of Global Giving
19 country IIPD

Pamala Wiepking and Femida Handy
Version 1
December 2016

Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Recommended reference to the Individual International Philanthropy Database datafile:

IIPD. (2016). Individual International Philanthropy Database. [Machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, P., and F. Handy [principle investigators]. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Erasmus University Rotterdam [distributor].

Reference to the edited volume in which results of analyses with IIPD data has been published:

Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (Eds.) (2015). The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan. ISBN: 9781137341532.

Reference to this document:

Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (2016). Documentation Individual International Philanthropy Database (IIPD). A Comparative Study of Global Giving. 19 country IIPD. Version 1. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Acronyms

CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal Interview
CASI	Computer Assisted Self Interview (online survey)
CATI	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing
IIPD	Individual International Philanthropy Database
AU	Australia
FR	France
UK	United Kingdom
NL	Netherlands
US	United States of America
CA	Canada
NO	Norway
FI	Finland
MX	Mexico
KR	South Korea
JP	Japan
AT	Austria
ID	Indonesia
TW	Taiwan
IE	Ireland
IL	Israel
CN	China
RU	Russia
VT	Vietnam
CH	Switzerland
DE	Germany

Publications

* this section is not yet available. It will be added in a next version of the documentation.

INTRODUCTION

Individual International Philanthropy Database

The Individual International Philanthropy Database is an harmonized dataset composed of microdata from 20 countries: Australia, France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, United States of America, Canada, Norway, Finland, Mexico, South Korea, Japan, Austria, Indonesia, Taiwan, Ireland, Israel, China, Russia, Switzerland and Germany. The datasets were collected between 2004 and 2010 (see Table 1).

Table 1 Dataset per country

Country	Dataset	Acronym	Year	Research study	Wave	Total waves ¹
Australia	Giving Australia, Individual and Household Survey 2005	-	2005	Cross-sectional (one-off study)	-	-
France	The Giving France Study	-	2009	One-off study	-	-
United Kingdom	Helping Out		2006-2008	One-off study	-	-
Netherlands	Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2005	GINPS 2005	2005	Longitudinal	2 nd wave	4
United States	Philanthropy Panel Study	PPS	2004	Longitudinal	3 rd wave	5
Canada	Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating	CSGVP	2004	Cross-sectional	3 rd wave	5
Norway	Population survey on giving and volunteering Statistics Norway	-	2009	Cross-sectional (one-off study)	-	-
Finland	Auttaminen, RAY	-	2008	Cross-sectional (one-off study)	-	-

Mexico	National Survey on Philanthropy and Civil Society	ENAFI	2005	Cross-sectional	1 st wave	2
South Korea	Giving Korea 2006	-	2006	Cross-sectional	3 rd wave	Unknown
Japan	Japan Giving and Volunteering Study	JGVS	2009	Longitudinal	1 st wave	Unknown
Austria	Findings on giving in Austria from a representative population survey		2008	Cross-sectional	3 rd wave	4
Indonesia	Indonesia Family Life Survey	IFLS4	2007	Longitudinal	4 th wave	4
Taiwan	Taiwan Social Change Survey ⁷	TSCS	2009	Cross sectional	5 th wave (from phase 5)	Unknown
Ireland	Irish Household Budget Survey	HBS	2005	Cross sectional	4 th wave	5
Israel	Giving, Volunteering and Organ Donations in Israel,	GiVOD-IL	2009	Longitudinal	3 rd wave	3
China	Survey of Philanthropic Behavior in China	-	2011	One-off study	-	-
Russia	Population survey Centre for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector NRU HSE	-	2010	One-off study	-	-

Germany	German Socio Economic Panel Study	G-SOEP	2010	Longitudinal	27 th wave	30
Switzerland	Freiwilligen-monitor	-	2006	Cross sectional	1 st wave	3

¹ Current number of waves refers to the number of waves conducted before May 2014.

Sample composition (overview)

Below an overview is given of the sample composition for every country (see Table 2).

Table 2 Overview sample composition

Country	Number of cases	Response rate	Type of data collection	Weighting variable
Australia	N=6,209	40%	Telephone interview	Yes, based on age, gender and education
France	N=1,195	-	CASI	Yes based on age, gender, social class, region, and household size to make it representative of the French population.
United Kingdom	N=2,705	60%	CAPI	Yes, weighting to correct for bias due to sampling methods
Netherlands	N=1,367	79%	CASI	Yes, excluding the Protestant oversample
United States	N=7,251	-	CATI	Yes, weighted to adjust for the unequal probability of selection into the original 1968 low-income oversample, the 1997 immigrant refresher, and attrition.
Canada	N= 20,832	-	CATI	Yes, based on age and province
Norway	N=1,937 (N=1,579 and N=359 respondents from Africa and Asia)	53% and 36%	Telephone interviews	Yes, a weighed-in sub-sample of 359 respondents from Africa and Asia

Finland	N=701	-	Telephone interviews	No
Mexico	N=2990	-	Face-to-face interviews	No
South Korea	N=1,005	-	-	No
Japan	N=5,121	-	-	No
Austria	N=1,019	-	Computer-assisted face-to-face interviews	Yes, based on age, sex, federal state, and size of municipality
Indonesia	N=12,692	-	-	No
Taiwan	N=1,927	43%	Face-to-face interviews	Yes
Ireland	N=6,884		www.ucd.ie/issda/	Yes, based on the CSO weighting system
Israel	N=1,498	52%	Telephone survey	No
China	N=5,352	-	Face-to-face interviews	No
Russia	N= 41,500	-	Face to face interviews	No
Germany	N=25,456	-	Face-to-face interviews	Yes, applying frequency weights using the expansion factor
Switzerland	N=7,410	58.7	CATI	Yes, a post stratification weight variable that corrects for different selection probabilities in respect to cantons and household size. It also extrapolates the sample with respects to age, nationality, gender and education to the Swiss resident population parameters.

Sample composition

Below a description is given about the sample composition for every country.

Australia

For Australia, the cross-sectional study Giving Australia, Individual and Household Survey 2005 is included in the IIPD. The study is part of a one-off larger government-funded project called Giving Australia, which also included a Survey of Business, and a Survey of Nonprofit Organizations and Fundraisers. The data for the Individual and Household Survey was collected by the Australian market research company Roy Morgan Research between February 1 and March 15, 2005. To recruit the respondents, a stratified sampling design was used. The sample was stratified by Census Collection Districts (CCD) and 30 per cent of the completed interviews have been taken from those CCDs in the top 20 per cent

of mean household income (Lyons & Passey, 2007). The respondents are Australians of 18 years or older and living in a household with a telephone, because the structured interviews were conducted by phone. On average an interview lasted for 20 minutes. This resulted in an overall response of 6,209 respondents and a raw response rate of 40 per cent (Lyons & Passey, 2007). Some extreme outliers were identified, and these were individually examined. The responses that appeared to be a consequence of erroneous recollection or recording were rebased to the mean for all other responses (Lyons & Passey, 2007). This applied to responses for giving and a little over 2.5 per cent of volunteering responses. After correcting for outliers the data was made representative for the Australian population by applying a weight for age, gender, and educational attainment (excerpt from Scaife, McDonald, Williamson, et al., 2015: 495- 496).

France

For France, the Giving France study (Giving France, 2009) is included in the IIPD. The Giving France study was conducted by the Center for Philanthropic Studies at the VU University in Amsterdam. The French data were collected by market research firm TNS Sofres. Between January 30 and February 19, 2009, 4,612 French households regularly participating in survey research were invited to participate in an online survey using CASI (Computer Assisted Self Interviewing)¹. After 1,195 respondents filled out the questionnaire; the survey was closed from further participation. The data was weighted for the characteristics age, gender, social class, region, and household size to make it representative of the French population. The Giving France survey was modelled after the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study (GINPS08, 2008), using the International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations (ICPNO; Salamon, Sokolowski & List, 2003) to adjust this Dutch based survey for an international classification of nonprofit organizations (excerpt from Gautier, Pache, & Mossel., 2015: 144-145).

United Kingdom

For the United Kingdom, the Helping Out study is included in the IIPD. The study was commissioned by the Office of the Third Sector in the Cabinet Office. The Helping Out survey was run as a follow-up study to the 2005 Citizenship Survey, drawing the sample from those respondents to the Citizenship Survey who agreed at the time to be re-contacted for further research. The advantage of this method was that certain groups of particular interest to the study could be over-sampled to allow sufficient numbers for more detailed analysis. The groups that were over-sampled in this way were: regular formal volunteers; young people aged 16–24 (at the time of the Citizenship Survey interview); and those belonging to the PSA4 target groups, comprising those with limiting, long-term illnesses, those with no qualifications and BME respondents. The oversampling of BME respondents made use of the separate minority ethnic boost sample that the Citizenship Survey had employed. However, a potential disadvantage is the risk of bias in such a sample, as it did not include those who refused to take part in the Citizenship Survey or did not agree to be

¹ Mistakenly, the 4,511 respondents initially invited to participate in the survey were selected based on a previously answered question about doing “most of the shopping in the household”. Only respondents who indicated to do most of the shopping in their household were invited to participate in the survey. After 1,000 respondents filled out the survey, it closed for further participation. To correct for the selection error, a second group of 1,110 respondents (who had previously indicated to “not to do most of the shopping in the household”) were invited to participate on February 18 and 19. This resulted in another 195 responses, after which the survey was again closed for further participation.

re-contacted for future research. They could differ from respondents in terms of the key variables of interest, although it was anticipated that some types of bias could be corrected for using the information already available from the Citizenship Survey. Face-to-face briefings were held for interviewers working on the study from October to November 2006. Fieldwork ran from the end of October 2006 until the middle of February 2008, with the majority of areas finishing work by the end of January. In total, 2,705 people were interviewed for Helping Out. Of these, 2,156 were within the core sample and 549 were within the separate minority ethnic boost sample. Overall, 60% of the issued sample were interviewed, nearly all of which were full interviews. Forty per cent of the sample could not be interviewed, with 20% (half the non-responders) refusing an interview. Another 10% of the sample had moved and could not be traced to a new address. In the core sample, the response rate was 62%. This gave a base of 2,156 cases for analysis. The response among the minority ethnic boost sample was somewhat lower: 51% of the sample were interviewed. Data were weighted to incorporate or correct for: the pre-existing weighting structure used for the original 2005 Citizenship Survey sampling; differences in the characteristics between those agreeing and not agreeing to be recontacted; differences in the characteristics between those agreeing and not agreeing to be interviewed for the Helping Out study; and the over-sampling of certain groups carried out for the Helping Out study. (Excerpt from: Low et al., 2007: 12-13).

The Netherlands

For the data on the Netherlands, the third wave of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2005 is included in the IDP (GINPS05, 2006), conducted by the Center for Philanthropic Studies at the VU University in Amsterdam. The GINPS is a bi-annual longitudinal study on charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands, which started in 2001. Respondents for the first wave of GINPS (GINPS01, 2001) were randomly drawn from a pool of 72,000 respondents who regularly participate in survey research. The respondents in this large pool were included through a random sample drawn from population registers, and they were contacted through postal mail. Special attention was paid to avoid sample bias with regard to internet use due to stratification based on age, gender, and geographical region. Respondents without direct access to a computer were provided with one in exchange for participation in surveys.

In GINPS01, 1,964 respondents completed the questionnaire. For GINPS03, conducted in May 2004, 1,557 persons were requested to fill out a questionnaire on their households' donating behavior in 2003. 1,246 respondents participated in both GINPS01 and GINPS03. GINPS03 includes an additional sample of 70 fresh respondents. In total, 1,316 respondents (85 per cent of 1,557) completed the GINPS03 questionnaire, using Computer Assisted Self-Administered Interview procedures (CASI). For GINPS05, conducted in May 2006, 1,868 persons were questioned about their donating behavior in 2005 (of which 752 were new respondents). In total, 1,474 respondents (79 per cent) completed the GINPS05 questionnaire, using Computer Assisted Self-Administered Interview procedures (CASI). In GINPS01, an oversampling of 257 Protestants were included. In GINPS03, 168 of the respondents in this oversample were still included in the sample. In GINPS05, this number was reduced to 107. We have excluded the Protestant oversample from the analyses, resulting in a basis sample of 1,367 respondents in GINPS05, which is representative of the Dutch population after applying weights (excerpt from Wiepking & Bekkers., 2015: 219-220).

United States

The data on giving in the United States comes from the 2005 wave of the Philanthropy Panel Study (PPS; Wilhelm, Brown, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2005)². The PPS is a module in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID; Stafford et al., 2005), a genealogical longitudinal study begun in 1968. The original 1968 sample contained two sub-samples: 2,930 families from a nationally-representative sampling frame and 1,872 families from an over-sample of low-income families in the metropolitan North and the rural South. An immigrant refresher sample of 441 families was added in 1997. The PSID exerts considerable effort to mitigate attrition; it pays families \$60 per wave for participating, and sends them a regular newsletter. Also, there is extensive re-contact of families who have become non-response. As a result, the wave-to-wave response rate is 96% or higher. The PSID interviews participants using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing. The 2005 interview asks income and charitable giving questions about the 2004 calendar year. The study's unit of analysis is the 'Family Unit' defined to be a (a) legally married or cohabiting couple or (b) a single person, plus the persons (i) living together with (a) or (b) in the same house/apartment and (ii) living as family (being related by blood, marriage, or romantic relationship as well as being economically interdependent) (excerpt from Brown, Einolf, & Ottoni-Wilhelm, 2015: 52-53).

Canada

For data on demographic patterns of philanthropic giving in Canada, the 2004 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (CSGVP, 2004) is included in the IIPD. Since 1997, the survey has been conducted every three years³ by Statistics Canada and focuses on four key pro-social behaviors: giving to non-profit and charitable organizations, volunteering for such organizations, providing help to individuals outside the household without involving an organization, and participating as a member of a group or association. The 2004 cycle collected responses from 20,832 Canadians aged 15 and over. The survey was conducted using a Random Digit Dialling platform, with interviewers using a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview) application to collect responses. Respondents were weighted according to age and province to provide estimates that were more representative of the Canadian population (excerpt from Lasby & Barr, 2015: 33-34).

Norway

The data on Norway are from a stratified, representative population survey on giving and volunteering from 2009 based on telephone interviews conducted by Statistics Norway with 1,579 respondents aged 16–80 (response rate of 53 per cent). Added to the data is a weighed-in sub-sample of 359 respondents from Africa and Asia (first and second generation) that had been living at least 5 years in Norway (response rate of 36 per cent) (Wollebæk & Sivesind, 2010)⁴ (excerpt from Sivesind, 2015: 240).

Finland

For the data on Finland a telephone interview survey in 2008 in Finland is included in the IIPD. The group of respondents is representative of the Finnish population (aged 15 to 70), excluding the area of

² All waves of the PPS data are publicly available

(https://resources.oncourse.iu.edu/access/content/user/mowilhel/Web_page/data.htm).

³ The 2003 cycle of the survey was delayed until 2004 due to labor unrest at Statistics Canada.

⁴ See documentation of the survey in Norwegian: <http://sivilsamfunn.no/Prosjekter/Spoerreundersoekelse-om-frivillig-innsats>

Ahvenanmaa which is an autonomous, Swedish-speaking region of Finland. The questions used in the following analyses were a part of a larger survey, which was commissioned by Finland's Slot Machine Association. Their purpose was to provide insights on Finns' attitudes and activity in relation to helping others. The data should be referred to as "Auttaminen, RAY" (excerpt from Grönlund & Pessi, 2015: 163-164; Auttaminen, 2008).

Mexico

For the data on Mexico, the results of the first national public opinion survey on giving and volunteering in Mexico, the National Survey on Philanthropy and Civil Society (ENAFI, 2005), are included in the IIPD. Given the pioneering nature of the effort, the instrument went through vigorous revision and field-testing to assure that it reflected the Mexican context. The survey examines a range of topics related to philanthropic behavior, including: donations, volunteer work, and social capital (interpersonal and institutional trust, norms of reciprocity, and organizational membership and participation). The survey was designed by the Philanthropy and Civil Society Project at the Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico, a private university in Mexico City best known by the acronym, ITAM.

This survey was conducted twice, in February 2005 and November 2008, with a probability sample of 1,500 respondents each year. For the analyses we use only the data collected in February 2005. The interviews were conducted face-to-face rather than via telephone, which insures the inclusion of poorer households and heightens the representativeness of the results; the downside is the risk of socially desirable responses, a common effect when studying pro-social behavior (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2010). (A full discussion of the survey results in Spanish is available in Layton & Moreno, 2010) (excerpt from Layton & Mossel, 2015: 76-77).

South Korea

For the data on South Korea the data from Giving Korea in 2006 (The Beautiful Foundation, 2006) are included as the dataset covers diverse aspects of giving and volunteering and has the longest data collection history on giving and volunteering in South Korea since 2001. Giving Korea is a biennial cross-sectional study on charitable giving and volunteering in South Korea. Every two years, respondents are randomly drawn from residents in South Korea using multiple cluster sampling by a professional research organization. Individuals selected by the multiple clusters sampling method are contacted by professional interviewers. In the sample selection process by the professional research organization, special attention is given to ensure the representativeness of the sample by stratifying based on age, gender, education, economic and geographical characteristics, and others. More than 1,000 respondents complete the questionnaire by computer assisted face-to-face interview procedures (CASI) biennially. In 2006, 1,005 respondents of 19 years or older participated in the interview from July 10, 2006 to August 11, 2006 (excerpt from Kang, Yoonkyung Auh, & Younghye Hur, 2015: 437-438).

Japan

For the data on Japan the first wave of Japan Giving and Volunteering Study (Japan Fundraising Association, 2010) is included. Starting in 2010, JGVS is an annual longitudinal study on giving and volunteering in Japan. The survey is conducted nationwide, using an internet survey as the method of data collection. JGVS is intended to explicate the details of the types of giving that are less likely to be captured in existing statistics. It explores the breakdown of membership fee payments, which is a pool of money that

functions as donated money in many organizations but less likely to be perceived as giving. Respondents of the first wave of JGVS were randomly drawn from a pool of 13,892 monitors registered for the internet survey, and of those 5,322 completed the questionnaire. The number of eligible survey responses was 5,121, which were collected through a stratified random sampling by population size. The survey asks the respondents about their individual donating behavior in 2009 (excerpt from Okuyama & Yamauchi, 2015: 415).

Austria

For Austria, the data from a survey of the Austrian population conducted in 2008 is included (Neumayr & Schober, 2009). Funded by the Austrian Institute of Fundraising, this survey had the purpose to provide insights into philanthropic behavior. Similar and comparable studies on philanthropic giving in Austria took place in 2000, 2004, and 2011.

The sample for the study in 2008 comprises data of 1,019 respondents, with ages fourteen years and older. For this sample, addresses of households were randomly drawn from a register, and one adult member was interviewed within each selected household. The sample is representative of the Austrian population after applying weights regarding age, sex, federal state, and size of municipality. Data were collected using a standardized questionnaire with computer-assisted face-to-face interviews. The unit of analysis was individuals, and the questions referred to individuals' giving behavior in the period of the previous 12 months (between September 2007 and October 2008) (excerpt from Neumayr, 2015: 108-109).

Indonesia

The data that is included for Indonesia focuses mainly on giving to community causes and religious organizations: the fourth wave of the Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS4). Conducted in 2007 and 2008. This survey of 12,692 households is representative of about 83 percent of Indonesia's population (Strauss et. al 2009). Table 21.1 provides an overview of the household and community variables used in our analysis. The IFLS4 data is particularly well-suited to the study of giving. To our knowledge, there are few data sources (from developed or developing countries) that provide detailed evidence on giving to religious and secular organizations, as well as measures of trust. However, although IFLS has a panel structure, the religion and trust modules were only introduced in IFLS4. The IFLS4 study is a collaborative effort of RAND, the Center for Population and Policy Studies (CPPS) of the University of Gadjah Mada, and Survey METRE. The fieldwork took place between late November 2007 and the end of April 2008, with long distance tracking extending through the end of May 2008. The household members were asked whether and how much they contributed to community organizations (both religious and secular) in the past four weeks (excerpt from Osili & Ökten, 2015: 395-397).

Taiwan

For Taiwan, the data from the research project 'Taiwan Social Change Survey' (TSCS, 2009) is included in the IIPD. The data analyzed in this study are collected from the 2009 Questionnaire II in Phase 5, wave 5 Survey of the research project 'Taiwan Social Change Survey' (TSCS). The project was conducted by the Institute of Sociology of Academia Sinica, and sponsored by the National Science Council in Taiwan. The TSCS provides insight on long-term trends of social changes through national representative survey data on various topics. Beginning in 1985, this long-term cross-sectional survey has followed 5-year cycles, enabling researchers to understand social change in Taiwan from longitudinal perspectives. Topics covered

include: economic attitudes, family, political participation, national identity, social networks, mental health, religion, social problems, and globalization. With more than 80,000 face-to-face interviews completed over the past 22 years, the TSCS has become the largest survey series among all of the general social surveys in the world (excerpt from Lo & Wu, 2015: 463).

Ireland

For Ireland, the data from the Irish Household Budget Survey 2005 (HBS, 2005) which is carried out every five years by the Irish Central Statistics Office is included in the IIPD.⁵ Households in the survey are required to maintain a highly detailed diary of expenditure (total household levels) over a two-week survey period and figures in the final dataset are weekly averages.⁶ In addition to expenditure items, very detailed data on income and household demographics and characteristics are collected. Although the main purpose of the HBS is to determine the expenditure patterns of Irish households in order to identify and update the Irish Consumer Price Index, its size, scope, representativeness and availability make it an ideal source of data for numerous applications. With 6,884 households from throughout the Republic of Ireland in 2005, the survey is currently the largest and most nationally representative survey of expenditure, including how much a household gives to charity⁷ (excerpt from Breen & Carroll, 2015: 198-199).

Israel

For Israel, the survey of Israeli philanthropy (Giving, Volunteering and Organ Donations in Israel, GiVOD-IL) conducted in 2009 by the Israeli Center for Third Sector Research is included (Haski-Leventhal, Katz & Yogev-Keren, 2011). The giving module was second in the questionnaire (preceded by a volunteering module, and succeeded by organ donations module). This is the third wave of a long-term attempt to establish a longitudinal, nationally representative database of household philanthropy in Israel. Previous surveys were conducted in 1997 and 2006 (Shye et al., 2000; Katz, Levinson & Gidron, 2007). In 1997, 58 per cent of survey respondents reported donating to nonprofit organizations, and in 2006, 72 per cent of the adult Jewish population reported giving monetary and in-kind donations.⁸ With regards to the survey participants, a sample of 1,498 respondents completed a telephone survey in March of 2009. The sample was representative of the adult population over 18 years old in Israel, both Arab and Jewish. Sampling was

⁵ The survey took place between July 2004 and June 2005 but for ease of communication we will refer to the survey as the 'HBS 2005' henceforth. All HBS data is sourced from the Central Statistics Office HBS Microdata File, © Government of Ireland. For further details visit the Irish Social Science Data Archive at www.ucd.ie/issda/ (last accessed April 22, 2013).

⁶ The diaries are physically distributed by the HBS team to participating households and collected two weeks later. See, for example, the template diary in Central Statistics Office, Household Budget Survey 2010 – Volume 2 available at www.cso.ie/en/media/csoie/releasespublications/documents/housing/2010/full.pdf.

⁷ Household representativeness is ensured through the CSO weighting system that is included in the dataset.

⁸ These surveys also looked at informal giving, that is: giving preformed outside formal organizations to neighbors, beggars and so on. Informal giving was quite prevalent, amounting to 46% in 1997, 42% in 2006 and 43% in 2008.

layered by ethnicity and by age group. Response rate was 52 per cent (excerpt from Katz & Greenspan, 2015: 328-329).

Russia

For the data on Russia the survey conducted by CSCSNS NRU HSE is included in the IIPD (CSCSNS, 2010). The survey represents adult population of the Russian Federation and evaluates the level of individual donations. Household donation behavior was not examined. The method of face-to-face interviews was used. Results of the nationwide population survey conducted by the Centre for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector of NRU HSE in 2010. Data collection was conducted by the Public Opinion Foundation. The face-to-face interviews were conducted in 83 regions of the Russian Federation among the adult population (18 years and older). The sample size for each region was 500 respondents, totaling 41,500 for the country. The same general principles for building the sample were used in all regions. A three-stage stratified sampling of households was used. The selection of households took place in three stages. Administrative regions were selected in the first stage, towns and cities in the second, and households in the third. The margin of error for the Russian Federation was under 5.5 per cent. The margin of error each region was below one per cent.

Germany

For more detailed analyses of donors and their characteristics, one of the many surveys such as the Donation Monitor [Spendenmonitor] (TNS Infratest, 2011), the GfK CharityScope (Deutscher Spendenrat & GfK, 2013), the public survey of the DZI (Sommerfeld, 2009), or the 2010 survey for the German Socio Economic Panel Study (Socio-economic Panel, 2011) can be used. Because of its large size of about 20,000 respondents each year and the extensive list of variables, the German Socio Economic Panel Study collected in 2010 that asked respondents about their donation behavior in the year 2009 is included in the IIPD. The annual study of people living in Germany started in 1984 (Wagner et al., 2007).

Respondents were mostly interviewed face-to-face with a pen and pencil survey (Wagner et al., 2007) and all questions regarding donations were asked on an individual level, meaning they asked for personal donations rather than combined household donations. There are two separate questions regarding donations: the first one measures the incidence of giving, and the second measures the exact amount donated in 2009. Unfortunately, only total amount of donations were asked, and respondents did not further specify to which nonprofit subsector the money was given. Because some of the items we used were asked in previous waves of the annual survey, we pulled an unbalanced sample of the years 2010, 2009, 2008, and 2007 with all age groups included. The complete unbalanced sample is made up of 25,456 respondents. We find 16,819 valid responses, 1,946 'does not apply', 93 'no answer', and 6,598 missing responses to the question of whether the respondent donated in 2009. The amount donated was given by 6,961 respondents, with 11,766 'does not apply', which includes non-donors of the previous question, 131 'no answer' and 6,598 missing responses. In order to make the dataset usable for this study, we recode 'does not apply' to equal an amount donated of zero Euros, if the respondent indicated that he did not make a donation in 2009 in the first question. Thereafter, the amounts were adjusted to equal 2012 US dollars to make them comparable to the other countries of this study. Because of oversampling of some groups, such as people of immigrant backgrounds and high income individuals (for detailed description of sampling procedures of the last 20 years see Wagner et al., 2007), the sample is not representative without applying weights or using expansion factors, which we did but only in the following descriptive part of this chapter (excerpt from Mews & Boenigk, 180-181).

Switzerland

For Switzerland, a study called “Freiwilligenmonitor 2007” is included in the IIPD (Stadelmann-Steffen et al., 2007). The purpose of the study was to get for the first time a representative overview of voluntary engagement (time and money) of people living in Switzerland. The data was gathered between September and November 2006 through computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI) by DemoSCOPE. The study was repeated in 2009 leading to the publication, “Freiwilligenmonitor 2010” (Stadelmann-Steffen, Traummüller, Gundelach, & Freitag, 2010). For reasons of comparability with other countries in this volume the data set from 2006 is used.

The study population included all Swiss residents who either speak German, French or Italian, who are over 15 years old and live in households with registered telephone landline. Selection followed a disproportional stratified random sampling procedure. Households were drawn randomly from the Swisscom telephone directory. A letter asking for participation in the study was sent before calling the households. Target persons were selected by the birthday method when interviewers reached the household (random-random method). In total 7410 valid interviews were conducted (58.7 per cent response rate). For the logistic regression we use a post stratification weight variable that corrects for different selection probabilities in respect to cantons and household size. It also extrapolates the sample with respects to age, nationality, gender and education to the Swiss resident population parameters (excerpt from von Schnurbein & Bethmann, 2015: 275-276).

Data user agreement

Researchers using the IIPD agree to:

1. Only use the Individual International Philanthropy Database to work on an academic (and not commercial) research project. The main intended outcome of any project using the IIPD should be an academic journal article publication. For other outcomes, please consult with Pamala Wiepking and Femida Handy.
2. Mention all data contributors in the acknowledgements of any publication with the IIPD: Pamala Wiepking, Femida Handy, Sohyun Park, René Bekkers, Steffen Bethman, Oonagh Breen, Beth Breeze, Chris Einolf, Zbignev Gricevic, Chulhee Kang, Hagai Katz, Michael D. Layton, Kuang-Ta Lo, Michaela Neumayr, Irina Mersianova, Una Osili, Anne Birgitta Pessi, Karl-Henrik Sivesind, Wendy Scaife, Arjen de Wit, Zhang Xiulan, Naoto Yamauchi
3. Cite this document to give full information on the included datasets:
Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (2016). Documentation Individual International Philanthropy Database (IIPD). A Comparative Study of Global Giving. 19 country IIPD. Version 1. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Erasmus University Rotterdam.
4. Register with the following data registration agencies: Australia, Canada, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Taiwan, United Kingdom and Naoto Yamauchi for Japan. Instructions included in Appendix C. Without registration use of these country data is not permitted.
5. Provide an IPD license agreement (see appendix D), signed by all co-authors (one form per co-author). The IPD license agreement includes a short abstract of the project to be undertaken with the IPD, including (initial) research question, (concept) hypotheses and analytical methods. Please also let us know the expected target audience (journal/discipline). We will share this information with anyone interested in working with the IPD in the future, so that overlap between projects can be avoided.
6. It is not permitted to share the IIPD with other researchers not included on the licence agreement. It is also not permitted to store the IIPD in environments without sufficient data protection, such as dropbox.

The IIPD will be shared after receiving the IIPD license agreement (see appendix D, signed by all co-authors (one form per co-author)).

User files

Questionnaire modules

Country datasets consists of 4 modules:

- (1) Philanthropic giving
- (2) Socio-demographic background: age, education, gender, marital status, income, religious denomination
- (3) Trust
- (4) Additional variables

Variable names

Variable names in the user data files are composed of a country prefix. Table 3 presents the country abbreviations, prefix and country number.

Table 3 Country abbreviations, prefix and country number

Country	Abbreviation	Prefix	Country number	Datafiles
Australia	AU	a	1	au-merge_1212
France	FR	b	2	fr-merge_1212
United Kingdom	UK	c	3	uk-merge_0404
Netherlands	NL	d	4	nl-merge_1212
United States	US	e	5	us-merge_0208
Canada	CA	f	6	ca-merge_0404
Norway	NO	g	7	no_merge_1212
Finland	FI	h	8	fi-merge_0229
Mexico	MX	i	9	mx-merge_1212
South Korea	KR	j	10	sk-merge_1212
Japan	JP	k	11	jp-merge_0629
Austria	AT	l	12	at-merge_1202
Indonesia	ID	q	13	in-merge_0310
Taiwan	TW	r	14	tw-merge_0411
Ireland	IE	s	15	ir-merge_0502
Israel	IL	t	16	is-merge_1802
China ¹	CN	u	17	ch-merge_0408
Russia	RU	v	18	ru-merge_0202
Germany	DE	w	19	ge-merge_0418
Switzerland	CH	y	20	sw-merge_0125

¹ The data for China are not publicly available, but synchronized during the project.

For instance, the variable name for marital status (married) in the German dataset (w) is: **wmarried**

Country prefix	Variable name
w	married

Weighting

In the current version of the IIPD (2016) the weight variables have not been synchronized.

References

- Auttaminen (2008). *Auttaminen*. [machine-readable datafile]. Pessi, Anne-Birgitta, Grönlund, Henrietta. [principle investigators]. Helsinki: University of Helsinki [distributor].
- Breen, O.B. & Carroll, J. (2015). Chapter 10. Giving in Ireland: A Nation of Givers in a Largely Unregulated Arena. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Breeze, B., & Halfpenny, P., & Wilding, K. (2015). Giving in the UK: Philanthropy Embedded in a Welfare State Society In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillanMcMillan.
- Brown, E., Einolf, C., & Ottoni-Wilhelm, M. (2015). Chapter 2. Giving in the United States: Generous Philanthropy in a Classic Liberal Regime. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- CSCSNS. (2010). *Population survey*. Moscow, Russia: Centre for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector of the National Research University Higher School of Economics.
- CSGVP (2004). *Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating 2004*. Toronto, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Deutscher Spendenrat & GfK (2013) (Eds.). *Bilanz des Helfens 2013 [Record of Helping 2013]*. Retrieved, 2013, from <http://www.spendenrat.de/download.php?f=9fedafe910992ce219fa31f8ac65654a>.
- ENAFI. (2005). *Encuesta Nacional De Filantropía (ENAFI) [National Survey on Philanthropy] 2005*. Project on Philanthropy and Civil Society. Mexico: ITAM. More information at www.filantropia.itam.mx.
- Federal Ministry of Family, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (2013). *Hauptbericht des Freiwilligensurveys 2009 [Main Report of the Volunteer Survey 2009]*. Retrieved September 4, 2013, from www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/3_20Freiwilligensurvey-Hauptbericht.property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf.
- Gautier, A., Pache, A., & Mossel, V. (2015). Chapter 7. Giving in France: A philanthropic Renewal After Decades of Distrust. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- GINPS01 (2001). *Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2001*. [computer file]. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: VU University Amsterdam.
- GINPS05 (2006). *Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2005*. [machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, Pamala, Bekkers, René, Schuyt, Theo N.M., Gouwenberg, Barbara M. [principle investigator(s)]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].

- GINPS08. (2008). Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2008. [machine-readable data file]. Bekkers, René; Schuyt, Theo N.M.; Gouwenberg, Barbara M., Wiepking, Pamala [principle investigators]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].
- Giving France. (2009). *Giving France*. [machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, Pamala [principle investigator]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].
- Grönlund, H., & Pessi, A.B. (2015). Chapter 8. Giving in Finland: The Multidimensional Role of Giving in a Context of a Changing Welfare. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- HBS. (2005). Household Budget Survey, 2005. [dataset]. Dublin, Ireland: Irish Social Science Data Archive. Accessed via the Irish Social Science Data Archive - www.ucd.ie/issda.
- Haski-Leventhal, Debbie, Katz, Hagai & Yogev-Keren, Hila, (2011). *Philanthropy in Israel 2008: Pattern of Volunteering, Giving and Organ Donations*. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israeli Center for Third Sector Research.
- Japan Fundraising Association. (2010). *KifuHakusho 2010* [Giving Japan 2010]. Tokyo, Japan: Nihon Keidanren Suppan.
- Kang, C., Yoonkyung Auh, E., & Hur, Y. (2015). Chapter 23. Giving in South Korea: A Nation of Givers for the Population Under Public Assistance. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Katz, H. & Greenspan, I. (2015). Chapter 17. Giving in Israel: From Old Religious Traditions To an Emerging Culture of Philanthropy. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Katz, H., Levinson, E. & Gidron, B. (2007). *Philanthropy in Israel 2006: Pattern of giving and volunteering of the Israeli public*. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israeli Center for Third Sector Research.
- Lasby, B., & Barr, C. (2015). Chapter 1. Giving in Canada: Strong Philanthropic Traditions Supporting a Large Nonprofit Sector. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Layton, M.D., & Moreno, A. (2010). *Filantropía y sociedad civil en México. Análisis de la ENAFI 2005-2008* [Philanthropy and civil society in Mexico: An analysis of the ENAFI 2005-2008]. Mexico City: Miguel Angel Porrua.
- Layton, M., & Mossel, V. (2015). Chapter 3. Giving in Mexico: Generosity, Distrust and Informality. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Lo, K. & Wu, S (2015). Chapter 24. Giving in Taiwan: On the Rise Following Economic Growth and Political Democratization. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Low, N., Butt, S., Ellis, P., & Davis Smith, J. (2007). Helping Out: A national survey of volunteering and charitable giving. Available at: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/2547/1/Helping%20Out.pdf>.
- Lyons, M. & Passey, A. (2007). *Giving Australia, Individual and Household Survey, 2005*. Sydney, Australia: University of Technology.
- Mersianova, I., Jakobson, L., & Krasnopolskaya, I. (2015). Chapter 13. Giving in Russia: The Difficult Shaping of the New Nonprofit Regime. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.

- Meng, Z., Peng, J., & Liu, Y. (Eds.). (2012). *Zhongguo cishan juanzhu baogao* (2011) [Survey of Philanthropic Behavior in China 2011]. Beijing: China Society Press.
- Mews, M. & Boenigk, S. (2015). Chapter 9. Giving in Germany: Towards Systematic Information on a Fragmented Nonprofit Sector. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Neumayr, M. (2015). Chapter 5. Giving in Austria: A Corporatist Relationship Between the Nonprofit Sector and the State. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy* (p. 8). Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Neumayr, M., & Schober, C. (2009). Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Bevölkerungsbefragung zum Spendenverhalten in Österreich [Findings on giving in Austria from a representative population survey]. Vienna, Austria: Vienna University of Economics and Business.
- Okuyama, N., & Yamauchi, N. (2015). Chapter 22 Giving in Japan: The Role of Philanthropy in Strengthening Civil Society. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Osili, O. & Ökten, Ç. (2015). Chapter 21. Giving in Indonesia: A Culture of Philanthropy Rooted in Islamic Tradition. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Paul-Ehrlich-Institute (2013) (Ed.). Berichte nach § 21 Transfusionsgesetz (TFG) [Reports from the § 21 Transfusionact], from <http://www.pei.de/DE/infos/meldepflichtige/meldung-blutprodukte-21-transfusionsgesetz/berichte/berichte-21tfg-node.html>.
- Salamon, L.M., Sokolowski, S.W. & List, R. (2003). Global civil society: An overview. *The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project*.
- Scaife, W., McDonald, K., Williamson, A., & Mossel, V. (2015). Chapter 26. Giving in Australia: Philanthropic Potential Beginning to Be Realized. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Shye, S., Lazar, A., Duchin R. & Gidron, B. (2000). *Philanthropy in Israel: Patterns of giving and volunteering of the Israeli public*. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israeli Center for Third Sector Research.
- Sivesind, K. (2015). Chapter 12. Giving in Norway: An Ambitious Welfare State With a Self-Reliant Nonprofit Sector. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Socio-economic Panel (SOEP). (2011). Data for years 1984 - 2010. Doi: 10.5684/soep.v27.
- Sommerfeld, J. (2009). Evaluierung von Auswirkungen des Gesetzes zur weiteren Stärkung des bürgerschaftlichen Engagements. Empirische Untersuchung der Entwicklungen im Regelungsbereich, insbesondere zum Spendenaufkommen. Berlin: Deutsches Zentralinstitut für soziale Fragen im Auftrag des Bundesministerium für Finanzen.
- Stadelmann-Steffen, I., Freitag, M. & Bühlmann, M. (2007). *Freiwilligenmonitor 2007*. Zürich, Switzerland: Seismo.
- Stafford, F.P., Schoeni, R.F., Eccles, J.S., McGonagle, K., Yeung, W.J.J., & Wallace, R.B. (2005). *The Panel Study of Income Dynamics* (Wave XXXIV) [machine-readable data file]. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Strauss, J., Witoelar, F., Sikoki, B., & Wattie, A.M. (2009). *The Fourth Wave of the Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS4): Overview and Field Report*. WR-675/1-NIA/NICHD.

- The Beautiful Foundation. (2006). *Giving Korea 2006*. Seoul, Korea: The Beautiful Foundation.
- TNS Infratest (2011) (Ed.). Deutscher Spendenmonitor 2011 [German Donation Monitor 2011], Retrieved September 4, 2013, from http://www.tns-infratest.com/presse/pdf/Presse/TNS_Infratest_Deutscher_Spendenmonitor_2011.pdf.
- TSCS. (2009). Taiwan Social Change Survey. Questionnaire II, phase 5, wave 5. Taipei, Taiwan: Center for Survey Research, Academia Sinica.
- von Schnurbein, G. & Bethmann, S. (2015). Chapter 14. Giving in Switzerland: High Engagement and International Outreach. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.
- Wagner, G. G., Frick, J. R., & Schupp, J. (2007). The German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) – Scope, Evolution and Enhancements. *Schmollers Jahrbuch: Journal of Applied Social Science Studies*, 127(1), 139-169.
- Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2015). Chapter 11. Giving in the Netherlands: A Strong Welfare State with a Vibrant Nonprofit Sector. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Research Companion to Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave McMillan.
- Wilhelm, M. O., Brown, E., Rooney, P. M., & Steinberg, R. (2005). *The Center on Philanthropy Panel Study* [Data file]. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Wollebæk, D., & Sivesind, K. H. (2010). *Fra folkebevegelse til filantropi? Frivillig innsats i Norge 1997-2009 [From popular movement to philanthropy? Volunteering in Norway 1997-2009]*. Oslo, Norway: Senter for forskning på sivilsamfunn og frivillig sektor.
- Xinsong, W., Fengqin, L., Fang, N., Xiaoping, Z., & Xiulan, Zhang (2015). Chapter 19. Giving in China: An Emerging Nonprofit Sector Embedded within a Strong State. In P. Wiepking and F. Handy (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Hampshire, UK: PalgraveMcMillan.

VARIABLES IN THE INDIVIDUAL INTERNATIONAL PHILANTHROPY DATABASE DATASET

Table 5 Description variables

Variable name	Description	Answer categories
Module 1: philanthropic giving		
idont	Incidence of giving	0 No 1 Yes
adont	Total amount donated in U.S. dollars	0 – highest donations
adontln	Natural log total amount donated	0 – natural log (total amount donated +1)
idonr	Incidence of giving to religious organizations	0 No 1 Yes
adonr	Total amount donated to religious organizations	0 – highest donations
adonrln	Natural log total amount religious giving	0 – natural log (total amount donated to secular organization + 1)
idons	Incidence of giving to secular organizations	0 No 1 Yes
adons	Total amount donated to secular organizations	0 – highest donations
adonsln	Natural log total amount secular giving	0 – natural log (total amount donated to secular organization + 1)
Module 2: socio-demographic background		
age	Age in years	Lowest age – highest age
ageu35	Aged under 35 (up until 34)	0 No 1 Yes
age3565	Aged between 35 and 65 (up and until 64)	0 No 1 Yes
ageo65	Aged 65 and over	0 No 1 Yes

educ	Educational level in three categories	1 (less than) Primary educational level 2 Secondary educational level completed 3 Tertiary educational level completed
educt31	(less than) primary educational level completed	0 No 1 Yes
educt32	Secondary educational level completed	0 No 1 Yes
educt33	Tertiary educational level completed	0 No 1 Yes
male	Male	0 No 1 Yes
married	Married	0 No 1 Yes
income	After tax household income in 2012 U.S. dollar/10,000	0 – highest income
home	Home owner	0 No 1 Yes
religious	Religiously affiliated	0 No 1 Yes
romcat	Affiliated with Roman Catholic Church	0 No 1 Yes
prot	Affiliated with Protestant church	0 No 1 Yes
angl	Affiliated with Anglican/Church of England	0 No 1 Yes
muslim	Affiliated with Islam	0 No 1 Yes
hinduism	Affiliated with Hinduism	0 No 1 Yes
buddhism	Affiliated with Buddhism	0 No 1 Yes
taoism	Affiliated with Taoism	0 No 1 Yes
folk	Affiliated with folk beliefs	0 No 1 Yes
othrel	Affiliated with other religion	0 No

		1 Yes
relatt	Religious attendance in times per month	0 – 30
Module 3: trust		
trust	Generalized social trust; rescaled to continuous measure with 1=high generalized trust	0..1
Module 4: additional variables		
weight	Weight factor to make data representative of country population	n.a.
country	Country number in study	1 - 20

Table 6

Overview variables in the Individual International Philanthropy Database

Variable name	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Module 1:																				
<u>philanthropic giving</u>																				
idont	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
adont	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
adontln	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
idonr	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
adonr	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X					
adonrln	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X					
idons	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
adons	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X					
adonsln	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X					
Module 2:																				
<u>socio-demographic background</u>																				
age	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
ageu35	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
age3565	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
ageo65	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
educ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X			X
educt31	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
educt32	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
educt33	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X

male	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
married	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
income	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
home		x	x	x	x	x			x	x		x	x	x		x	x
religious	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x		x	x
romcat	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x				x
prot	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x				x
othrel	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x				x
angl																	
muslim													x				
hinduism													x	x			
buddhism																	
taoism														x			
folk														x			
relatt	x	x		x	x	x	x		x			x		x		x	
Module 3: trust																	
trust	x	x		x		x	x		x	x			x	x		x	
Module 4: additional variables																	
weight				x	x	x				x		x		x	x		x
country number	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
outlier																	

Table 7 Description variables idons and adons (incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations) and idonr and adonr (incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations)

Country	idons and idonr	adons and adonr	Description
Answer category	0 No 1 Yes	Amount donated in 2012 US dollar	
AU	aidons	aadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) youth and children organizations, (2) food security organizations, (3) health organizations, (4) neighborhood and community organizations, (5) women’s organizations, (6) environment and animal protection organizations, (7) culture, recreation, arts and sports organizations (8) donated to other organizations.
	aidonr	aadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations.
FR	bidons	badons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to organizations active in (1) civic rights & advocacy, (2) culture, arts & humanities, (3) education and research, (4) health, (5) international assistance, (6) environment & animals, (7) social services, (8) sports & recreation, (9) other causes.
	bidonr	badonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations.
UK	cidons	caadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) education, (2) children, (3) sports, (4) religion, (5) elderly, (6) overseas aid, (7) medical, (8) hospitals, (9) health care, (10) disabled, (11) social welfare, (12) conservation, (13) animals, (14) arts, (15) hobbies, (16) other
	cidonr	cadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i>

			Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations.
NL	didons	dadons	<p><i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) religious causes, (2) health, (3) international relief, (4) nature, environment and animals, (5) education and research, (6) culture and arts, (7) sports and recreation, (8) public and social benefits, (9) other causes, (10) tsunami.</p>
	didonr	dadonr	<p><i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations.</p>
US	eidons	eadons	<p><i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) youth and family services, (2) environment and animals, (3) combined purposes, (4) basic needs, (5) health and medical research, (7) education, (8) culture, art and ethnic, (9) neighborhoods and community improvement, (10) international relief and peace, (11) tsunami relief, and (12) other purposes.</p>
	eidonr	eadonr	<p><i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious congregations.</p>
CA	fidons	fadons	<p><i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) culture and recreation, (2) education and research, (3) health, (4) social services, (5) environment, (6) development & housing, (7) law, advocacy and politics. (8) philanthropic intermediaries, voluntarism, (9) international, (10) religion, (11) business, professional associations, unions, (12) universities & colleges, (13) business, professional associations & unions and (14) other.</p>
	fidonr	fadonr	<p><i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations.</p>
NO	gidons	gadons	<p><i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) health, nursing, and emergency services, (2) social services and alcohol or drug addict rehabilitation and (3) international relief.</p>

	gidonr	gadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religion and life stance
FI	hidons	hadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) veterans, (2) international emergency relief, (3) children (Unicef Plan, World Vision etc (4) Salvation Army's Christmas Fundraising, (5) Fundraising for nature, for example WWF, Greenpeace, the Finnish association for Nature Concervation , (6) social causes (mental health patients etc.), (7) local fundraising such as schools, Lions, Rotary and (8) other causes.
	hidonr	hadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> -
MX	iidons	iadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) educational and schools, (2) ecological organizations and animal protection, (3) health, (4) elderly, (5) humanitarian organizations, (6) youth groups and clubs, (7) cultural and artistic organizations, (8) natural disaster relief, (9) other.
	iidonr	iadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) church, (2) almsgiving when attending Mass.
KR	jidons	jadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) charitable organizations (2) international aid, (3) educational organizations, (4) medical organizations, (5) art or cultural organizations, (6) environmental or animal organizations, NGO's, (7) public organizations or community, (8) relatives, friends or neighbors, (9) strangers, (10) political parties, elections or politicians (11) other causes

	jidonr	jadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) alms through religious organizations, (2) religious organizations
JP	kidons	kadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations.
	kidonr	ladonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious causes.
AT	lidons	ladons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to organization and activities in the fields of (1) animal protection, (2) environmental protection, (3) development aid, (4) handicapped people, (5) kids and youth, (6) elderly, (7) asylum seekers, refugees, (8) addicted people, (9) homeless, (10) poor people, (11) art and culture, (12) sports and recreation, (13) education, (14) research, (15) hospitals, (16) human rights, (17) international relief, (18) national relief, (19) politics.
	lidonr	ladonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to organization to religious causes.
ID	qidons	qadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations
	qidonr	qadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations
TW	ridons	radons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations
	ridonr	radonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations

IE	sidons	sadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations
	sidonr	sadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations
IL	tidons	tadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) children & youth organizations, (2) food security, (3) health, (4) community & neighborhood (5) women, (6) nature, environment & animals, (7) culture, arts, sports & recreation, and (8) other.
	tidonr	tadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious causes.
CN	uidons	uadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to (1) education, (2) environmental protection, (3) culture/sports/recreation, (4) health, (5) disaster relief, (6) poverty alleviation, (7) help for the disabled and elderly and (8) other causes.
	uidonr	uadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious causes.
RU	vidons	vadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to secular organizations
	vidonr	vadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> Incidence and amount of giving to religious organizations
DE	widons	wadons	<i>Secular organizations:</i> 9999999
	widonr	wadonr	<i>Religious organizations:</i> 9999999

Notes: the total incidence of giving (idont) indicates whether a respondent made any donation, either to secular or religious causes. The total amount donated (adont) is the sum of the amount donated to religious (adonr) and secular (adons) organizations.

DESCRIPTIVES PER COUNTRY

The tables below show the descriptives per country. From every country the unweighted descriptives are reported. 999999 indicates missing values.

Descriptives module I: philanthropic giving

Table 8 Descriptives idont (incidence of total giving in percentages)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	12.4	33.9	4.6	5.9	34.8	11.2	34.1	27.5	16.6	22.3
1 Yes	87.6	66.1	95.4	94.1	65.2	88.8	65.9	72.5	83.4	77.7
N valid	6209	1195	2156	1367	7251	20832	1937	967	2990	1005
N missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0

Table 8 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	65.3	34.0	51.2	36.1	37.7	33.6	47.4	48.7	57.8	21.2
1 Yes	34.7	66.0	48.8	63.9	62.3	66.4	52.6	51.3	42.2	78.8
N valid	5121	1019	10515	1927	6884	1466	5352	41500	16819	7410
N missing	0	0	6	0	0	32	0	0	286	0

Table 9a Descriptives adont (amount donated of total giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	539.1	165.6	1208.4	338.3	1553.9	414.2	266.7	27.3	28.8	201.5
Median	155.0	47.5	464.1	101.7	254.4	110.3	53.7	12.8	8.1	21.9
Minimum	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	114052.4	3717.6	136495	7859.2	119992.1	57073	18499	85.5	1359.7	10445.4
N Valid	6209	1195	1811	1376	7251	20832	1937	967	2990	1005
N missing	0	0	345	0	0	0	0	33	0	0

Table 9a continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	56.8	66.2	201.3	186.6	574.3	963.26	22.2	17.8	152.0	532.5
Median	0	15.0	0	28.8	211.3	0	3.0	0	0	179.8
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	19758.42	4100.1	193800	12787.1	33445.3	5868622.2	7609.1	16050	37084.2	11237.5
N Valid	5121	1019	10515	1881	6884	966	5352	32793	16688	7075
N missing	0	0	6	46	0	532	0	8707	417	335

Table 9b Descriptives adont (conditional amount donated of total giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI*	MX	SK
Mean	615.5	250	1278.3	359.3	2384.2	466.3	404.9	37.6	34.5	259.2
Median	210.7	136	518.7	112.6	872.9	142.9	138.2	29.9	13.5	57.4
Minimum	1.2	3	5.5	1.6	1.2	0.96	0.2	0	2.7	0
Maximum	114052.4	3717.6	136495	7859.2	119992.1	57073	18499	85.5	1359.7	10445.4
N Valid	5438	790	1712	1287	4726	18505	1276	701	1495	781
N Missing	0	0	345	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9b continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	163.5	100.2	412.5	296.15	921.6	1969.4	42.2	46.2	364.4	684.1
Median	12.8	45.1	20.6	63.9	538	234.7	18.3	9.6	148.3	179.8
Minimum	0.01	0.00	0.15	0.48	3.1	4.4	0.15	0.1	1.48	45.0
Maximum	19758.4	4100.1	193800	12787.2	33445.3	5868622.2	7609.1	16050.0	37084.2	11237.5
N Valid	1778	673	5132	1184	4290	473	2815	12578	6961	5507
N Missing	0	0	0	46	0	500	0	8707	131	335

Table 10 Descriptives idonr (incidence of total religious giving in percentages)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	72.7	86.5	70.5	63.1	56.4	56.5	86.1	999999	28	70.2

1 Yes	27.3	13.5	29.5	36.9	43.6	43.5	13.9	999999	72	29.8
N Valid	6209	1195	2152	1367	7251	20832	1937	0	2990	1005
N Missing	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 10 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	95.7	78.5	67.5	44.9	49.9	78.8	99.3	999999	999999	65.5
1 Yes	4.3	21.5	32.5	55.1	50.1	21.2	0.7	999999	999999	34.5
N Valid	5121	1019	10515	1927	6884	1466	5352	0	0	7410
N missing	0	0	6	0	0	32	0	41500	17105	0

Table 11 Descriptives adonr (amount donated of total religious giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	187.4	21.9	999999	145.4	983.8	202	80.6	999999	10	136.6
Median	0.00	0	999999	0	0	0	0	999999	2.7	0
Minimum	0.00	0	999999	0	0	0	0	999999	0	0
Maximum	61985	2713.6	999999	7820.1	119992.1	28766.6	16887	999999	187.3	10445.4
N valid	6209	1195	0	1367	7251	20832	1937	0	2990	1005
N missing	0	0	2156	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 11 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	25.3	999999	157.8	116.4	327.8	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Median	0	999999	0	6.4	14.9	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Minimum	0	999999	0	0	0	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Maximum	18596.2	999999	146914.7	12787.1	9967.6	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
N Valid	5121	0	10515	1890	6884	0	0	0	0	0
N Missing		1019	6	37	0	1498	5352	41500	17105	7410

Table 12 Descriptives adonr (conditional amount donated of total religious giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	685.3	162	999999	393.6	2256.7	463	577.9	999999	13.9	459.1
Median	247.9	67.8	999999	101.7	839.9	119.9	92.1	999999	5.4	146.2
Minimum	0.37	1.36	999999	1.56	1.20	0.96	4.6	999999	1.7	0
Maximum	61985.0	2713.6	999999	7820	119992.1	28766.6	16887	999999	187.3	10445.4
N Valid	1698	161	0	505	3161	9071	270	0	2151	299
N Missing	?	0	635	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 12 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	583.9	999999	485.9	214.9	327.8	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Median	58.1	999999	14.7	63.9	14.92	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Minimum	0.12	999999	0.01	3.2	0.00	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
maximum	18596.2	999999	146914.7	12787.1	9967.6	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
N Valid	222	0	3415	1024	3448	0	0	0	0	0
N Missing	0	219	0	37	0	311	37	41500	17105	2553

Table 13 Descriptives idons (incidence of total secular giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	14.1	35.9	11.6	6.6	43.7	14.7	36.5	999999	40.9	28.8
1 Yes	85.9	64.1	88.4	93.4	56.3	85.3	63.5	999999	59.1	71.2
N Valid	6209	1195	2152	1367	7251	20832	1937	0	2990	1005
N Missing	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 13 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	68	42.2	67.5	73.2	66.1	35.9	48.1	999999	999999	25.1
1 Yes	32	57.8	32.5	26.8	33.9	64.1	51.9	999999	999999	74.9
N Valid	5121	1019	10515	1927	6884	1466	5270	0	0	7410
N Missing	0	0	6	0	0	32	82	41500	17105	0

Table 14a Descriptives adons (amount donated of total secular giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	351.7	143.69	999999	192.9	570.2	212.2	186.2	999999	18.74	64.9
Median	124.0	40.704	999999	78.2	48.0	57.5	46.1	999999	2.7	10.4
Minimum	0.00	0	999999	0	0	0	0	999999	0	0
Maximum	114052.4	3717.6	999999	5059.6	60236.0	57073	15720.3	999999	1172	5233.2
N valid	6209	1195	0	1367	7251	20832	1937	0	2990	1005
N Missing	0	0	2156	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 14a continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	31.5	999999	43.5	68.9	246.6	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Median	0	999999	0	0	0	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999

Minimum	0	999999	0	0	0	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Maximum	12552.4	999999	146900	9590.3	32750.3	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
N Valid	5121	1019	10515	1910	6884	0	0	0	0	0
N Missing	0	0	6	17	0	1498	5352	41500	17105	7410

Table 14b Descriptives adons (conditional amount donated of total secular giving)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	409.3	224.2	999999	206.5	1013.3	248.8	293.2	999999	31.7	91.0
Median	148.8	112.1	999999	86	360	81.5	122.8	999999	28.7	21.4
Minimum	0.02	2.7	999999	1.6	1.20	0.96	0.2	999999	2.7	0
Maximum	114052.4	3717.6	999999	5059.6	60236.0	57073	15720.3	999999	1172.4	5233.2
N valid	5335	766	0	1277	4080	17766	1230	0	1767	716
N Missing	0	0	1902	0	0	0	0	1000	0	0

Table 14b continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	1637	999999	133.0	263.2	727.2	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Median	11.6	999999	14.7	63.9	380.9	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999

Minimum	0.01	999999	0.01	0.32	3.14	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
Maximum	12552.4	999999	146900	9590.3	32750	999999	999999	999999	999999	999999
N Valid	1637	0	3416	500	2334	0	0	0	0	0
N Missing	0	589	0	17	0	939	2733	41500	17105	5552

Descriptives Module II: Socio-demographic background

Table 15 Descriptives age

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
age (mean)	47.9	46.2	49.2	46.8	44.1	46.3	42.5	44.6	39.8	41.1
ageu35	12.4	28.1	21.1	27.9	32.2	28.3	36.5	36.2	43.5	33.1
age3565	71.4	56.0	60.4	56	56.2	54.6	52.7	45.9	47.4	63.9
ageo65	16.2	15.9	18.5	16.1	11.6	17.1	10.8	17.9	9.1	3.0
N Valid	6209	1195	2156	1367	7251	20832	1937	1000	2990	1005
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 15 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Age	48.2	43.9	41.8	46.3	50.6	42.2	47.9	43.8	49.2	47.7
Ageu35	17.3	34.3	35.6	29.1	16.7	41.0	18.7	64.7	23.6	24.4
Age3565	74.1	54.0	57.6	55.3	62.3	45.6	66.6	35.3	52.6	56.0
Ageo65	8.7	11.7	6.9	15.6	21.3	13.4	14.7	51.6	23.8	19.6
N valid	5121	1019	10521	1927	6884	1477	5309	41500	17105	7410

N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	21	43	0	0	0
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---

Table 16 Descriptives education

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
educt31	27.8	33.6	33.4	31.6	17.7	17.3	40.1	27.4	43.7	6.0
educt32	24.6	45.1	34.4	41.6	59.2	59.4	28.4	35.3	43	50.5
educt33	47.6	21.3	32.2	26.7	23.2	23.3	31.5	37.2	13.3	43.5
N valid	6175	1195	2156	1367	7251	19486	1937	1000	2990	1001
N Missing	34	0	0	0	0	1346	0	0	0	4

Table 16 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Educt31	13.2	13.8	48.5	20.6	22.3	10.4	10.0	33.2	38.2	15.7
Educt32	31.4	78.8	41.9	39.1	49.6	47.1	57.6	50.3	38.9	33.6
Educt33	55.4	7.4	8.6	40.3	28.1	42.5	32.4	16.5	22.9	28.8
N Valid	5072	1019	10521	1927	6884	1447	5304	41479	16525	7333
N Missing	49	0	0	0	0	51	48	215	580	77

Table 17 Descriptives male

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	61.8	56.4	54.3	52.3	61.7	57.8	49.7	50	46.8	50.7
1 Yes	38.2	43.6	45.7	47.7	38.3	42.2	50.3	50	53.2	49.3
N valid	6209	1195	2156	1367	7251	20832	1937	1000	2990	1005
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 17 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	45.0	52.4	16.1	49.0	40.1	55.3	48.8	54.7	52.3	59.6
1 Yes	55.0	47.6	83.9	51.0	59.9	44.7	51.2	45.3	47.7	40.4
N Valid	5121	1019	10521	1927	6884	1498	5352	41500	17105	7410
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 18 Descriptives married

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	36.7	62.6	44.8	40.5	41.0	57.8	53.3	36.6	35.8	30.9
1 Yes	63.3	37.8	55.2	59.5	59.0	42.2	46.7	61.4	64.2	69.1
N Valid	6209	1195	2156	1367	7251	20832	1937	968	2972	1003
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	17	2

Table 18 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	25.3	60.1	18.8	31.0	29.3	35.8	18.5	39.4	39.1	50.6
1 Yes	74.7	39.9	81.2	69.0	70.7	64.2	81.5	60.6	60.9	49.4
N Valid	5121	1019	10521	1927	6884	1474	5331	41500	16912	7390
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	0	193	20

*Note: percentage people that are married or one year cohabiting

Table 19 Descriptives income in 2012 US dollars (*1000)

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI*	MX	SK
Mean	9.1	2.2	3.7	4.0	7.5	5.1	7.2	3.3	0.53	3.1
Median	10.6	1.53	2.6	3.8	5.4	4.8	6.9	3.2	0.3	3.2
Minimum	0.13	0	0.52	0	0	0.96	0	0.43	0.08	0
Maximum	25.8	61.0	10.50	41.3	660	9.59	15.4	6.2	2.0	20.62
N valid	6209	1195	1981	1367	7251	20832	1937	802	2990	1001
N Missing	0	0	175	0	0	0	0	198	0	4

Table 19 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	7.7	0.35	0.17	2.2	6.9	0.29	0.67	0.41	5.3	6.4
Median	6.8	0.30	0.09	1.7	5.9	0.29	0.53	0.31	4.4	6.5
Minimum	0.61	0.050	0	0	0	0.09	0	0.21	0	1.62
Maximum	24.56	0.90	14.0	26.2	58.3	0.57	30.45	2.48	47.7	18.34
N Valid	5121	816	10521	1912	6884	1254	5166	35289	16061	5888
N Missing	0	203	0	0	0	244	186	6211	0	1522

*Note: measured in categories

Table 20 Descriptives home owner

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	999999	50.3	999999	36.6	39.5	999999	999999	999999	999999	22.2
1 Yes	999999	49.7	999999	63.4	60.5	999999	999999	999999	999999	77.8
N Valid	0	1195	0	1367	7251	0	0	0	0	1001
N Missing	6209	0	2156	0	0	20832	1937	1000	2990	4

Table 20 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	28.3	999999	32.5	999999	17.1	999999	32.5	95.7	44.0	55.1
1 Yes	71.7	999999	67.5	999999	82.9	999999	67.5	4.3	55.9	44.9
N Valid	5121	0	10521	0	6884	0	5352	41500	17082	7352
N Missing	0	1019	0	1927	0	1498	0	0	23	58

Table 21 Descriptives religious

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
0 No	36.9	52.8	13.2	56.8	11.4	19.5	999999	999999	6.8	46.6
1 Yes	63.1	42.2	86.8	43.2	88.6	80.5	999999	999999	93.2	53.4
N Valid	6209	1195	2156	1367	7251	19129	0	0	2977	997
N Missing	0	0	0	0	0	1703	0	1000	13	8

Table 21 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS*	CH	RU	GE	SW
0 No	999999	15.4	0.4	12.9	49.9	999999	92.8	999999	31.3	13.9
1 Yes	999999	84.6	99.6	87.1	50.1	999999	7.2	999999	68.7	86.1
N Valid	0	1009	10482	1927	6884	0	5352	0	15530	7319

N Missing 5121 10 39 0 0 1498 0 41500 1575 92

*Note: 'no' is not Jewish and observant and 'yes' is Jewish and observant

Table 22 Descriptives religious affiliation

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Roman Catholic	23.0	33.2	999999	24.2	18.9	37.1	999999	999999	81.7	9.0
Protestant	2.7	1.5	999999	8.6	64.4	38.2	999999	999999	8.9	22.1
Other religious affiliation	23.7	10.1	86.7	10.4	5.3	5.1	999999	999999	2.2	22.3
N Valid		1195	2149	1367		19129	0	0	2990	997
N Missing		0	7	0		1703	1937	1000	0	8

Table 22 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Roman catholic	999999	75.2	999999	1.5	999999	999999	999999	999999	28.5	40.8
Protestant	999999	5.1	999999	4.0	999999	999999	999999	999999	35.1	34.3
Other religious affiliation	999999	4.4	100	81.6	999999	100	999999	999999	5.0	11.0
N Valid	0	1009	10521	1927	0		5352	0	15530	7319
N missing	5121	10	0	0	6884			41500	1575	0

Table 23 Descriptives religious attendance in months

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	1.0	0.48	999999	0.46	2.7	0.2449	999999	999999	2.9	999999
Median	0.00	0	999999	0	1.0	0.10	999999	999999	3.0	999999
Minimum	0.00	0	999999	0	0.0	0	999999	999999	0	999999
Maximum	10.0	30	999999	8.7	65.0	1	999999	999999	8	999999
N Valid	6209	1195	0	1367	7251	19398	0	0	2940	0
N missing	0	0	2156	0	0	2449	1937	1000	50	1005

Table 23 continued

Country	JP	AT*	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	999999	0.19	999999	2.2	999999	3.4	999999	999999	0.55	999999
Median	999999	0.00	999999	1.0	999999	0.50	999999	999999	0	999999
Minimum	999999	0.00	999999	0	999999	0.0	999999	999999	0	999999
Maximum	999999	1.00	999999	30.0	999999	30.0	999999	999999	4.0	999999
N Valid	0	1010	0	1927	0	1474	0	0	16215	0
N Missing	5121	9	10521	0	6884	24	5352	41500	890	7410

* Measured dichotomously, with regular religious attendance yes (1) / no (0)

Descriptives Module III: trust

Table 24 Descriptives trust

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX*	SK
Mean	0.51	0.37	0.84	0.57	999999	999999	0.63	999999	0.18	0.47
N Valid	5986	1195	2156	1367	7251	0	1937	0	2922	1005
N Missing	223	0	0	0	0	20832	0	1000	68	0

Table 24 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	0.40		0.19	0.45	999999	0.49	999999	999999	0.54	0.64
N Valid	5121		10003	1927	0	1466	0	0	15927	7263
N Missing	0		518	0	6884	32	5352	41500	1178	147

* Measured dichotomously in Mexico, with generalized social trust yes (1) / no (0)

Descriptives Module IV: additional variables

Table 25 Descriptives weight (not synchronized)

country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
Mean	2.5	1.0	45923	1.0044	21	1249.01	1.0162	999999	1.04	1.001
Minimum	0.6	0.079	11129	0.44	0.12	21.56	0.01	999999	0.74	0.75
Maximum	18	8.720	171242	1.83	132.64	21989.04	1.21	999999	1.62	1.33

Table 25 continued

country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
Mean	16.0054	1.1045	999999	1.0005	21046287.31	999999	999999	999999	1.1150	850
Minimum	11.32	0.54	999999	0.38	6787794	999999	999999	999999	0.00	0
maximum	16.44	2.02	999999	1.54	61102292	999999	999999	999999	11.33	9188

Table 26 Descriptives country number

Country	AU	FR	UK	NL	US	CA	NO	FI	MX	SK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Table 26 continued

Country	JP	AT	IN	TW	IR	IS	CH	RU	GE	SW
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

DESCRIPTIVES FOR THE INDIVIDUAL INTERNATIONAL PHILANTHROPY DATABASE

Descriptives of unique variables per country, for country datasets including donations to subsectors

Australia

Incidence of giving to different causes⁹

adq4c01. Incidence of giving to medical research

0 No (Non-donor)	47.1
1 Yes (Donor)	52.9

adq4c02. Incidence of giving to other health organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	81.2
1 Yes (Donor)	18.8

adq4c03. Incidence of giving to community or welfare services

0 No (Non-donor)	36.8
1 Yes (Donor)	63.2

adq4c04. Incidence of giving to international aid and development

0 No (Non-donor)	75.0
1 Yes (Donor)	25.0

adq4c05_in. Incidence of giving to Australian emergency relief services

0 No (Non-donor)	66.9
1 Yes (Donor)	33.1

adq4c06. Incidence of giving to any environmental or animal welfare groups

0 No (Non-donor)	76.6
1 Yes (Donor)	23.4

adq4c07. Incidence of giving to any arts or cultural associations

0 No (Non-donor)	95.0
1 Yes (Donor)	5.0

⁹ The number of people indicating to not have made a donation in the incidence variable differs from the number of people indicating to not have made a donation in the amount variable, because some people who indicate to have made donation don't specify the amount they donated.

adq4c08. Incidence of giving to school, universities or colleges

0 No (Non-donor)	81.7
1 Yes (Donor)	18.3

adq4c09. Incidence of giving to sporting clubs

0 No (Non-donor)	86.4
1 Yes (Donor)	13.6

adq4c10. Incidence of giving to recreational or hobby groups

0 No (Non-donor)	96.7
1 Yes (Donor)	3.3

adq4c11. Incidence of giving to religious or spiritual organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	71.5
1 Yes (Donor)	28.5

adq4c12. Incidence of giving to political parties, unions, business or professional associations

0 No (Non-donor)	93.4
1 Yes (Donor)	6.6

adq4c13. Incidence of giving to other

0 No (Non-donor)	99.5
1 Yes (Donor)	0.5

Amount donated to different causes

aq2a.. Amount Donated To Schools, Universities Or Colleges

Mean	38.67
Minimum	.00
Maximum	12397.00

aq2b.. Amount Donated To Sporting Clubs

Mean	12.80
Minimum	.00
Maximum	3099.25

aq2c-. Amount Donated To Any Recreational Or Hobby Groups

Mean	3.03
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1239.70

aq2d. Amount Donated To Religious Or Spiritual Organizations

Mean	187.41
Minimum	.00
Maximum	61985.00

aq2e. Amount Donated To Medical Research

Mean	54.19
Minimum	.00
Maximum	7438.20

aq2f. Amount Donated To Other Health Organizations

Mean	21.25
Minimum	.00
Maximum	9917.60

aq2g. Amount Donated To Community Or Welfare Services

Mean	67.25
Minimum	.00
Maximum	24794.00

aq2h. Amount Donated To International Aid And Development Organizations

Mean	3.03
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1239.70

aq2i. Amount Donated To Australian Relief Services

Mean	22.11
Minimum	.00
Maximum	24794.00

--	--

aq2j. Amount Donated To Any Environmental Or Animal Welfare Groups

Mean	25.57
Minumum	.00
Maximum	24794.00

aq2k. Amount Donated To Any Arts Or Cultural Associations

Mean	16.09
Minumum	.00
Maximum	61985.00

aq2l. Amount Donated To Political Parties, Unions, Business Or Professional Associations

Mean	10.22
Minumum	.00
Maximum	2479.40

aq2_997. Amount Donated To Other

Mean	1.78
Minumum	.00
Maximum	3719.10

Module 2: socio-demographic background

Module 3: trust

Module 4: additional variables

France

Incidence of giving to different causes

bv400_1_in. Incidence of giving to civic rights and advocacy

0 No (Non-donor)	92.2
1 Yes (Donor)	7.8

bv700_1_in. Incidence of giving to culture, arts and humanities

0 No (Non-donor)	93.6
------------------	------

1 Yes (Donor)	6.4
---------------	-----

bv1000_1_in. Incidence of giving to education and research

0 No (Non-donor)	84.9
1 Yes (Donor)	15.1

bv1300_1_in. Incidence of giving to health

0 No (Non-donor)	63.3
1 Yes (Donor)	36.7

bv1600_1_in. Incidence of giving to international assistance

0 No (Non-donor)	81.3
1 Yes (Donor)	18.7

bv1900_1_in. Incidence of giving to environment and animals

0 No (Non-donor)	87.8
1 Yes (Donor)	12.2

bv2200_1_in. Incidence of giving to religious organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	86.5
1 Yes (Donor)	13.5

bv2500_1_in. Incidence of giving to social services

0 No (Non-donor)	75.2
1 Yes (Donor)	24.8

bv2800_1_in. Incidence of giving to sport and recreation

0 No (Non-donor)	92.9
1 Yes (Donor)	7.1

bv3100_1_in. Incidence of giving to other

0 No (Non-donor)	89.0
1 Yes (Donor)	11.0

Amount donated to different causes

bv400_1. Amount donated to civic rights and advocacy

Mean	11.58
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1356.80

bv700_1. Amount donated to culture, arts and humanities

Mean	9.82
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1356.80

bv1000_1. Amount donated to education and research

Mean	16.07
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1085.44

bv1300_1. Amount donated to health

Mean	34.68
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1356.80

bv1600_1. Amount donated to international assistance

Mean	21.32
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1356.80

bv1900_1. Amount donated to environment and animals

Mean	9.68
Minimum	.00
Maximum	542.72

bv2200_1. Amount donated to religious organizations

Mean	21.89
Minimum	.00
Maximum	2713.60

bv2500_1. Amount donated to social services

Mean	22.58
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1628.16

bv2800_1. Amount donated to sport and recreation

Mean	9.23
Minimum	.00
Maximum	2035.20

bv3100_1. Amount donated to other

Mean	8.74
Minimum	.00
Maximum	542.72

United Kingdom

Incidence of giving to different causes

cdcgywh1. Incidence of giving to education

0 No (Non-donor)	69.7
1 Yes (Donor)	30.3

cdcgywh2. Incidence of giving to kids

0 No (Non-donor)	73.8
1 Yes (Donor)	26.2

cdcgywh3. Incidence of giving to sports

0 No (Non-donor)	86.6
1 Yes (Donor)	13.4

cdcgywh4. Incidence of giving to religion

0 No (Non-donor)	70.5
1 Yes (Donor)	29.5

cdcgywh5. Incidence of giving to elderly

0 No (Non-donor)	73.0
1 Yes (Donor)	27.0

cdcgywh6. Incidence of giving to overseas aid

0 No (Non-donor)	58.9
1 Yes (Donor)	41.1

cdcgywh7. Incidence of giving to medical

0 No (Non-donor)	48.9
1 Yes (Donor)	51.1

cdcgywh8. Incidence of giving to hospitals

0 No (Non-donor)	63.6
1 Yes (Donor)	36.4

cdcgywh9. Incidence of giving to health care

0 No (Non-donor)	68.1
1 Yes (Donor)	31.9

cdcgywh10. Incidence of giving to disabled

0 No (Non-donor)	68.1
1 Yes (Donor)	31.9

cdcgywh11. Incidence of giving to social welfare

0 No (Non-donor)	69.3
1 Yes (Donor)	30.7

cdcgywh12. Incidence of giving to conservation

0 No (Non-donor)	79.5
1 Yes (Donor)	20.5

cdcgywh13. Incidence of giving to animals

0 No (Non-donor)	67.8
1 Yes (Donor)	32.2

cdcgywh14. Incidence of giving to arts

0 No (Non-donor)	82.3
1 Yes (Donor)	17.7

cdcgywh15. Incidence of giving to hobbies

0 No (Non-donor)	90.9
1 Yes (Donor)	9.1

cdcgywh96. Incidence of giving to other

0 No (Non-donor)	93.3
1 Yes (Donor)	6.7

4. Netherlands

Incidence of giving to different causes

dchmchn1. Incidence of giving to religious causes

0 No (Non-donor)	63.1
1 Yes (Donor)	36.9

dchmhln1. Incidence of giving to health

0 No (Non-donor)	15.1
1 Yes (Donor)	84.9

dchmian1. Incidence of giving to international relief

0 No (Non-donor)	41.3
1 Yes (Donor)	58.7

dchmnean1. Incidence of giving to nature, environment and animals

0 No (Non-donor)	45.9
1 Yes (Donor)	54.1

dchmern1. Incidence of giving to education and research

0 No (Non-donor)	92.6
1 Yes (Donor)	7.4

dchmcan1. Incidence of giving to culture and arts

0 No (Non-donor)	87.3
------------------	------

1 Yes (Donor)	12.7
---------------	------

dchmsrn1. Incidence of giving to sports and recreation

0 No (Non-donor)	82.7
1 Yes (Donor)	17.3

dchmps1. Incidence of giving to public and social benefits

0 No (Non-donor)	62.7
1 Yes (Donor)	37.3

dchmothn1. Incidence of giving to other causes

0 No (Non-donor)	95.8
1 Yes (Donor)	4.2

dchmtsun1. Incidence of giving to Tsunami

0 No (Non-donor)	85.9
1 Yes (Donor)	14.1

Amount donated to different causes

dchmchy1. Amount donated to religious causes

Mean	145.41
Minimum	.00
Maximum	7820.12

dchmhly1. Amount donated to health

Mean	50.90
Minimum	.00
Maximum	2815.24

dchmiay1. Amount donated to international relief

Mean	71.46
Minimum	.00
Maximum	2167.74

dchmney1. Amount donated to nature, environment and animals

Mean	33.30
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1635.97

dchmery1. Amount donated to education and research

Mean	5.74
Minimum	.00
Maximum	3128.05

dchmcay1. Amount donated to culture and arts

Mean	5.72
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1955.03

dchmsry1. Amount donated to sports and recreation

Mean	5.97
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1251.22

dchmpsry1. Amount donated to public and social benefits

Mean	11.21
Minimum	.00
Maximum	782.01

dchmothy1. Amount donated to other causes

Mean	8.58
Minimum	.00
Maximum	1173.02

dchmtsuy1. Amount donated to Tsunami

Mean	6.82
Minimum	.00
Maximum	312.80

United States

Incidence of giving to different causes

egrelig. Incidence of giving to religious congregations

0 No (Non-donor)	56.0
1 Yes (Donor)	44.0

egyouth. Incidence of giving to youth and family services

0 No (Non-donor)	88.4
1 Yes (Donor)	11.6

egenvir. Incidence of giving to environment and animal

0 No (Non-donor)	93.3
1 Yes (Donor)	6.7

egcomb. Incidence of giving to combination purposes

0 No (Non-donor)	74.5
1 Yes (Donor)	25.5

egneed. Incidence of giving to basic needs

0 No (Non-donor)	74.0
1 Yes (Donor)	26.0

eghlth. Incidence of giving to health

0 No (Non-donor)	81.0
1 Yes (Donor)	19.0

egeduc. Incidence of giving to education

0 No (Non-donor)	86.0
1 Yes (Donor)	14.0

egart. Incidence of giving to cultures and arts

0 No (Non-donor)	93.7
1 Yes (Donor)	6.3

egneig. Incidence of giving to neighborhoods and community

0 No (Non-donor)	94.7
1 Yes (Donor)	5.3

egintl. Incidence of giving to international relief

0 No (Non-donor)	95.9
1 Yes (Donor)	4.1

egoth. Incidence of giving to other purposes

0 No (Non-donor)	93.5
1 Yes (Donor)	6.5

etsunamiamount_incidence. Incidence of giving to tsunami relief

0 No (Non-donor)	76.1
1 Yes (Donor)	23.9

Amount donated to different causes

earelig. Amount donated to religious congregations

Mean	951.69
Minimum	.00
Maximum	116060.00

eyouth. Amount donated to youth and family services

Mean	25.02
Minimum	.00
Maximum	11606.00

eaenvir. Amount donated to environment and animal

Mean	13.78
Minimum	.00
Maximum	5803.00

eacomb. Amount donated to combination purposes

Mean	138.59
------	--------

Minimum	.00
Maximum	23212.00

eaneed. Amount donated to basic needs

Mean	139.28
Minimum	.00
Maximum	23212.00

eahlth. Amount donated to health

Mean	51.91
Minimum	.00
Maximum	9284.80

eaeduc. Amount donated to education

Mean	68.39
Minimum	.00
Maximum	34818.00

eaart. Amount donated to cultures and arts

Mean	17.98
Minimum	.00
Maximum	11606.00

eaneig. Amount donated to neighborhoods and community

Mean	14.62
Minimum	.00
Maximum	11606.00

eaintl. Amount donated to international relief

Mean	13.26
Minimum	.00
Maximum	4642.40

eaoth. Amount donated to other purposes

Mean	36.47
Minimum	.00
Maximum	49905.80

etsunamiamount. Amount donated to tsunami relief

Mean	33.92
Minimum	.00
Maximum	6963.60

Canada

Incidence of giving to different causes

fgs1ga201_in. Incidence of giving to culture and recreation

0 No (Non-donor)	76.4
1 Yes (Donor)	23.6

fgs1ga202_in. Incidence of giving to education and research

0 No (Non-donor)	75.0
1 Yes (Donor)	25.0

fgs1ga203_in. Incidence of giving to health

0 No (Non-donor)	32.1
1 Yes (Donor)	67.9

fgs1ga204_in. Incidence of giving to social services

0 No (Non-donor)	52.4
1 Yes (Donor)	47.6

fgs1ga205_in. Incidence of giving to environment

0 No (Non-donor)	91.0
1 Yes (Donor)	9.0

fgs1ga206_in. Incidence of giving to development and housing

0 No (Non-donor)	96.6
1 Yes (Donor)	3.4

fgs1ga207_in. Incidence of giving to law/advocacy/politics

0 No (Non-donor)	92.0
1 Yes (Donor)	8.0

fgs1ga208_in. Incidence of giving to philanthropic intermediaries/voluntarism

0 No (Non-donor)	87.5
1 Yes (Donor)	12.5

fgs1ga209_in. Incidence of giving to international

0 No (Non-donor)	92.5
1 Yes (Donor)	7.5

fgs1ga210_in. Incidence of giving of religion

0 No (Non-donor)	56.5
1 Yes (Donor)	43.5

fgs1ga211_in. Incidence of giving to business/professional association/unions

0 No (Non-donor)	99.5
1 Yes (Donor)	0.5

fgs1ga212_in. Incidence of giving to not elsewhere classified

0 No (Non-donor)	96.0
1 Yes (Donor)	4.0

Amount donated to different causes in 2012 in USD

fgs1ga201. Total amount given to culture and recreation

Mean	18.36
Minimum	1
Maximum	9588

fgs1ga202. Total amount given to education and research

Mean	21.20
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	22209.76

--	--

fgs1ga203. Total amount given to health

Mean	70.2929
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	16435.34

fgs1ga204. Total amount given to social services

Mean	41.9511
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	47713.29

fgs1ga205. Total amount given to environment

Mean	8.7810
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	5361.14

fgs1ga206. Total amount given to development and housing

Mean	2.8278
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	4410.88

fgs1ga207. Total amount given to law/advocacy/politics

Mean	5.5742
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	8150.55

fgs1ga208. Total amount given to philanthropic intermediaries/voluntarism

Mean	19.4666
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	12465.54

fgs1ga209. Total amount given to international

Mean	16.7815
Minimum	0.00

Maximum	17259.98

fgs1ga210. Total amount given to religion

Mean	202.0159
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	28766.63

fgs1ga211. Total amount given to business/professional associations/unions

Mean	0.5710
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	2397.22

fgs1ga212. Total amount given to not elsewhere classified

Mean	6.3927
Minimum	.00
Maximum	14479.20

Norway

Incidence of giving to different causes

goekst2_in. Incidence of giving to health, nursing and emergency

0 No (Non-donor)	60.6
1 Yes (Donor)	39.4

goekst2_2in. Incidence of giving to social services and alcohol or drug rehabilitation

0 No (Non-donor)	76.6
1 Yes (Donor)	24.0

goekst2_3in. Incidence of giving to international relief

0 No (Non-donor)	62.6
1 Yes (Donor)	37.4

goekst2_4in. Incidence of giving to religion and view of life

0 No (Non-donor)	86.1
------------------	------

1 Yes (Donor)	13.9
---------------	------

Total amount donated to different causes

goekst2_. Total amount donated to health, nursing and emergency

Mean	65.8434
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	15351.84

goekst2_2. Total amount donated to social services and alcohol or drug rehabilitation

Mean	24.3947
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	1535.18

goekst2_3. Total amount donated to international relief

Mean	95.9601
Minimum	.00
Maximum	6140.73

goekst2_4. Total amount donated to religion and view of life

Mean	80.5508
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	16887.02

Finland

Incidence of giving to different causes

hidonia1. Incidence of giving to veterans

0 No (Non-donor)	27.7
1 Yes (Donor)	72.3

hidonia2. Incidence of giving to international emergency relief

0 No (Non-donor)	43.2
1 Yes (Donor)	56.8

hidonia3. Incidence of giving to children, for example unicef, Plan, World vision

0 No (Non-donor)	33.5
1 Yes (Donor)	66.5

hidonia4. Incidence of giving to salvastion army annual Christmas fundraising

0 No (Non-donor)	51.1
1 Yes (Donor)	48.9

hidonia5. Incidence of giving to fundraisings for nature, for example WWF, Greenpeace, The Finnish Association for nature Concervation

0 No (Non-donor)	20.2
1 Yes (Donor)	29.8

hidonia6. Incidence of giving to fundraising for social causes, for example mental health

0 No (Non-donor)	63.8
1 Yes (Donor)	36.2

hidonia7. Incidence of giving to local fundraisings such as schools, Lions, Rotary

0 No (Non-donor)	54.1
1 Yes (Donor)	45.9

hidonia8. Incidence of giving to something else

0 No (Non-donor)	68.6
1 Yes (Donor)	31.4

Mexico

Incidence of giving to different causes

ip17b_a_in. Incidence of giving to education and school

0 No (Non-donor)	70.9
1 Yes (Donor)	29.1

ip17b_b_in. Incidence of giving to animal protection and ecological organisations

0 No (Non-donor)	95.1
1 Yes (Donor)	4.9

ip17b_c_in. Incidence of giving to health

0 No (Non-donor)	76.9
1 Yes (Donor)	23.1

ip17b_d_in. Incidence of giving to church

0 No (Non-donor)	55.6
1 Yes (Donor)	44.4

ip17b_e_in. Incidence of giving to elderly

0 No (Non-donor)	85.5
1 Yes (Donor)	14.5

ip17b_f_in. Incidence of giving to humanitarian organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	90.5
1 Yes (Donor)	9.5

ip17b_g_in. Incidence of giving to other religious organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	89.4
1 Yes (Donor)	10.6

ip17b_h_in. Incidence of giving to neighborhood association

0 No (Non-donor)	91.2
1 Yes (Donor)	8.8

ip17b_i_in. Incidence of giving to youth groups and clubs

0 No (Non-donor)	93.5
1 Yes (Donor)	6.5

ip17b_j_in. Incidence of giving to cultural/artistic organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	96.3
1 Yes (Donor)	3.7

ip17b_k_in. Incidence of giving to natural disaster relief

0 No (Non-donor)	71.7
1 Yes (Donor)	28.3

ip17b_l_in. Incidence of giving to alms during mass

0 No (Non-donor)	39.3
1 Yes (Donor)	60.7

ip17b_m_in. Incidence of giving to other

0 No (Non-donor)	97.8
1 Yes (Donor)	2.2

Total amount given to different causes

ip17b_a. Total amount given to education and school

Mean	4.4603
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_b. Total amount given to animal protection and ecological organizations

Mean	0.7495
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_c. Total amount given to health

Mean	2.6464
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_d. Total amount given to church

Mean	5.2310
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_e. Total amount given to elderly

Mean	1.9330
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_f. Total amount given to humanitarian organizations

Mean	1.2659
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_g. Total amount given to other religious organizations

Mean	1.2245
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_h. Total amount given in neighborhood association

Mean	0.9707
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_i. Total amount given to youth groups and clubs

Mean	0.9162
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_j. Total amount given to cultural/artistic organisations

Mean	0.6727
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_k. Total amount given to natural disaster relief

Mean	4.5898
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_l. Total amount given to alms during mass

Mean	3.5724
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

ip17b_m. Total amount given to other

Mean	0.5365
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	129.97

South Korea

Incidence of giving to different causes

ig_y2. Incidence of giving to alms through religious organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	89.7
1 Yes (Donor)	10.3

ig_y3. Incidence of giving to religious organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	70.2
1 Yes (Donor)	29.8

ig_y4. Incidence of giving to charitable organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	38.7
1 Yes (Donor)	61.3

ig_y5. Incidence of giving to international aid

0 No (Non-donor)	100
1 Yes (Donor)	0

ig_y6. Incidence of giving to educational organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	98.9
1 Yes (Donor)	1.1

ig_y7. Incidence of giving to medical organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	99.6
1 Yes (Donor)	0.4

ig_y8. Incidence of giving to art and cultural organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	99.8
1 Yes (Donor)	0.2

yg_y9. Incidence of giving to environmental or animal organizations, NGO's

0 No (Non-donor)	99.0
1 Yes (Donor)	1.0

yg_y10. Incidence of giving to public organizations or community

0 No (Non-donor)	97.9
1 Yes (Donor)	2.1

yg_y11. Incidence of giving to relatives, friends or neighbors

0 No (Non-donor)	88.5
1 Yes (Donor)	11.5

yg_y12. Incidence of giving to strangers (the homeless)

0 No (Non-donor)	81.9
1 Yes (Donor)	18.1

yg_y13. Incidence of giving to political parties, elections or politicians

0 No (Non-donor)	99.0
1 Yes (Donor)	1.0

yg_y14. Incidence of giving to other causes

0 No (Non-donor)	99.9
1 Yes (Donor)	0.1

Amount donated to different causes

yg_money2. Total amount donated to alms through religious organizations

Mean	24.0161
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	5222.70

yg_money3. Total amount given to religious organizations (offering)

Mean	136.5988
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	10445.40

yg_money4. Total amount given in charitable organizations

Mean	27.25599
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	1096.77

yg_money5. Total amount given to international aid

Mean	0.00
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	0.00

yg_money6. Total amount given to educational organizations

Mean	1.7690
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	1044.54

yg_money7. Total amount given to medical organizations

Mean	0.2307
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	125.35

yg_money8. Total amount given to art of cultural organizations

Mean	0.00
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	0.00

yg_money9. Total amount given to environmental of animal organizations, NGO's

Mean	1.2576
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	376.03

yg_money10. Total amount given to public organizations or community

Mean	1.9903
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	522.27

--	--

yg_money11. Total amount given to relatives, friends of neighbors

Mean	4.1366
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	208.91

yg_money12. Total amount given to strangers (the homeless)

Mean	3.2428
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	104.45

yg_money13. Total amount given to political parties, elections or politicians

Mean	0.9552
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	313.36

yg_money14. Total amount given to other causes

Mean	0.00
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	0.00

Austria

Incidence of giving to different subsectors needs to be added

Israel

Tyouth. Incidence of giving to youth and children organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	53.8
1 Yes (Donor)	46.2

Tfood. Incidence of giving to food security organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	54.2
1 Yes (Donor)	45.8

Thealth. Incidence of giving to health organisations

0 No (Non-donor)	61.3
1 Yes (Donor)	38.7

Tcommunity.. Incidence of giving to neighborhood and community organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	85.3
1 Yes (Donor)	14.7

Twomen. Incidence of giving to women's organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	87.4
1 Yes (Donor)	12.6

Tenviron. Incidence of giving to environment and animal protection organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	92.6
1 Yes (Donor)	7.4

Tculrec. Incidence of giving to culture, recreation, arts and sports organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	95.3
1 Yes (Donor)	4.7

Trelig. Incidence of giving to religious organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	77.1
1 Yes (Donor)	22.9

Tother. Incidence of giving to other organizations

0 No (Non-donor)	92.1
1 Yes (Donor)	7.9

Appendix A Converting local currency to the value of 2012 U.S. dollars (per country)

1. Calculate the value of your local currency into U.S. dollars for that year, using historical exchange rates, such as for example available on oanda.com: <http://www.oanda.com/currency/historical-rates/>

2. Convert the value of a U.S. dollar in 2005 to the value of a U.S. dollar in 2012 (source: http://www.bls.gov/cpi/cpi_dr.htm):

Use Consumer Price Index annual averages of all items:

CPI-U (consumer price index for all urban consumers)

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

1982-84=100

U.S. Dollar

year	CPI-U
2000	172.2
2001	177.1
2002	179.9
2003	184
2004	188.9
2005	195.3
2006	201.6
2007	207.342
2008	215.303
2009	214.537
2010	218.056
2011	224.939
2012	226.665

Appendix B Country specific information to take into account when working with the IIPD (2016)

Country	Country number	Country specific information
Australia	1	
France	2	
United Kingdom	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of non-donors in cidont and cadont did not match because of 6 very small donors (amount donated was rounded down to 0), we recoded these 6 cases donating virtually nothing to non-donors on cidont; • The amount question was only asked for donors who donated during the previous four weeks, amounts donated were not asked to respondents that only donated over the course of last year, for which incidence was measured. Hence those not donating last four weeks, but donated last year (N=282) are missing (999999) on cadont. • Amount donated was asked for past four weeks, and then multiplied by 13 to get the amount donated on a yearly basis.
Netherlands	4	
United States	5	
Canada	6	
Norway	7	Description weight variable Vekt 1 is used because there is an oversampled group of immigrants from Africa and Asia in the data set. With Vekt 1, they are weighted according to their share of the population.
Finland	8	Amount donated and income is based on categorical var, top category recoded as lowest boundary ("over 100 euros", coded as 100)
Mexico	9	Data submitted was automatically weighted, set weight off
South Korea	10	Researchers have to mention that the Korean data is Giving Korea, constructed by the Beautiful Foundation in Korea
Japan	11	Researchers wanting to use the Japanese data need to ask Naoto Yamauchi.
Austria	12	
Indonesia	13	

Taiwan	14	Table 25.5 in Palgrave book (Tobit) is wrong, because of the coding error (999997 and 999998) were treated as amounts rather than missings: "1. Religious giving: 30 cases indicating "forgot", 7 cases indicating "refused"; 2. Secular donations: 15 cases indicating "forgot", 2 cases indicating "refused". Therefore, there are 37 cases with incorrect values of religious giving and 17 cases with incorrect values of secular giving, respectively. For total giving, the number of cases with incorrect value of total giving is 46 because eight cases have incorrect values for both religious and secular giving." Data included in the IIPD is corrected and correct.
Ireland	15	• age is measured in categories 10-20-30-40-50-60-70-80 converted to <35;36-65;>65 using midpoints of original data, except for lowest category (=14) and highest (=80). Weight is absolute weight, but statistical software accounts for this.
Israel	16	Religion in Israel is different. recoded the Jewish, the Muslims and the Christians to "other", as we also do not know whether they are Orthodox or Roman Catholic (or Protestant). We made an exception and included the original religious affiliation variable with the data for Israel (treligion). we set Tromcat and tprot to 999999 as we do not know whether christians are roman catholic or protestant / Note the big outlier in amounts donated. The highest value on "tadont" is 5,868,622, which is a lot higher than the second highest value of 293,431, Trespnr=415 was extreme outlier, with donation of 5,868,622 US Dollar, while only 19 years old. It could always be a possibility that it is a correct donation, but following the advice of the Israeli authors, we have set the donation value for this respondent to "999999", missing.
Russia	18	Income in seven categories: below 172 US Dollar in 2012; 172 – 344; 344 – 516; 516 - 860; 860 – 1548; 1548 – 2064; over 2064 2012 US dollar. The only condition for using the data is to mention our Centre as an institution which elaborated the methodology and questionnaire for Russian data and conducted the data collection. The complete name of the Centre is The Center for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector, National Research University Higher School of Economics.

Germany	19	<p>The religious affiliation variables "wromcat", "wprot" and "wothrel" are adopted from the 2007 wave of the survey</p> <p>The religious attendance variable "wrelatt" is adopted from the 2009 wave.</p> <p>The generalized social trust measure "wtrust" is adopted from the 2008 wave.</p> <p>Arjen de Wit and Marius Mews took a closer look at the weighting variable and found out that there is an independent sample in the data (in the SOEP documentation it is referred to as the 'Incentive Sample', which is included in the 'Innovation Sample' after 2012). These households distort the distribution and score 0 on the weighting variable. the ~2,000 respondents from the oversample are excluded in the data prepared for IIPD.</p>
Switzerland	20	<p>Only the post stratification weight is needed. The design weight weighs for selection probability after canton (state) and household size. The post stratification weight extrapolates the sample to be representative for the population as measured in the 2000 census and has the design weight included. From the method report: (Um Stichprobenverzerrungen für Auswertungen zu korrigieren, wurden zwei Gewichte berechnet. Das Designgewicht (Variable des_gew) gewichtet für die unterschiedlichen Auswahlwahrscheinlichkeiten nach Kanton und Haushaltsgrösse. Das Poststratifikationsgewicht kombiniert das Designgewicht mit einer Poststratifikation, welche die gewichteten Bevölkerungsanteile hinsichtlich Alter, Nationalität, Geschlecht und Bildung auf die Eckwerte der Wohnbevölkerung über 15 Jahren gemäss Volkszählung 2000 hochgerechnet (Variable gew_tot).</p>

Appendix C Instructions for registering with the following data registration agencies

Australia

Giving Australia, Individual and Household Survey, 2005

1. Go to <http://www.ada.edu.au/ada/01087> and register
2. You can browse and analyse the data but you'll need access to download it
3. to request access for download, click on 'request Download access' on the right side above.
4. You will be redirected to a form which is necessary to fill in.
5. fill in at 'Filter': '01087'
6. fill in your intended use of data, description of intended use or a research abstract and continue
7. read the conditions of use and agree
8. Now you have to wait for an email whether you'll get access or not.

Canada

Register for using the Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (CSGVP), 2004

Germany

German Socio Economic Panel Study, 2010

How to access data

Current EUI members can access German SOEP data as follows:

1. Complete the online [Data Registration Form](#) (selecting 'G-SOEP' in the dropdown menu)
2. Sign the EUI 'Conditions of Use' agreement and the 'Confidentiality Declaration' at the Badia Library Economics Office (085) or the Economics Department information desk (VSP)
3. EUI members who wish to use the data should send a project title and the name of their supervisor (where applicable) to soepmail@diw.de
4. Following registration, users will be given access to the restricted server and provided with a password.

Source:

<http://www.eui.eu/Research/Library/ResearchGuides/Economics/Statistics/DataPortal/GSOEP.aspx#Access>

Indonesia

Indonesia Family Life Survey, 2007

Link to study: <http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/1044>

register to use data: <https://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/access.html>

Ireland

Irish Household Budget Survey, 2005

James Carroll (co-author Irish chapter Palgrave Handbook) writes: “I was in touch with the [ISSDA](#) about sharing our variables. The ISSDA are the organisation that manages the dissemination and user contracts for many Irish data sources. The Irish Central Statistics Office are the owners of the data. The ISSDA have not said that there are any issues with sharing our variables. However, the formal contract is between me and the ISSDA, so I would prefer if you contact them directly to gain official access. [Registering](#) for the data is very straightforward and I do not expect that you will have any issues.”

Taiwan

1. Please specify sources in quoting data from this project. Publications (including manuscripts) based on the TSCS datasets should include the following acknowledgment:
Data analyzed in this research were collected in the fifth round, fifth wave 2009 survey of the research project "Taiwan Social Change Survey". The project was conducted by the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica (data gathered before the first Year of the third Round were conducted by the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica), and sponsored by the Ministry of Science and Technology (formerly known as National Science Council), Republic of China.

(See: <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/en/survey.php> for more details on survey wave)

2. The TSCS Data are solely for the use of academic purpose and strictly prohibited from any commercial use. Authors of publications based on TSCS data should specify sources in quoting data from this project and send copies of their published works (thesis, books, or research reports) or references to us. Please provide us your publications by email to scst@gate.sinica.edu.tw or submit two copies of your work to:
Taiwan Social Change Survey
Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica
No. 128 Section 2 Academia Road, Nankang District,
115 Taipei, Taiwan
3. If you agree with the above conditions, please fill out the following:

Register here: <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/en/scDownload3.php>

United Kingdom

Helping Out, 2006/2007

UK Data Archive Study Number 5793 - National Survey of Volunteering and Charitable Giving, 2006-2007

Department for Communities and Local Government, National Centre for Social Research and Institute for Volunteering Research, *National Survey of Volunteering and Charitable Giving, 2006-*

2007 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], March 2008. SN: 5793, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-5793-1>.

Sign up for data use: <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/sign-up>

STUDY IS HERE:

<https://discover.ukdataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/?sn=5793&type=Data%20catalogue>

Japan

Send email to Naoto Yamauchi (yamauchi@osipp.osaka-u.ac.jp) asking permission, explaining your project (with title and abstract). Naoto keeps track of all the uses of the Japanese data, as part of his funding requirements.

Russia

The only condition for using the data is to mention The Center for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector, National Research University Higher School of Economics as an institution which elaborated the methodology and questionnaire for Russian data and conducted the data collection.

South Korea

Researchers using the IIPD need to include the following citation:

The Beautiful Foundation. (2006). *Giving Korea 2006*. Seoul, Korea: The Beautiful Foundation.

Appendix D IIPD license agreement

Name

Address

Country

Telephone number

Email address

- 1. Title research project:**
- 2. Authors:**
- 3. Abstract (incl. research question and initial main hypotheses):**
- 4. Key variables used:**
- 5. Target publication outlet:**
- 6. Expected publication date:**

Date

Signature

Appendix E List of data sources included in the IIPD

(August 31, 2017)

Australia

Lyons, M. & Passey, A. (2007). *Giving Australia, Individual and Household Survey, 2005*. Sydney, Australia: University of Technology.

Austria

Neumayr, M., & Schober, C. (2009). *Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Bevölkerungsbefragung zum Spendenverhalten in Österreich* [Findings on giving in Austria from a representative population survey]. Vienna, Austria: Vienna University of Economics and Business.

Canada

CSGVP (2004). *Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating 2004*. Toronto, Canada: Statistics Canada.

France

Giving France. (2009). *Giving France*. [machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, Pamala [principle investigator]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].

Finland

Auttaminen (2008). *Auttaminen*. [machine-readable datafile]. Pessi, Anne-Birgitta, Grönlund, Henrietta. [principle investigators]. Helsinki: University of Helsinki [distributor].

Germany

Socio-economic Panel (SOEP). (2011). *Data for years 1984 - 2010*. Doi: 10.5684/soep.v27.

User agreements also states you have to cite one of the following:

Gert G. Wagner, Joachim R. Frick, and Jürgen Schupp (2007) The German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) - Scope, Evolution and Enhancements, *Schmollers Jahrbuch (Journal of Applied Social Science Studies)* 127 (1), 139-169 (download)

Gert G. Wagner, Jan Göbel, Peter Krause, Rainer Pischner, and Ingo Sieber (2008) Das Sozio-oekonomische Panel (SOEP): Multidisziplinäres Haushaltspanel und Kohortenstudie für Deutschland - Eine Einführung (für neue Datennutzer) mit einem Ausblick (für erfahrene Anwender), *AStA Wirtschafts- und Sozialstatistisches Archiv* 2 (4), 301-328 (download)

Schupp, Jürgen (2009): 25 Jahre Sozio-oekonomisches Panel - Ein Infrastrukturprojekt der empirischen Sozial- und Wirtschaftsforschung in Deutschland, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 38 (5), pp. 350-357.

Source: <https://data.soep.de/soep-core>

Indonesia

Strauss, J., Witoelar, F., Sikoki, B., & Wattie, A.M. (2009). *The Fourth Wave of the Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS4): Overview and Field Report*. WR-675/1-NIA/NICHD.

Ireland

HBS. (2005). *Household Budget Survey, 2005*. [dataset]. Dublin, Ireland: Irish Social Science Data Archive. Accessed via the Irish Social Science Data Archive - www.ucd.ie/issda.

Israel

Haski-Leventhal, Debbie, Katz, Hagai & Yogev-Keren, Hila, (2011). *Philanthropy in Israel 2008: Pattern of Volunteering, Giving and Organ Donations*. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israeli Center for Third Sector Research.

Japan

Japan Fundraising Association. (2010). *KifuHakusho 2010* [Giving Japan 2010]. Tokyo, Japan: Nihon Keidanren Suppan.

Mexico

ENAFI. (2005). *Encuesta Nacional De Filantropía* (ENAFI) [National Survey on Philanthropy] 2005. Project on Philanthropy and Civil Society. Mexico: ITAM. More information at www.filantropia.itam.mx.

Netherlands

GINPS05 (2006). *Giving in the Netherlands Panel Study 2005*. [machine-readable data file]. Wiepking, Pamala, Bekkers, René, Schuyt, Theo N.M., Gouwenberg, Barbara M. [principle investigator(s)]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].

Norway

Wollebæk, D., & Sivesind, K. H. (2010). *Fra folkebevegelse til filantropi? Frivillig innsats i Norge 1997-2009* [From popular movement to philanthropy? Volunteering in Norway 1997-2009]. Oslo, Norway: Senter for forskning på sivilsamfunn og frivillig sektor.

Russia

CSCSNS. (2010). *Population survey*. Moscow, Russia: Centre for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector of the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

South Korea

The Beautiful Foundation. (2006). *Giving Korea 2006*. Seoul, Korea: The Beautiful Foundation.

Taiwan

TSCS. (2009). *Taiwan Social Change Survey*. Questionnaire II, phase 5, wave 5. Taipei, Taiwan: Center for Survey Research, Academia Sinica.

Switzerland

Stadelmann-Steffen, I., Freitag, M. & Bühlmann, M. (2007). *Freiwilligenmonitor 2007*. Zürich, Switzerland: Seismo.

Markus Freitag, Isabelle Steffen, Marc Bühlmann: Befragung zu Art, Umfang, Motiven und Mobilisierungspotentialen der Freiwilligentätigkeit - 2006 [Dataset 2007AF]. University Konstanz. Distributed by FORS, Lausanne, 2007

United Kingdom

Low, N., Butt, S., Ellis, P., & Davis Smith, J. (2007). *Helping Out: A national survey of volunteering and charitable giving*. Available at: Low, N., Butt, S., Ellis, P., & Davis Smith, J. (2007). *Helping Out: A national survey of volunteering and charitable giving*. Available at: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/2547/1/Helping%20Out.pdf>).

United States

Wilhelm, M. O., Brown, E., Rooney, P. M., & Steinberg, R. (2005). *The Center on Philanthropy Panel Study* [Data file]. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, the University of Michigan.