



# **Philanthropy in Europe**

**Mapping Research and Data on  
Donations by Households, Bequests,  
Foundations, Corporations and  
Charity Lotteries**

Barry Hoolwerf & Johan Vamstad (eds.)

AN ERNOP PUBLICATION

**ERNOP.EU**

European Research Network on Philanthropy



# Philanthropy in Europe

**Mapping Research and Data on Philanthropy by Households,  
Bequests, Foundations, Corporations and Charity Lotteries**

**Barry Hoolwerf & Johan Vamstad (eds.)**

## Colophon

Title: Philanthropy in Europe: Mapping Research and Data on Donations by Households, Bequests, Foundations, Corporations and Charity Lotteries  
Editors: Barry Hoolwerf & Johan Vamstad  
Publisher: European Research Network on Philanthropy (ernop)

isbn: 978-90-9041791-2  
Language: English  
Publication type: e-book (pdf)  
Edition: First edition  
Date of publication: 3 March 2026

Design and layout: villa y, Andre Klijsen

Copyright © 2026 by the European Research Network on Philanthropy (ernop)  
and the authors of the respective chapters.

This publication is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International license (cc by-nc-nd 4.0).



You may share this publication in its original form for non-commercial purposes, provided that appropriate credit is given, a link to the license is included, and the material is not altered.

The publication is exclusively available for download via the ernop website [www.ernop.eu](http://www.ernop.eu)

Redistribution or uploading of this publication to third-party platforms is not permitted without prior written permission from the publisher.

License details: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

For permissions beyond the scope of this license, contact: [info@ernop.eu](mailto:info@ernop.eu)

More information: [www.ernop.eu](http://www.ernop.eu)

# Contents

|                                                |     |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|
| List of contributors by country                | 6   |
| Foreword                                       | 7   |
| Acknowledgements                               | 8   |
| Executive summary                              | 9   |
| <br>                                           |     |
| Philanthropy in Europe: Scope and Significance | 12  |
| Assessing the Quality of Data on Philanthropy  | 20  |
| <br>                                           |     |
| Austria                                        | 29  |
| Belgium                                        | 47  |
| Croatia                                        | 65  |
| Czech Republic                                 | 79  |
| France                                         | 93  |
| Germany                                        | 109 |
| Hungary                                        | 129 |
| Iceland                                        | 143 |
| Ireland                                        | 151 |
| Israel                                         | 173 |
| Italy                                          | 189 |
| The Netherlands                                | 203 |
| Poland                                         | 217 |
| Portugal                                       | 239 |
| Romania                                        | 249 |
| Serbia                                         | 261 |
| Slovakia                                       | 275 |
| Spain                                          | 291 |
| Sweden                                         | 317 |
| Switzerland                                    | 331 |
| United Kingdom                                 | 345 |
| <br>                                           |     |
| Conclusion: Philanthropy in Europe             | 367 |

## List of authors by country

### Austria

Michaela Neymayr  
Reinhard Millner

### Belgium

Ann-Sophie Bouckaert  
Sanne Holvoet  
Joke Persyn  
Freek van Baelen

### Croatia

Gojko Bežovan  
Jelena Matančević

### Czech Republic

Vladimir Hyanek

### France

Lucy Pfliger  
Arthur Gautier

### Germany

Georg Mildenberg  
Jörg Lindenmeier  
Silke Boenigk  
Lena Höpken  
Maya Gebhard  
Marcel Oster

### Hungary

Márton Gerő

### Iceland

Steinunn Hrafnadóttir

### Ireland

Oonagh B. Breen  
Niamh Carruthers  
Patricia Quinn  
Niall O'Sullivan

### Israel

Osnat Hazan  
Galia Feit

### Italy

Gina Rossi  
Raffaella Rametta  
Chiara Leardini

### The Netherlands

Stephanie Koolen-Maas  
Marlou Ramaekers  
René Bekkers  
Sterre van Tongeren

### Poland

Anita Budziszewska

### Portugal

Madalena Eça de Abreu  
Ana Simaens  
Pedro Calado

### Romania

Lev Fejes

### Serbia

Bojana Radovanović  
Vuk Vuković

### Slovakia

Alžbeta Brozmanová Gregorová  
Mária Murray Svidroňová

### Spain

Helena Monill Badell  
Lisa Hehenberger  
Guido Lanese Pettit  
Dalia Silberstein

### Sweden

Johan Vamstad  
Stefan Einarsson  
Mårten Palmefors

### Switzerland

Georg von Schnurbein  
Dominik Meier  
Anja Rogenmoser  
Muriel Grassmann

### United Kingdom

Christopher Dougherty

## Philanthropy in Europe

# HUNGARY

**Márton Gerő<sup>1</sup>**

Faculty of Social Sciences,  
Eötvös Loránd University,  
HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences

# 1 Introduction on Philanthropy Research in Hungary

Over the past two decades, research on philanthropy in Hungary has been conducted only sporadically. The last comprehensive study dates back to 2004 (Czike & Kuti, 2005). As with earlier Hungarian studies, philanthropy was interpreted broadly – encompassing not only monetary and in-kind donations to civil society organizations or churches, but also contributions to public institutions (such as schools and social services), and direct support to individuals in need. According to that 2004 survey, nearly half of Hungary’s adult population made in-kind donations, while over 60% contributed financially.

The only consistently available data source on philanthropy remains the annual nonprofit organization survey published by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (KSH).

In recent years, however, interest in philanthropy has grown. A range of organizations – mostly nonprofit and for-profit entities – have conducted surveys to assess Hungarians’ willingness to give. A 2023 survey by the Hungarian Red Cross found that almost 60% of respondents had donated, with two-thirds giving money and one-third providing in-kind support. However, only 19% identified as regular donors.

Although philanthropy is not the main focus, some insights can be drawn from research on political participation, such as studies by the HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences. Additionally, research on solidarity with refugees and migrants – conducted by both the Centre and TÁRKI – offers valuable context on the public’s willingness to help. These studies typically examine informal, individual acts of support, rather than institutionalized philanthropy (Tóth & Bernát, 2022; Zakariás et al., 2023).

Within the nonprofit sector, the Nonprofit Information and Education Centre (NIOK) plays a key role in studying philanthropy. In 2023, it conducted a nationwide survey on individual donations. NIOK also operates Hungary’s largest micro-donation platform, adjukossze.hu, and has begun analyzing user data to better understand giving behavior<sup>2</sup>.

Previously known as the Hungarian Philanthropic Forum (Magyar Adományozói Fórum), the organization now called EffekTeam<sup>3</sup> continues to research corporate social responsibility (CSR), ESG practices, and corporate philanthropy – also referred to as corporate social investment. These studies include both financial giving and corporate volunteering as forms of support.

Lastly, while not classified as philanthropy, the “1% system” allows Hungarian taxpayers to allocate 1% of their income tax to public benefit organizations. The volume of funds directed through this mechanism has increased in recent years (Láng, 2022), and it plays an important role in sustaining the nonprofit sector.

## 2 State of Philanthropy Research in Hungary

### 2.1 Philanthropy by Individuals

#### 2.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of Philanthropy by Individuals *In Vivo*

In Hungary, the primary data on individual giving come from population surveys conducted by academic institutions and public opinion agencies. Before examining these surveys, it is important to highlight a major, albeit non-traditional, channel of support: the 1% income tax designation system. Although not formally considered philanthropy, this mechanism plays a crucial role in funding the nonprofit sector. As some scholars have argued, the 1% system may even stimulate broader philanthropic behavior (Strecansky et al., 2016).

As shown in Table 1, the number of taxpayers directing 1% of their income tax to civil society organizations has fluctuated in recent years. After declining from 1.8 million to 1.44 million by 2022, participation has begun to recover, with the most recent figures approaching pre-2018 levels.

**Table 1: Number of designations for the 1% of personal income tax and the total amount of designated tax per year, 2018–2024.**

|      | No of designations (million capita) | Total amount (thousand EUR) |
|------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2024 | 1.77                                | 43836                       |
| 2023 | 1.81                                | 40132                       |
| 2022 | 1.44                                | 27968                       |
| 2021 | 1.66                                | 29334                       |
| 2020 | 1.62                                | 27337                       |
| 2019 | 1.69                                | 26956                       |
| 2018 | 1.8                                 | 25873                       |

**Datasource:** <https://ado-egy-szazalek.hu/>

Although interest in philanthropy appears to be growing in Hungary, consistent annual data on giving remain scarce. Insights primarily come from population surveys conducted by polling agencies and academic institutions. A recent survey by Pulzus, commissioned by the Nonprofit Information and Education Centre (NIOK), as well as several representative studies examining political participation, included questions about donation practices. While some of these surveys also explore in-kind giving, they tend to focus more heavily on financial contributions.

Three representative surveys captured the proportion of the adult population donating to civil society organizations in 2017, 2018, and 2021.<sup>4</sup> In 2017, 8% of respondents reported donating to a civil society organization. However, this figure dropped to just 3% in both 2018 and 2021. The lower percentages may be partly explained by differences in questionnaire wording: while the 2017 survey asked specifically about donations to civil society organizations, the later surveys included both civil society and political organizations in the same question, potentially diluting the responses.

In 2023, NIOK again commissioned Pulzus to assess donation habits, a study that aligned closely with research conducted by the Hungarian Red Cross in the same year. According to the findings, 65% of Hungarians reported providing financial assistance to a person or

organization. More specifically, 36% donated to civil society organizations (CSOs) in the year preceding the survey, and 15% contributed to church-based organizations.<sup>5</sup>

Demographic differences were also notable. Women were slightly more likely to donate to CSOs than men (38% vs. 35%). Donation patterns varied by age: individuals under 40 and over 60 were more likely to donate compared to those aged 40–59. Among CSO donors, 31% were from the 40–59 age group, compared to 41% of younger respondents and 39% of those over 60. The pattern was similar for donations to church organizations, though differences were somewhat smaller (11% among 40–59-year-olds, compared to 17% among younger respondents and 16% among those over 60).

Education level had the strongest correlation with donation behavior: the likelihood of donating, especially to CSOs, increased significantly with higher levels of educational attainment.

Although the study did not directly link donations to specific fields of activity, respondents were asked to indicate which areas they believed were most deserving of support. Sports and religion emerged as the most favored causes, followed by culture and legal advocacy (see Table 2).

**Table 2: Public Perception of Donation Worthiness by Sector (Ranking from 1-7; lower score indicates higher priority; based on responses from the 18+ population)**

| Area                     | Ranking (mean) |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Healthcare               | 2.9            |
| Education                | 3.1            |
| Animal rights            | 3.2            |
| Welfare                  | 3.3            |
| Environmental protection | 3.4            |
| Culture                  | 4.8            |
| Human Rights             | 5.3            |
| Sport                    | 5.9            |
| Religion                 | 6.4            |

**Source:** Pulzus report:p:15

According to the survey, healthcare and education are considered the most worthy causes for donations. However, the difference in perceived value between these sectors and others – such as animal welfare, social support, and environmental protection – is relatively small. In contrast, there is a more marked drop in perceived worthiness for sectors such as culture, human rights, sports, and religion.

Most individuals donate infrequently: 45% report donating two to three times per year or less, while only 20% give more than three times annually. Among donors, half contribute less than €7 per donation, while the other half give more.

A more recent survey was conducted by the IDEA Institute and Mikulásgyár<sup>6</sup> between November 29 and December 6, 2024. It examined the extent to which Hungarians donate to the poor, charitable organizations, or other philanthropic causes. According to the results, 35% of respondents occasionally made in-kind or financial contributions to organizations, while 18% gave specifically to organizations working with people in need.

The same survey also investigated public awareness of charitable organizations, focusing primarily on religious charities. The least-known organization was Catholic Caritas (Kato-

likus Karitás), with 76% of respondents unfamiliar with it. In contrast, the Hungarian Red Cross and the Maltese Charity Service (Máltai Szeretetszolgálat)<sup>7</sup> were recognized by nearly all respondents. Interestingly, while only 19% had donated to the least-known organization, 40% had contributed to the best-known ones.<sup>8</sup>

Context plays a significant role in donation behavior. Over the past decade, Hungarian society has faced two refugee crises, the Red Sludge Disaster, and the COVID-19 pandemic. In each case, public solidarity surged. Following the Red Sludge Disaster in 2010, charities and the government collected a total of HUF 763 million within two months (Bartal, 2013). Similarly, in early 2024, a fundraising campaign for homeless youth – launched after a demonstration on Heroes' Square – raised HUF 219 million in just six days, according to the Street to Home Association.<sup>9</sup>

During the Ukrainian refugee crisis, between February and June 2023, 23% of Hungarian adults donated in-kind and another 23% made financial contributions. Additionally, 2% provided accommodation. In total, 40% of the population offered some form of assistance, with monetary donations being the most common form of support (Zakariás et al., 2023). One possible explanation is that financial giving is among the simplest and most immediate forms of aid.

While these examples show that Hungarian society has significant potential for giving during emergencies, regular philanthropic behavior has yet to become deeply ingrained.

As crowdfunding becomes an increasingly popular form of fundraising, data from platforms such as adjukossze.hu, managed by NIOK, offer useful insights. Between November 28, 2016, and May 5, 2023, 229 civil society organizations ran 367 campaigns on the platform, generating 42,466 unique donation events.

Although the platform recorded 15,295 donors during this period, the true number may be higher due to anonymous contributions. Notably, 73% of donations came from repeat donors, even though three-quarters of all donors contributed only once. Just 13% of donors gave more than three times.

Campaign themes also influenced donation patterns. More than one-third of campaigns focused on social issues, followed by education. Other sectors showed minimal variation in fundraising success, except for sports, which appeared to be the least funded area on the platform (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Distribution of donations and campaigns by theme**

| Theme             | Proportion of Campaigns by Theme | Individual Donations by Theme (%) | Average Number of Donors per Campaign |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Animal Protection | 7%                               | 11%                               | 177                                   |
| Healthcare        | 9%                               | 6%                                | 63                                    |
| Human rights      | 5%                               | 4%                                | 101                                   |
| Culture           | 10%                              | 11%                               | 135                                   |
| Education         | 19%                              | 9%                                | 57                                    |
| Sport             | 1%                               | 0.2%                              | 19                                    |
| Social            | 36%                              | 37%                               | 120                                   |
| Environmental     | 5%                               | 2%                                | 42                                    |
| Other             | 8%                               | 20%                               | 273                                   |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>100% (367)</b>                | <b>100% (42,466)</b>              |                                       |

Although the proportion of regular donations is highest in the relatively few sports-related campaigns, the small donor base in this category limits the strength of any conclusions. More notably, the proportion of recurring donations is also substantial in the social sector, where regular contributions account for over 60% of the total. The average donation amount across all campaigns was €12.40 (4,957 HUF), with total contributions amounting to approximately €526,000 during the observed period.<sup>10</sup>

In summary, while giving is undoubtedly a component of Hungary's philanthropic landscape, only a portion of donations are channeled through civil society organizations. Systematic philanthropy remains confined to a relatively small segment of the population. However, the emergence of crowdfunding platforms offers promising avenues for expanding habitual giving. As evidenced by Hungary's largest fundraising portal, these platforms may play a pivotal role in fostering a culture of regular donations. Despite the limited prevalence of sustained philanthropic engagement, Hungarian society has demonstrated significant potential for mobilizing financial resources, particularly during times of crisis.

### 2.1.2 Data Sources of Philanthropy by Individuals *In Vivo*

The primary data on individual donations in Hungary comes from several surveys conducted over the past decade.

The Mobility Research Centre's project, carried out under the Excellence Cooperation Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA) at the Hun-REN Centre for Social Sciences in Budapest, provides a key source of information. Led by Imre Kovách, these studies explore themes such as political participation and social integration. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews with representative samples of the Hungarian adult population (aged 18 and over), considering gender, age, and settlement type. Sample sizes were 2,000 in 2017, 2,700 in 2018, and 5,000 in 2021. While the datasets have not yet been made publicly available, they are in the process of being placed in a research repository. These data have also been used in publications such as Geró and Szabó (2023) and Kovách et al. (2016).

In 2023, a population survey was conducted by Pulzus Research Ltd. on behalf of the Non-profit Information and Education Centre (NIOK). The survey employed an online panel and produced a representative sample of 1,020 respondents, considering gender, age, educational attainment, and settlement type. Although the raw dataset is not publicly accessible, the findings were shared with the authors of this report by NIOK.

Additional data on donation patterns were obtained from the adjukossze.hu crowdfunding platform, operated by NIOK. The dataset covers the period from 28 November 2016 to 5 May 2023 and contains information on individual donations by campaign and organization. While the exact number of donors cannot be fully established – due to the presence of anonymous contributions – the platform recorded 42,466 unique donation events and 15,295 donors, with a high proportion of repeat donations. Because the data involve sensitive information, they are not publicly available but were shared directly by NIOK for this report.

## 2.2 Philanthropy by Corporations

Insights into corporate donations were derived from both sector-specific studies and surveys among civil society organizations.

In 2020, Effekteam conducted a study of 15 major companies to assess changes in corporate social investments, particularly in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>11</sup> While the research did not report on the specific amounts donated, it revealed notable trends. Before the pandemic, a slight majority of the companies had increased their resources allocated for social causes, and a similar proportion planned to continue doing so. Corporate volunteering and pro bono services were also on the rise, although the overall picture was mixed: half of the companies had reduced their philanthropic contributions, and only one-third had increased them. The marketing dimension of corporate philanthropy had gained prominence. The most frequently supported causes were children and disadvantaged groups, followed by the elderly and residents of small towns. Civil society organizations were the primary recipients, with 12 of the 15 companies reporting such partnerships.

In 2024, the Hun-REN Centre for Social Sciences conducted a survey of 491 civil society organizations, with a focus on human rights, environmental, and advocacy groups, although the sample also included local organizations. The sample overrepresents larger organizations<sup>12</sup> and underrepresents those in the fields of sport and culture, sectors that may receive a larger share of corporate donations. The findings indicate that 41% of the surveyed organizations had received donations from for-profit or charitable institutions. Larger organizations were more likely to attract such contributions.

**Table 4: The share of organization receiving organizational donations**

| Yearly revenue (2023) | yes       | no        | N          |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 0-1250                | 26        | 74        | 88         |
| 1251-12500            | 41        | 59        | 138        |
| 12501-62500           | 44        | 56        | 72         |
| 62501-125000          | 54        | 46        | 33         |
| 125000+               | 62        | 38        | 29         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>59</b> | <b>41</b> | <b>360</b> |
| chi2                  |           |           | 0,00       |

**Source:** Buzogány-Gerő-Labanino 2024, own calculation

In the 2024 survey, respondents were asked<sup>13</sup> to assess the importance of various thematic issues in their organization's work. This allowed for an analysis of how donations from other organizations function as a financial resource across different areas of activity.

The results indicate that the specific field of operation does not lead to significant differences in the likelihood of receiving organizational donations. Rather, a general pattern emerges: organizations that consider a particular issue to be important are slightly more likely to receive such support. An exception to this trend may be found in the broad and less clearly defined category of "policy issues," where patterns were less consistent.

On average, among organizations that identified an issue as important, donations from other organizations constituted approximately 20–25% of their annual budget in 2023 (Table 5).

**Table 5: Ratio of organisations receiving organizational donations by importance of key issues. Last column: Mean percentage share of organizational donations in the organisation's budget in 2023 among organizations' recognise an issue as important.**

|                                                   | Not important | Somewhat important | important | Mean % of the budget in 2023 |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Human rights                                      | 32            | 43                 | 45        | 21                           |
| Family values                                     | 28            | 38                 | 46        | 25                           |
| Environmental protection                          | 31            | 50                 | 43        | 25                           |
| Policy issues                                     | 45            | 49                 | 38        | 19                           |
| Inequalities                                      | 33            | 46                 | 47        | 23                           |
| National interests, national traditions           | 38            | 44                 | 41        | 25                           |
| Religious values                                  | 36            | 44                 | 49        | 24                           |
| Fighting ethnic and religion based discrimination | 31            | 53                 | 50        | 24                           |
| Fighting gender inequalities                      | 31            | 59                 | 45        | 23                           |

**Source:** Buzogány-Gerő-Labanino 2024, own calculation

**2.3 Philanthropy by foundations**

**2.3.1 Descriptive statistics of Philanthropy by Foundations**

The primary data on donations by foundations in Hungary is provided by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO), which collects annual information from foundations that distribute donations. The data distinguishes between donations made to organizations and individuals; however, since 2009, these two categories are no longer separated in the HCSO records. Despite this, the total value of donations directed specifically to organizations remains available.<sup>14</sup>

Most donations are provided in the form of monetary support, while only a small share is given in-kind or through other forms. Unfortunately, the data does not specify the nature of these non-monetary contributions.

**Table 6: Number of grant-distributing organizations and the amount of donations**

|                                                                                                             | 2017    | 2018    | 2019    | 2020    | 2021    | 2022      | 2023      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of organisations giving financial donations to organisations and to individuals                      | 7 794   | 7 720   | 7 853   | 6 175   | 6 555   | 6 651     | 6 504     |
| Number of organisations giving financial donations to organisations                                         | 4 509   | 4 487   | n.d     | n.d     | n.d     | n.d       | n.d       |
| Number of organisations giving financial and in-kind donations to individuals and organisations             | 9 979   | 9 970   | 9 475   | 8 203   | 7 984   | 8 102     | 7 780     |
| Number of organizations giving financial and in-kind donations to organisations                             | 5 796   | 5 846   | n.d     | n.d     | n.d     | n.d       | n.d       |
| Value of financial donations given to organizations and individuals (Thousand EUR)                          | 668 478 | 586 536 | 593 766 | 596 840 | 759 902 | 1 076 538 | 1 149 674 |
| Value of financial donations given to organizations (Thousand EUR)                                          | 564 406 | 486 328 | 495 563 | 558 144 | 715 076 | 1 014 157 | 1 103 718 |
| Value of financial and in-kind donations given to organisations and individuals (Thousand EUR) <sup>1</sup> | 765 882 | 715 878 | 693 677 | 698 727 | 836 611 | 1 180 204 | 1 244 752 |
| Value of financial and in-kind donations given to organisations (Thousand EUR)                              | 630 160 | 547 518 | 553 596 | 610 343 | 754 068 | 1 089 933 | 1 176 497 |

**Source:** Hungarian Central Statistical Office (KSH 2024)  
[https://www.ksh.hu/stadat\\_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html](https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html)

Table 6 presents the number of organizations distributing grants alongside the total value of donations. Since the last report, the data reveal a gradual decline in the overall number of grant-making foundations. Initially, the total value of donations also declined – largely due to fluctuations in exchange rates when converted to euros – but began to rise again in 2020. Over the past two years, there has been a notable increase in the overall volume of distributed funds.

The composition of donations has also shifted. The share of financial contributions has increased steadily, from 82% in 2018 to 92% in 2023. When focusing specifically on donations directed to organizations, this proportion has remained relatively stable, at approximately 90%.

### Data sources

- 1 *Civil Society Organizations in Hungary: An Organizational Survey. Version 1.* This original dataset is based on a survey conducted by Áron Buzogány, Rafael Labanino, and Márton Gerő between May and June 2024. The survey, funded by the HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences in Budapest, has not yet been published.
- 2 *Central Statistical Office – Economic and Nonprofit Organizations.* This dataset contains publicly accessible information on grant-distributing foundations, available via the Hungarian Central Statistical Office at: [https://www.ksh.hu/stadat\\_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html](https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html). The HCSO is the primary state institution responsible for collecting and publishing statistical data across various domains.

### 3 Conclusion

Research on philanthropy and charitable donations in Hungary remains largely ad hoc. There is a notable absence of systematic, longitudinal studies – both at the level of civil society organizations and among the general population. As a result, it remains difficult to provide a comprehensive estimate of the total volume of donations, whether financial or in-kind.

Some limited insights can be drawn from population surveys and the statistics provided by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO). The HCSO data on civil society organizations' revenue offer an approximation of the total private donations received, although they do not distinguish between contributions from individuals and those from organizations.

According to these figures, the total amount of private donations increased from approximately €546,000 in 2017 to €785,500 in 2023.<sup>15</sup> However, this rise does not necessarily reflect an increased share of private donations within the overall revenue of civil society organizations. Without more detailed and disaggregated data, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about trends or shifts in philanthropic behavior over time.

This situation highlights the pressing need for more consistent data collection and regular, robust research efforts to better understand and support the philanthropic landscape in Hungary.

**Table 7: The amount of private donations and its share in the yearly revenue of civil society organisations by year, 2017-2023**

| Year | Amount of private donations<br>(thousand EUR) <sup>16</sup> | % of all revenue |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 2017 | 546 033                                                     | 21%              |
| 2018 | 641 713                                                     | 22%              |
| 2019 | 600 313                                                     | 20%              |
| 2020 | 574 461                                                     | 20%              |
| 2021 | 666 249                                                     | 20%              |
| 2022 | 797 269                                                     | 23%              |
| 2023 | 785 500                                                     | 20%              |

**Data source:** (KSH, 2025)

This estimate applies specifically to donations directed to civil society organizations (CSOs). However, since both the organizational survey and the data from the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) report similar figures regarding the share of donations in organizational revenue, it appears to be a credible approximation.

While giving is clearly part of the Hungarian society's philanthropic activity, it is equally evident that only a portion of donations flow through CSOs. Systematic philanthropy remains characteristic of a relatively small segment of the population. In recent years, the emergence of crowdfunding platforms has provided new opportunities for individual giving. Despite the generally low level of structured, recurring donations, Hungarians have demonstrated a strong capacity to mobilize financial support during times of crisis.

Corporate philanthropy is arguably the least understood area of the Hungarian philanthropic landscape. Although case studies suggest that corporate giving has become more embedded in CSR policies, there is no clear indication of whether corporate contributions are growing or merely holding steady. The limited data available makes it difficult to identify broader trends.

Similarly, the number of grant-distributing foundations and the total value of grants awarded has slightly declined in recent years. This reduction must be viewed in the context of a sharp decline in such organizations following 2014 (Gerő & Kerényi, 2020). Despite these declines, many organizations – particularly larger and more professionalized ones – are still able to secure around 20–25% of their revenue from organizational donations, which likely includes both local and international foundations as well as private sector contributions.

In conclusion, reliable data on philanthropy in Hungary remains limited, and significant gaps persist in understanding the full scale and diversity of donations. Individual giving appears to be relatively stagnant and is still closely tied to traditional conceptions of charity, such as helping those in immediate need. While this plays a vital role in crisis response, it is less effective in fostering long-term, systemic change. Bridging this gap requires not only more structured giving but also better data collection and a broader cultural shift toward more strategic philanthropy.

## 4 Notes

- 1 Márton Gerő's work is supported by the Bolyai János Research Scholarsip Programme (BO/00598/23).
- 2 Gerő Márton A adományozás Jellemzői. NIOK. 2024  
<https://www.nonprofit.hu/tudastar/-Az-adomanyozas-jellemzoi> Last accessed on 26 July 2024.
- 3 <https://effekteam.hu/>. Last accessed on 15 January 2025.
- 4 These surveys were conducted by the MTA Excellence Cooperation Programme Mobility Research Centre at the Centre for Social Sciences (see datasets)
- 5 The categories may overlap, and a single respondent may have marked more than one choice.
- 6 <https://mikulasgyar.hu/international>.
- 7 94 and 93% of the respondents know them, respectively.
- 8 IDEA Institute on Facebook about donation habits:  
<https://www.facebook.com/share/18c5kJPWZc/> Last accessed on 15 January 2025.
- 9 <https://www.facebook.com/utcarollakasba/posts/778772830952474>.
- 10 2024 exchange rate.
- 11 Efektam: Hol tartanak a magyar vállalatok az ESG bevezetésében?  
<https://effekteam.hu/hol-tartanak-a-magyar-vallalatok-az-esg-bevezeteseben/>  
Last accessed on 15 January, 2025.
- 12 The list of organizations in our sample is based on the Nonprofit Register curated by the Central Statistical Office and consisting of each working Nonprofit Organizations, A classification by budget is available for the whole register-Based on this variable in our sample, 11% of our sample belongs to the group of organizations with the largest budget size, over 125000 EUR compared the 8% of the whole list and 32% to the second "wealthiest" group (between 12500 and 125000 EUR) compared to 23% of the whole set of organizations.
- 13 Respondents were asked, How important is the representation of the following social issues in your organization's work? Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not important at all and 5 means very important.
- 14 [https://www.ksh.hu/stadat\\_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html](https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gsz/hu/gsz0016.html).
- 15 The KSH include nonprofit organizations into the data collection. However several types of these are not considered as civil society organizations (e.g. public bodies, public foundations). ((STADAT – Módszertan – Gazdasági És Nonprofit Szervezetek, 2025) I table... Associations, private foundations, trade unions and professional organisations are included, and public bodies, public foundations, nonprofit companies, nonprofit institutions are excluded.
- 16 Calculated with with the yearly average EUR-HUF Exchange rate. Inflation is not included in the calculation.

## 5 References and further reading

- Bartal Anna Mária. (2013). A magyar segélyszervezetek vörösiszap-katasztrófa idején végzett humanitárius tevékenységének hatásvizsgálata. *Civil Szemle*, 10(4 (37)), 81–105.
- Buzogány, Á, Gerő, M. Labanino, R. (2024) Civil Society organizations in Hungary: an organizational survey. 2024 Version1 HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences, Budapest.
- Czike, K., & Kuti, É. (2005). Lakossági adományok és önkéntes tevékenységek. *Budapest: Non-profit Kutatócsoport Egyesület*. <http://www.nonprofitkutatas.hu/letoltendo/gyorsjelentes.pdf>
- Gerő, M., & Kerényi, S. (2020). A civil társadalom változó szerepei és a társadalmi integráció. In I. Kovách (Ed.), *Integrációs mechanizmusok a magyar társadalomban* (pp. 195–230). Argumentum Kiadó, Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont.
- Gerő, M., & Szabó, A. (2023). Political integration mechanisms in Hungary (2010–2022). *Intersections*, 9(4), 26–52. <https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v9i4.1158>
- Kovách, I., Hajdu, G., Gerő, M., Kristóf, L., & Szabó, A. (2016). A magyar társadalom integrációs és réteg\Hodésmodelljei. *Szociológiai Szemle*, 26(3), 4–27.
- KSH. (2025). 9.1.1.12. A nonprofit szervezetek működési jellemzők szerinti száma és bevétele szervezeti forma szerint. [https://www.ksh.hu/stadat\\_files/gsz/hu/gsz0014.html](https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gsz/hu/gsz0014.html)
- Láng N. (2022). SZJA 1% fogadása – Útmutató civil szervezetek részére. *Nonprofit.hu – Tudástár*. <https://www.nonprofit.hu/tudastar/utmutato-nonprofit-szervezetek-reszere-szja-1-fogadasa>
- STADAT – Módszertan – Gazdasági és nonprofit szervezetek. (2025). [https://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/modsz/gsz\\_modsz.html#nonprofit](https://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/modsz/gsz_modsz.html#nonprofit)
- Török, M., & Sebestény, I. (2017). Research on Giving in Hungary. In *Giving in Europe The current state of research on household donations, corporations, foundations and charity lotteries to charitable organisations in Europe* ERNOP. <https://ernop.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Giving-in-Europe-2013-total-versie-16-01-2017-upload-to-ERNOPpdf>
- Tóth J., & Bernát A. (2022). Menekültválság 2022-ben: Az Ukrajna elleni orosz agresszió menekülteinek magyarországi fogad(tat)ása. In Kolosi T., Szelényi I., & Tóth I. G. (Eds.), *Társadalmi Riport* (pp. 347–367). TÁRKI Társadalomkutatási Intézet Zrt. <https://doi.org/10.61501/TRIP2022.18>
- Zakariás, I., Feischmidt, M., Gerő, M., Morauszki, A., Zentai, V., & Zsigmond, C. (2023). Solidarity with Displaced People from Ukraine in Hungary: Attitudes and Practices. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-023-01096-8>